

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 20, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John D. Banks, minister, Bethany Congregational Church, Quincy, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Lord of Creation, whose wisdom overrules the faltering judgment of Your children: A new day summons us to labor within the framework You have given us. To the men and women who here engage in great decisions, grant Your Holy Spirit in guidance and power. For their acceptance, in faith and trust, of the burgeoning concerns of their neighbors, we thank You. For their firm commitment to the right as You give them to see it, we thank You. Lift them above the dark sense of futility, for in Your economy there is neither majority nor minority, neither losers nor winners, but only degrees of integrity. Form and inform the minds of these Representatives, and those they represent. Then may grace, mercy, and peace be the hallmarks of our national life, and Your will be done. 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 agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1989. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the renewal of certain star route contracts; and

S. 3153. An act to amend the Act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91-660; 84 Stat. 1967), an act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes.

The message also 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. 6797. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Kickapoo Indians of Kansas and Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets No. 316, 316-A, 317, 145, 193, and 318; and

H.R. 7742. An act to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Yankton Sioux Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 332-A, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9212) entitled "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," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. STAFFORD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution to urge each American family to plant a vegetable garden; and

S. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution paying tribute to President Harry S. Truman on the occasion of his 88th birthday.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that both some American papers and foreign papers have been carrying statements to the effect that the United States will not support the Federal Republic of Germany unless the Bundestag ratifies the proposed agreements with Soviet Russia.

I think this is a complete misstatement of fact since the relations between the United States and the Federal Republic do not depend upon the relations between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union has made no concessions in this agreement to the Federal Republic that it did not make to the United States and other powers in 1945 and 1946. The only difficulty is that the Soviet Union did not live up to its obligations and agreements and has continued to harass traffic between West Germany and Berlin and is directly responsible for the infamous division of the city of Berlin and the inability of Germans to be reunited from time to time with their relatives on the other side of the wall.

If history is any guide, and it has been in the past, there is no assurance that if the treaty is ratified that the Soviet would come any closer to keeping its word with the Federal Republic than it has with the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUPS OF CONGRESS ON EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the reports of the committees and interparliamentary groups of the Congress on expenditures of foreign currencies and appropriated funds for the 92d Congress, first session.

In doing so, I thought it might be interesting to point out a few facts concerning travel by members of the executive branch of the U.S. Government. It is always the congressional travel that gets the attention of the press and public since we yearly publish a record of it. A little research clearly indicates that the congressional travel is, in fact, a drop in the bucket.

To illustrate this, I have asked the Agency for International Development to submit a record of their temporary duty travel for the calendar year 1971. This TDY travel, as it is called, represents travel for short periods of time—usually a few days or weeks—for supervisory purposes, meetings, special projects, and the like. The report covers only people who work in Washington and travel to other countries and back to Washington. This report does not include TDY travel from one overseas post to another, nor does it include movement of personnel going to an overseas post for a tour of 2 or 3 years.

I had no particular reason for choosing AID for this report. I am sure that the travel of the Department of State, U.S. Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense, and numerous other agencies which have people overseas would be equally, if not more, interesting. And I am certain that the travel record of Mr. Kissinger would make for fascinating reading.

Actually, I was planning to insert the AID travel report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but found that it would cost the taxpayer too much to print as it covers 157 legal size pages. So I am going to give you a brief analysis of the travel and a few examples of executive branch travel. The report itself will be on file in the House Administration Office for anyone who wants to examine it.

The total number of AID trips for the year was 1,080, at an estimated cost of \$1,490,891. I found, not to my surprise, that France rated the most visits from AID personnel. There was a total of 96 trips to France, where we have no foreign assistance program, as contrasted with 89 trips to Vietnam.

Here are some other comparisons of numbers of temporary duty trips:

England had 68, and Nigeria had 51.
Switzerland had 40, and Laos had 37.
Italy had 44, and Ghana had 47.
Hawaii had 15, and Tanzania had 21.
Canada had 19, and the Congo had 20.

Back to France for a minute, I discovered in analyzing this report that Paris is a favorite place for meetings of AID personnel for discussions concerning other countries. Meetings took place in Paris for purposes of discussions on the following countries: The Ivory Coast, the Philippines, Turkey, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nigeria, the Congo, Morocco, Tunisia, and Colombia.

Other interesting meetings took place in Paris. A Mr. Konnerup attended a meeting there to, "participate in discussions relative to cost estimates for tsetse fly suppression and control."

And a Mr. Pfoutz went to three separate meetings in Paris to "attend OECD working party on development assistance untying agreement meeting."

Practically all of these AID travelers managed to hit more than one country on these 1,080 trips. Most hit several. A Mr. Brown, in the Technical Assistance Bureau, visited England, France, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Italy and Tunisia "to visit AID field activities re relevance of domestic foreign assistance activities and experiences and minority talent."

And a Mr. Oleson, described as a multisector officer in SER-PM at AID, spent 1 month traveling through France, Greece, Italy, Spain, and England "to complete a case study in connection with long-term training at Foreign Service Institute Senior Seminar."

And so, here are a few examples from a report I think fairly revealing.

I asked my staff to total up the number of trips made by Members of Congress, and the number given me was 365. The total amount of money reported for travel for both Members and staff as listed in the reports I am submitting is \$833,197.15.

I am not trying to be pious in pointing out the 365 congressional trips as contrasted to 1,080 trips by personnel of the Agency for International Development. And I acknowledge that most of these congressional trips included more than one country, as did the AID trips. Nor am I saying that I think it is necessarily wrong that a Mr. Konnerup participated in some discussions in Paris on the control of the tsetse fly.

What I do point out is that as congressional travel is revealed to the public, perhaps it should be put into proper perspective. There are many people, nameless to the public, who are going out to Dulles and National airports each day from the executive branch to board a plane for someplace. And many of them have a lot more miles on them than do any Members of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for me to go to my district for a period of time in connection with an imminent danger of infestation of the reported fire ant that has swept the South and is presently working its way through my district; also other official business in connection with the Corps of Engineers and the change of the command at the Advanced Training Base in Corpus Christi, and some other personal matters. I ask unanimous consent for permission to absent myself from the House for a period not to exceed 3 weeks.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the North Vietnamese all-out offensive is cold calculated aggression. Their attack is deliberate escalation of the war in the face of American withdrawal and American efforts to promote peace. In its initial stages it was designed to overrun the Republic of South Vietnam and capture American withdrawal forces. There was a very real danger the Communists would break through and capture thousands of Americans, most of whom are not combat trained. Had they been permitted to do so, this would have been a giant step toward world war III.

American response was necessary to protect our withdrawal forces and thus is in the interest of peace. Without American air action, the peace of the entire world would be threatened by rewarding unwarranted Communist aggression against our forces already committed to withdrawal. The President absolutely had no alternative. The President has committed our country to peace in Southeast Asia by withdrawing nearly 500,000 troops. This Nation has taken every honorable step for peace, including the President's journey for peace to Peking and the pending trip to Moscow. The President would be in a position of pitiful weakness in Moscow had he not taken action against a blatant and unconcealed aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I am today joining many of my colleagues in introducing a resolution to condemn North Vietnamese aggression and its all-out attack on its neighbors. Our resolution further calls for congressional support of the President's forthright action to repeal this invasion and attack upon our forces in the act of promoting peace.

EMPLOYMENT RISES SHARPLY IN MARCH

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, employment soared in March to record heights. After adjustments for seasonal factors, the number of jobholders exceeded 81 million as employment increased by 618,000, the largest absolute advance since April 1960.

The extraordinary growth in employment last month has been overshadowed in some public discussions by the two-tenths of 1 percent rise in the unemployment rate. However, as an indicator of the general strength of the economy, the rise in employment is much more revealing.

The fact is that while the economy produced the largest 1-month increase in employment in over 10 years, the labor force expanded even more sharply. Had the civilian labor force increased at its historical trend rate, the March increase in employment would have driven the

jobless rate down substantially. As it happened, our economic expansion provided an unusually large number of new jobs, but the increase in the labor force—the largest in 25 years—prevented the jobless rate from falling.

This does not signal any faltering of the economy. Since June 1971, the adjusted figures indicate labor markets have absorbed 2.3 million out of the 2.6 million increase in the civilian labor force, a remarkable record. Despite creating an extraordinary number of jobs, the economy also had to accept the largest increase in the labor force in two and one-half decades.

There are ample indications that the economy is expanding and will continue to expand at a healthy rate. The March employment increase is one indicator of this strength. As the unusual growth in the labor force tapers off, the coming months should show a falling rate of unemployment in the face of marked employment gains, a development which we all desire.

HAVE PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S WORDS LOST MEANING FOR TODAY?

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, about a decade ago a young President said America would pay any price, bear any burden, meet any obligation to assure the survival of freedom.

How far some of those in John Kennedy's party have come in just a decade to the point where those noble words are void of meaning.

Today many of those who have inherited the leadership of his party seem to have more concern for the enemy than for our ally, more condemnation for our President than for the aggressor and more interest in the next election than in the next generation.

Peace at any price may be fine from the floor of the Congress because the price will be paid by someone else if they are wrong.

The President has no such simple decision. As Commander in Chief he must assess the military and diplomatic challenge to his country and its goals. He must calculate what effects his action will have on American desire to help assure peace in the Middle East. Can anyone rationally suggest that it is not important to this country and the free world that we end this war in an honorable way. There is something important about the honor of America. Can we be trusted along the Suez Canal if we are not trusted at the DMZ? Can we be credible at the SALT talks if we are not credible in Southeast Asia?

The Democratic candidates for President speak of peace, yet would purchase it by accepting the dictates of the enemy. In their moral acrobatics they would abandon 18 million people in the midst of as naked an aggression as the 20th century has witnessed. In World War II they called for unconditional surrender of our Nazi enemy. Today they call uni-

laterally for surrender, not of the Communist enemy, but of our own country.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS DENOUNCED COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to our colleague, the gentleman from New York, a moment ago, and I would take this time to ask him a question. This morning at the Democratic caucus, by an overwhelming vote of 186 to 16, or some lopsided figure such as that, the Democratic caucus roundly denounced the naked aggression of the Communists in South Vietnam.

After having taken that action, what is the basis for my colleague's statement on the floor of the House?

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

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

Mr. KEMP. The gentleman knows full well that yesterday the Democratic caucus defeated by only a vote of 105 to 97 a proposal that the United States cease its support of South Vietnam within 30 days.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

This morning they voted by more than 200 to 16 to condemn this Communist aggression.

Mr. KEMP. The gentleman knows the statement of my Democratic colleagues—

Mr. PUCINSKI. Four years ago the President—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I refuse to yield further.

Four years ago the President went before the American people and said, "I have a plan—I have a plan to get us out of Vietnam." Unlike his illustrious predecessor, Dwight Eisenhower, who also said he had a plan and carried out his plan when he effectuated a truce in Korea and got us out of Korea, Mr. Nixon has failed. That is what we ought to be addressing ourselves to, how best we can get ourselves out of Vietnam without seeing that nation fall to the Communists.

PROPOSAL TO PRESENT QUESTION OF RESOLVING HOSTILITIES IN VIETNAM BEFORE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this morning, in the referred to Democratic caucus, I did not have an opportunity to offer a resolution, unfortunately, which I believe is something not only the Democrats but also every Member of the House as well as of the Senate should seriously consider. I was prevented from offering my resolution by a gag rule, in-

voked by the doves, yes, the same who have vociferated for "peace" and "democracy." It is incredible that those who have been so vocal against the gag rule in the past, should have been so gleeful about it now. I can account for it only by attributing it to their ignorance, since they gave no opportunity to find out what it was all about.

Regardless of all the recriminations, which I think are to be regretted, whether we like it or not there are Americans who are dying, and we have a responsibility to be very sober and responsible in our judgments and especially in our utterances at such critical times. It is for this reason I have been very loath to speak out, even during the past 5 or 6 years.

This resolution, which I hope to present to the entire membership at some proper time, reads:

Resolved, That the President should immediately take such steps as may be necessary, acting through the United States Delegation to the United Nations, to bring the question of resolving the hostilities of Vietnam before the General Assembly of the United Nations; that the recent massive invasion of North Vietnam by South Vietnam makes this imperative.

I believe there should be some appeal to that body which the world in great hope founded after World War II.

The Chinese nation, the Communist Chinese—I will not call them the People's Republic of China—the Communist Chinese regime is a member now of the United Nations. Russia is a member of the United Nations. I believe this would be a proper avenue.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Democratic caucus has just adjourned and in that caucus we adopted a historic resolution. That resolution is as follows:

That it is the sense of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives that in the 92nd Congress the House of Representatives:

Should condemn the current military invasion of South Vietnam by the forces of North Vietnam;

Resolved further, That the recent bombings of North Vietnam represent a dangerous escalation of our role in the Indochina war and a direct contradiction of the administration's stated policy of "winding down" the war;

Resolved further, that the national interest in obtaining a permanent peace with security would best be served by promptly setting a date to terminate all U.S. military involvement in and over Indochina, subject only to obtaining the release of our prisoners of war and all available information on the missing in action;

Resolved further, that the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives hereby directs the Democratic members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to prepare and report within 30 days legislation designated to accomplish these specific objectives.

As I stated in a speech on the floor yesterday, I offered a resolution in the caucus which was as follows:

That it is the sense of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives that in the 92nd Congress the House of Representatives:

Should condemn the current military invasion of South Vietnam by the forces of North Vietnam;

My resolution was adopted by the Democratic caucus by a vote of 186 for, 16 against, and 2 voting present. The final resolution incorporating my amendment was passed by a vote of 144 yeas to 58 nays. Although my resolution was not formally adopted until the second day of the debate this was because the parliamentary situation in the caucus prevented its consideration until that time. I think it is important to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there was in all of these deliberations in the Democratic caucus an overwhelming condemnation of the military invasion of South Vietnam by the forces of North Vietnam.

ACTION BY THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the comments of the gentleman from New York, and his colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois.

I want to say I think it is commendable that the caucus did as an afterthought finally condemn the North Vietnamese for their invasion. I understand that it came in the last part of the resolution, by an amendment from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) he decided perhaps it would be in the best interests of the caucus to also condemn the people who are invading the South, the North Vietnamese. I believe the caucus should be commended for taking that action.

If the gentleman from Illinois figures are correct I am amazed that there are 16 members of the caucus that would not vote to condemn this Communist invasion.

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I should like to correct the record. I will not have time to do it under the gentleman's 1 minute, but under the revision and extension I asked for I will put it in the Record.

Actually, the amendment had been pending for 2 days. It just took a little time parliamentarily to get to it. It was a part of the original context of the Democratic Caucus action.

We are delighted that it did happen.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois, who took such pride in telling us about this action, would tell us how many members of the Democratic Caucus voted against the provision condemning the North Vietnamese invasion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would hope to respond to the gentleman if the gentleman

will yield. It is my understanding and I am not sure on this point, but I believe there is some question as to what is privileged matter in the caucus, but I can tell the gentleman that it was overwhelming. My leader tells me we can tell. It was 200 for and 16 against.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING NORTH VIETNAMESE AGGRESSION

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, I am naturally inclined to be nonpartisan and objective in my approach to all issues. I take this opportunity to announce to the House that shortly, in conjunction with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER), we will be introducing a resolution cosponsored by approximately 61 Members commending the President for his actions in handling the entire situation in Southeast Asia and pointing out the flagrant violations perpetrated by the North Vietnamese. I remind Members of the House that it is our policy to achieve peace and freedom in that area. I certainly think this will ultimately be the view expressed by a majority of the Members of Congress.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I offered the resolution this morning in the Democratic Caucus, which received a nice vote.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

VOTE IN THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Illinois who gave some figures a few moments ago as to the vote in the Democratic caucus this morning, here is a UPI story which I just tore off the ticker. It says:

By the overwhelming vote of 144 to 58, Democrats gave final approval to the resolution combining the antiwar demands with condemnation of the Communist invasion.

This was not 16, as the gentleman said.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT HARRY S TRUMAN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 88TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 78.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to commend my colleague

from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) for bringing this up.

He provided me with a copy of the resolution sometime ago. It is worthwhile, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to make it unanimous on this side of the aisle. This, in behalf of the entire conference of Republicans from Missouri.

There is no question, as my colleague stated in his forwarding letter, that it has been handled in different ways in the past, doubtless due to different techniques evolving toward how to show appreciation and affection.

I would like to commend not only my colleagues on the other side of the aisle but particularly the author of the resolution and the President's own Congressman from Independence, Mo. (Mr. RANDALL) for helping to bring this erstwhile action to the floor.

I understand that it passed the other body yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one more deserving and noteworthy than President Truman, whom the good Lord has spared for four score and eight years, and who history in its objectivity will term not only a great President and statesman, but a man who took the time to read history and to apply it to his current problems before acting; and he always acted, before the "buck" stopped beyond the pale of his desk. I wish him good health, and all happiness, as well as happy returns of the 8th of May.

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to take a moment to make the record clear as to the reason the resolution was originated over in the other body. The fact is that the gentleman from Independence served in the other body and never was a Member of the House.

However, let me point out that Mr. Truman said many times that he regarded the House of Representatives as the people's body. He has said more than once that if he were to have had his way and the situation presented itself, he would have preferred to be a Member of the House of Representatives because it is closer to the people than the other body on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was necessary that this word of explanation be provided as to why the resolution was first adopted on the other side of the Capitol. I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I shall take only a minute to, first, commend the gentleman from Missouri and the other authors of this resolution in paying tribute to a very great American, President Harry S Truman.

I know of no man alive—and for that matter very few who have passed on—who has made a greater contribution to the welfare of this country and to the people of our country. He has done so many great things that time does not permit their enumeration.

Mr. Speaker, the political expression which he used when he was President which I liked best is:

If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

Happy birthday, Mr. President!

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I deeply appreciate the gentleman from Missouri offering this resolution.

I do not think I can match the eloquence or sincerity of the words of the gentleman from Missouri (Dr. HALL) in endorsing this particular resolution.

I simply want to say that I think history will show, as it has already indicated, that former President Harry Truman was one of our strong Presidents in a trying time. I think this resolution is highly appropriate and I am glad to indicate my personal endorsement of it.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON RES. 78

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby extends to the Honorable Harry S Truman, thirty-third President of the United States, its greetings and warm wishes on the occasion of his eighty-eighth birthday on May 8, 1972.

SEC. 2. The Congress expresses its admiration and gratitude to President Truman for his many years of distinguished service to the people of the United States and to the world community.

SEC. 3. The Congress expresses its appreciation to President Truman for his contributions as Senator, Vice President, President, author, and statesman.

SEC. 4. A copy of this concurrent resolution shall be promptly transmitted to the distinguished "Man from Independence", Harry S Truman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the history of this a little bit so that it will be completely understood. I am the dean of the Missouri delegation and I had the cooperation of the entire delegation, including Dr. Hall in the handling of this matter. I felt it was a pleasant idea for the Senate to act first since Mr. Truman served in the Senate. The Senate acted yesterday, and that is the resolution we are considering now. However, I introduced yesterday in behalf of each member of the Missouri delegation, all 10 Members of the House of Representatives, an identical resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to all of our delegation for their cooperation and I am very grateful to all the Members of the House for their obvious enthusiasm in the passage of this resolution honoring a man who served his country well.

Although Harry S Truman was a very partisan Democrat, when it came to matters of foreign affairs, he was as unpartisan as any man who ever served his country in American history.

I think this is an appropriate time to pass this resolution.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on that

tragic April day 27 years ago when the world learned of the sudden death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt at Warm Springs, Ga., there was deep foreboding throughout the free world that the man who was succeeding President Roosevelt would not be equal to the challenge. He had been Vice President only a few months, and his nomination to that office at the Democratic National Convention had been bitterly contested by the supporters of the Vice President he was displacing. In many quarters he was viewed as a small-town politician called upon to succeed one of the greatest Presidents in our history.

But the people of Missouri had few fears 27 years ago about Harry S. Truman's capacity to be an effective President of the United States, even in the midst of the largest war the world had ever known. We knew the character of dogged persistence, his courage and great strength, and his humaneness, too. As a two-term U.S. Senator, he had represented his constituents conscientiously and well, bringing to the Senate a sense of personal identification with the problems and the aspirations of all citizens. And he had proved himself one of the best investigators in the public interest that the Senate had ever had. Nevertheless, we knew that our fellow Missourian was assuming the hardest, most demanding job in public life, and one for which no one can truly be fully prepared.

Now, as our former President approaches his 88th birthday, 19 years after he left office, history looks back on his nearly 8 years as President not only with kindness but with intense respect. His accomplishments as President were remarkable and durable ones, from the restructuring of the world's economies to the establishment of the concept of equal rights in the United States. He lost many battles with the Congress during his early years as President—so many, in fact, that his State of the Union messages were, for a time, greeted with ridicule for the "outlandish" demands he was making for legislation to upgrade the quality of American life for all Americans. His program—a vast program for revitalizing the American Constitution and extending the principles of the New Deal—took shape slowly during his Presidency but has been carried through to almost complete achievement in his lifetime.

The pride which we Missourians had in Harry S. Truman when he became President is pride now shared by all Americans in his record as President, and as a human being.

To those of us who were privileged to know him as a fine Senator, as Vice President, and as President, and in the years of his retirement, there is special pride in saluting him as an old friend reaching his 88th birthday. As friends, we love him and his gracious and level-headed wife; as American citizens, we are forever grateful for what he was able to accomplish as President of the United States. Free people throughout the world will join us in this gratitude, for he not only fed the starving but lifted them back to

productive life in every nation ravaged by World War II.

Missouri treasures the Trumans, realizing, however, that they are not ours alone, that Harry and Bess are also beloved throughout the world. Congratulations, President Truman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Senate Concurrent Resolution 78 just concurred in by the House, and on House Concurrent Resolution 584, a similar resolution.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 928 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 928

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. 14070) 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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, 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 for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of absolutely no objection to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. It is an open rule with 2 hours of debate. I might say, however, that there is some objection to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the NASA request was for \$3,379,-

000,000, and that the committee, instead of decreasing this amount, increased it by \$49,950,000. It seems to me that we should be decreasing instead of increasing these NASA appropriations as the people are asking whether we have not enough moon rocks by this time, and whether we need additional flights just to secure more rocks. I think it is high time that we started cutting back on these flights and using some of this money for needed projects here on earth. As a consequence, I will vote for any reasonable amendment to reduce this authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule but I oppose this bill unless it is substantially reduced.

The purpose of H.R. 14070 is to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1973.

Authorizations contained in the bill total \$3,428,950,000, which are broken down as follows: research and development \$2,650,850,000—construction of facilities, \$77,300,000—research and program management \$700,800,000.

Some of the major programs included under research and development are: Apollo: \$128,700,000. The major focus of this program in fiscal year 1973 will be Apollo 17, the final flight in the series, scheduled for December 1972.

Skylab: \$540,500,000. This project will provide the first experimental space station with the initial launch scheduled for April 1973.

Space shuttle: \$200,000,000. This program will provide a multipurpose transportation system for routine round-trip access to near earth space. The first flight is planned for 1978. Development costs are estimated at \$5,150,000,000 over a 6-year period.

Mariner: \$43 million. This program has in the past produced unmanned flights by Mars and Venus, and in 1973 a Mariner is scheduled to fly by Mercury.

Viking: \$229,500,000. This project will provide unmanned flights to Mars, which will be able to land on the planet, rather than merely fly by, as Mariner has done.

Of the \$77,300,000 authorized for construction of facilities, the largest single amount, \$27,900,000, is earmarked for space shuttle facilities at various locations.

The \$700,800,000 authorized for research and program management provides the civil service staff necessary for in-house research and to manage the research and development programs. The 1973 budget provides for a further reduction in the number of NASA's permanent positions to a new level of 26,850, a reduction of 1,500 from the number planned for in the 1972 budget request. This reduction will bring to 8,291 the total reductions in permanent positions from peak NASA employment, a reduction of 25 percent, and the lowest level of personnel since 1962.

It is interesting that the original NASA request was for \$3,379 million. The committee increased this by \$49,950,000. The committee changes bring the total cost of the bill to \$3,428,950,000.

The 5-year cost estimate projected by the committee for NASA, assuming no

new programs, are fiscal year 1974, \$3,370 million; fiscal year 1975, \$3,300 million; fiscal year 1976, \$3,200 million; fiscal year 1977, \$3,100 million; and fiscal year 1978, \$2,800 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, 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. MILLER of California. 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. 14070) 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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. 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 350, nays 2, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—350

Abbutt	Broyhill, N.C.	Devine
Abernethy	Buchanan	Diggs
Abourezk	Burke, Fla.	Dingell
Abzug	Burke, Mass.	Donohue
Adams	Burleson, Tex.	Dorn
Addabbo	Burlison, Mo.	Downing
Alexander	Burton	Drinan
Anderson, Calif.	Byrne, Pa.	Dulski
Anderson, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	Duncan
Anderson, Tenn.	Byron	Eckhardt
Andrews, Ala.	Cabell	Edmondson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Caffery	Edwards, Ala.
Archer	Camp	Edwards, Calif.
Arends	Carey, N.Y.	Eilberg
Ashbrook	Carlson	Erlenborn
Aspin	Carter	Esch
Badillo	Casey, Tex.	Evans, Colo.
Baker	Cederberg	Evins, Tenn.
Baring	Celler	Fascell
Barrett	Chamberlain	Findley
Begich	Clancy	Fish
Belcher	Clausen,	Fisher
Bell	Don H.	Flood
Bennett	Clawson, Del.	Flowers
Bergland	Cleveland	Foley
Betts	Collier	Ford, Gerald R.
Bevill	Collins, Ill.	Ford,
Biaggi	Collins, Tex.	William D.
Blester	Conable	Forsythe
Blanton	Conte	Fraser
Blatnik	Corman	Frelinghuysen
Boggs	Cotter	Frenzel
Boland	Coughlin	Frey
Bolling	Daniel, Va.	Fulton
Bow	Daniels, N.J.	Fuqua
Brademas	Danielson	Galifianakis
Brasco	Davis, Ga.	Garmatz
Brinkley	Davis, S.C.	Gaydos
Broomfield	Davis, Wis.	Glaimo
Brotzman	de la Garza	Gibbons
Brown, Ohio	Delaney	Goldwater
	Dellenback	Gonzalez
	Denholm	Goodling
	Dennis	Grasso
	Derwinski	Green, Oreg.

Green, Pa.	Mahon	Rostenkowski
Griffiths	Mailliard	Roush
Gross	Mallory	Rousselot
Grover	Mann	Roy
Gubser	Martin	Roybal
Gude	Mathis, Ga.	Runnels
Hagan	Matsumaga	Ruppe
Haley	Mayne	Ruth
Hall	Mazzoli	St Germain
Hamilton	Meeds	Sandman
Hammer-	Meicher	Sarbanes
schmidt	Metcalfe	Satterfield
Hanley	Michel	Scherle
Hansen, Idaho	Miller, Calif.	Schmitz
Hansen, Wash.	Miller, Ohio	Schneebeli
Harrington	Mills, Md.	Schwengel
Harsha	Minish	Scott
Hastings	Mink	Sebellus
Hathaway	Minshall	Seiberling
Hays	Mitchell	Shoup
Hechler, W. Va.	Mizell	Shriver
Heckler, Mass.	Mollohan	Sikes
Helnz	Montgomery	Skubitz
Helstoski	Morse	Slack
Henderson	Mosher	Smith, Calif.
Hicks, Mass.	Moss	Smith, Iowa
Hicks, Wash.	Murphy, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.
Hillis	Murphy, N.Y.	Snyder
Hogan	Myers	Spence
Hoffield	Natcher	Springer
Horton	Nedzi	Steed
Hosmer	Nelsen	Steele
Howard	Nichols	Steiger, Ariz.
Hungate	Obey	Steiger, Wis.
Hunt	O'Hara	Stratton
Hutchinson	O'Konski	Stuckey
Ichord	O'Neill	Sullivan
Jacobs	Passman	Symington
Jarman	Patman	Talcott
Johnson, Calif.	Patten	Taylor
Jonas	Pepper	Teague, Tex.
Jones, Ala.	Perkins	Thompson, Ga.
Jones, N.C.	Peyser	Thomson, Wis.
Jones, Tenn.	Pickle	Thone
Karh	Pike	Tiernan
Kastenmeyer	Pirnie	Van Deerlin
Kazen	Podell	Vander Jagt
Keating	Poff	Vanik
Keith	Powell	Veysey
Kemp	Freder, N.C.	Vigorito
King	Price, Ill.	Waggonner
Kluczynski	Pryor, Ark.	Waldie
Koch	Pucinski	Wampler
Kuykendall	Purcell	Whalen
Kyl	Quile	Whalley
Kyros	Quillen	White
Landgrebe	Rallsback	Whitten
Latta	Randall	Widnall
Leggett	Rangel	Wiggins
Lennon	Rarick	Williams
Lent	Reid	Wilson, Bob
Link	Reuss	Winn
Lloyd	Rhodes	Wright
Long, Md.	Riegle	Wyatt
Lujan	Roberts	Wydler
McClary	Robinson, Va.	Wyllie
McClure	Robison, N.Y.	Wyman
McCollister	Rodino	Yates
McCulloch	Roe	Yatron
McDade	Rogers	Young, Fla.
McDonald,	Roncalio	Young, Tex.
Mich.	Rooney, N.Y.	Zablocki
McKay	Rooney, Pa.	Zion
	Rosenthal	Zwach

NAYS—2

Ryan
NOT VOTING—81

Annunzio	Eshleman	Madden
Ashley	Flynt	Mathias, Calif.
Aspinall	Fountain	Mikva
Bingham	Gallagher	Mills, Ark.
Blackburn	Gettys	Monagan
Brooks	Gray	Moorhead
Brown, Mich.	Griffin	Morgan
Broyhill, Va.	Halpern	Nix
Carney	Hanna	Pelly
Chappell	Harvey	Pettis
Chisholm	Hawkins	Poage
Clark	Hébert	Price, Tex.
Clay	Hull	Rees
Colmer	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Conyers	Kee	Scheuer
Crane	Landrum	Shipley
Culver	Long, La.	Sisk
Curlin	McCloskey	Staggers
Dellums	McEwen	Stanton,
Dent	McFall	Stanton,
Dickinson	McKevitt	J. William
Dowdy	McKinney	James V.
du Pont	McMillan	Stephens
Dwyer	Macdonald,	Stokes
Edwards, La.	Mass.	Stubblefield
		Stuckey
		Terry

Teague, Calif.	Ullman	Willson,
Terry	Ware	Charles H.
Thompson, N.J.	Whitehurst	Wolff
Udall		

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) to temporarily take the Chair.

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. 14070) 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 with Mr. FULTON (Chairman pro tempore) 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 pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 117]

Abourezk	Flynt	Mathias, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Foley	Melcher
Anderson, Tenn.	William D.	Mikva
Annunzio	Fountain	Mills, Ark.
Archer	Fraser	Monagan
Ashley	Gallagher	Montgomery
Aspinall	Gettys	Moorhead
Badillo	Glaimo	Morgan
Bingham	Gray	Morse
Blackburn	Green, Pa.	Nelsen
Blatnik	Griffin	Nix
Brooks	Gude	O'Hara
Brown, Mich.	Hanna	Peyser
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Poage
Buchanan	Harvey	Podell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hastings	Powell
Casey, Tex.	Hawkins	Preyer, N.C.
Chisholm	Hays	Price, Tex.
Clark	Hébert	Pryor, Ark.
Clay	Hillis	Rooney, N.Y.
Colmer	Hosmer	Rosenthal
Conyers	Hull	Saylor
Crane	Johnson, Calif.	Scheuer
Culver	Johnson, Pa.	Shipley
Curlin	Jonas	Sisk
Dellums	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Calif.
Dent	Kee	Spence
Dickinson	Kemp	Springer
Diggs	Landrum	Staggers
Dingell	Leggett	Stanton,
Dowdy	Long, La.	J. William
Duncan	McEwen	James V.
Dwyer	McKevitt	Stephens
Edwards, La.	McKinney	Stokes
Erlenborn	McMillan	Stubblefield
Eshleman	Macdonald,	Stuckey
Flowers	Mass.	Terry

Thompson, N.J. Ware
Udall Wilson,
Vander Jagt Charles H. Wolff
Zion

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FULRON, Chairman pro tempore 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. 14070, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 314 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. At the time the point of order was made that a quorum was not present, the gentleman from California was in the well and had consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, all of the increase proposed by the committee falls within the research and development program.

No changes to the construction of facilities or research and program management requests are being recommended.

The overall NASA request for fiscal year 1973 was \$5.2 million less than that authorized for fiscal year 1972.

This is the third year in a row that a minimal budget for space has been submitted to the Congress for consideration.

The committee is becoming increasingly concerned about the low level of space funding currently prevailing since there are strong indications that these low funding levels may be placing this Nation's position of preeminence in space in jeopardy.

These reduced funding levels are also having a considerable impact on the Nation's economy.

At the peak of the space program in the mid-sixties there were about 420,000 Americans engaged in space activities—employed by Government, industry, and the universities.

This number has now dwindled to approximately 139,000 people.

These cutbacks have seriously affected the local economies in many sections of our country.

For these reasons, the committee's deliberations on the fiscal year 1973 authorization request were far more exhaustive than in past years.

We went over each element of the request with a fine tooth comb.

We found no areas, except for one project, where reductions could be made.

We found many areas where increases should be made, but in the interest of maintaining a balanced space effort within the limited national resources available, elected to confine our recommended increases to only three areas.

The one reduction recommended by the committee is in the physics and astronomy program, with specific reference to the High Energy Astronomy Observatory project.

The committee approves of the objectives of this project, having been persuaded that it is of great scientific interest.

However, the committee was not convinced that the amount requested—\$68.6 million—was fully justified and accordingly reduced the request by \$4 million.

Mr. Chairman, one of the areas of the space program considered to be the most beneficial to mankind in the future is the earth resources survey program.

This program potentially could produce extremely valuable data for the discovery and monitoring of natural resources, improvement of their exploitation, management, and conservation.

Applications include: agriculture, forestry, geography, cartography, oceanography, hydrology, geology, and mineralogy.

To add impetus to this program and to start planning for follow-on spacecraft after the two presently scheduled flights of the earth resources technology satellites, the committee has added \$4 million to the program.

Two other adjustments to the R. & D. program effected by the committee were to add \$48,450,000 to the aeronautical research and technology program, and \$1,500,000 to the technology utilization program.

In the aeronautics area two critical problems face the Nation and require early solution—aircraft noise and safety.

Because of the public demand for some action on jet engine noise abatement, particularly around our Nation's airports, the committee considers that research in this area should be expedited.

NASA had requested only \$9 million for this important research.

The committee has increased the amount to be authorized by \$41 million.

The committee also added \$7,450,000 to the aeronautics program for aviation safety research.

During a recent 5-year period, half of the accidents involving civil aircraft occurred during approach and landing.

The committee believes that research on a fully automatic approach and landing system as well as aircraft collision avoidance should be expedited and accordingly has added authorization for these purposes.

The committee also increased the amount requested for technology utilization by \$1,500,000.

For many years the committee has strongly supported this program because of a firm belief that the scientific and technological knowledge acquired in the course of our space research should be made available to the public sector for its benefit as quickly and efficiently as possible.

The committee's action on this program further emphasizes the need for rapid technology transfer.

The balance of the research and development program has been approved by the committee in the amounts requested by NASA.

For the most part the bill before you will continue research and development in ongoing programs previously approved by the Congress:

These include:

The Apollo program in which the last two lunar missions are scheduled for this year—Apollo 16, launched last Sunday, and Apollo 17 scheduled for December;

The Skylab program, this Nation's first earth orbiting space station, now nearing completion and scheduled for launch in March 1973;

Continued scientific research and exploration in the physics and astronomy, lunar and planetary, and space applications areas;

Continued basic and applied research in space research and technology and nuclear power and propulsion fields of endeavor; and

Continued operation and maintenance of our worldwide tracking network.

There is one project included in this year's research and development program which I wish to highlight since it actually constitutes the start of a major program.

There is included in this bill \$200 million for the start of research and development of the space shuttle.

This project has been somewhat controversial. However, this committee is convinced that the shuttle is the key to this Nation's future in space, and strongly endorses an early start on this most important program.

On January 5, 1972, President Nixon stated that:

The United States should proceed at once with the development of an entirely new type of space transportation system designed to help transform the space frontier of the 1970s into familiar territory, easily accessible for human endeavor in the 1980s and 90s.

NASA plans to develop the space shuttle over the next 6 years at a total development cost of approximately \$5,-150,000,000.

Test flights are to begin in 1976, manned orbital test flights in 1978, and the complete space shuttle vehicle is to be operational before 1980.

The space shuttle will be a manned reusable space vehicle which will carry out various space missions in earth orbit.

It will consist of two stages.

The first stage booster will be an unmanned solid fueled rocket system.

The second stage orbiter will look like a delta-winged airplane and will be piloted by two men who will fly it back to earth for an airplane-like landing.

The booster and the orbiter will then be refurbished and flown over and over again thereby reducing the cost of placing payloads in orbit by 90 percent.

The first satellite this Nation launched cost about \$1 million a pound to place it in orbit.

Current launch procedures and equipment have reduced the cost per pound of placing payloads in orbit to slightly less than \$1,000 per pound.

Tomorrow's use of the shuttle will reduce that cost to about \$100 per pound or less.

I should also point out that the research and development program for the shuttle project will employ 50,000 Americans.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics strongly urges the House of Representatives to support this most important project.

There is also included in the bill before you \$77,300,000 for construction in support of our space activities.

Slightly over one third of this amount is for modification of existing Government-owned facilities in support of the space shuttle program.

The balance is for general support of the space research programs at the various NASA centers.

The research and program management part in this bill will provide for the civil service staff necessary for in-house research and the manpower necessary to plan, manage, and support the R. & D. programs.

It also provides for the operations, maintenance, and administrative support of the NASA field centers.

The committee has approved the NASA request of \$700,800,000 for these purposes.

We consider the amount included in the bill barely adequate to support a civil service strength of 26,850 personnel, located at 16 field installations in the United States, the capital plant value of which exceeds \$5.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has carefully reviewed the projects and programs included in the bill before you, and in our opinion it represents the minimum level at which our Nation's space effort can be carried on.

It should be much larger to stimulate and add to the momentum of our technological progress.

However, recognizing the other demands on our national resources, it is about the best we can expect under the circumstances.

In summary, we are presenting to you a bill which would authorize \$3,428,950,000 for the Nation's aeronautics and space effort in fiscal year 1973.

We are prepared to answer any questions which you may have regarding this measure.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I think the bill we are presenting to the House today is a very good bill and a particularly strong bill in the area of applications to the needs right here on earth, particularly in the area of aeronautics.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for the outstanding help that he has given to the members of the committee in bringing out a bill which gives due recognition to the aeronautical needs of this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished gentleman from California has consumed 17 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to join our committee in complete support of H.R. 14070, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1973.

I assure you that the minority side of the full Science and Astronautics Committee does support this bill. Ours is a completely bipartisan recommendation, and the White House also is in complete support.

As our distinguished chairman, GEORGE MILLER, has indicated, we pro-

pose a total authorization of \$3.428 billion which is slightly less than \$50 million—or 1.4 percent—above the administration's original request.

And, I emphasize this, all of that 1.4 percent increase is earmarked strictly for aeronautical research and development—not for space. It will be used for a more effective attack on the problems of airplane noise abatement and air safety. I am convinced those funds are needed and that NASA will use them well, or noise abatement and safety, coordinating of course with the FAA.

So, Mr. Chairman, the authorization we propose here for space activities, as distinguished from aeronautics, remains the same as the administration's budget request, no increase.

That is in sharp contrast to our committee's proposals in some other years. Often in the past, this committee has approved major increases, well above NASA's request. Not so, this time. We believe this is a lean budget, a minimum authorization, considering the vast potentials, the many opportunities available in space.

In contrast, some of you may remember 2 years ago at this time when I joined the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) in a very strong effort here on the House floor, to cut back some \$300 million from our committee's NASA authorization for fiscal year 1971.

As I remember it, the committee in that year had added approximately \$400 million for manned space programs, over and above the administration's request.

Some of us felt then that our committee had gone much too far in proposing such a mammoth increase, we felt it would distort the whole program. So we fought it.

But this year that situation does not exist. I am convinced, and I suspect Mr. KARTH agrees, that the NASA authorization we are considering today is well balanced, it represents a very careful reconsideration, modification, reorientation in NASA's activities, consistent with the budget constraints which are necessary today, and consistent with a transitional period in our space planning, a changing of emphasis.

For example, 2 years ago Mr. KARTH and I were arguing strenuously that the committee's proposed big increase would have NASA moving much too rapidly into development of a new shuttle program, making huge commitments, without adequate consideration and preparation.

In contrast, today, we are proposing only \$200 million for the next year of the shuttle. And it is a shuttle program very much diminished and simplified, much less costly than was contemplated 2 years ago. It is the product of a tremendous amount of careful reconsideration and better preparation. It does represent the "go slow" policy which we urged 2 years ago.

So, I stand before you today, confessing that I once was very much a skeptic concerning the shuttle plans. Now, I have changed my mind, and I believe it is for entirely valid reasons.

Today, I do support the shuttle plan, and I ask the House to uphold us with a strong vote of approval for the shuttle.

I am completely convinced that our

continuing, vigorous but careful exploration and exploitation of space is essential to our own national interests and to the benefit of all mankind.

Most of you are well aware of the impressive catalog of societal benefits, scientific knowledge, new technologies useful right here on earth which already are the recognized product of NASA's programs in both astronautics and aeronautics. I will not recount those here.

But, obviously, we have made only a beginning in these creative efforts, there is far, far more to be realized in the years to come, and it is imperative that we persevere, that we keep up the momentum—and the shuttle is necessary to that momentum.

The authorization we recommend here today will support the minimum essential effort. Personally, I wish we could do much more.

But Federal revenues are relatively very scarce this year, and there are other very pressing, very essential priorities. I fully recognize how crucial are our other needs. But I assert it is an error to look upon the space program and any other needed program as ever mutually exclusive. In fact, I believe the positive dividends of NASA's programs, in new technologies, in new knowledge, and in stimulating the economy—in all these ways, the space effort compliments, enhances, bolsters other essential programs. It does not detract from them in any way.

The funds we will authorize here today in no way threaten other essential funding. I am confident of that.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, our present budget constraints have forced NASA to sharpen its pencils and its wits, to take a closer look than ever before at the kind of space program the United States should have in the future. The NASA answer is that, first of all we must develop a more cost-attractive space transportation system, for delivering our satellites to space and maintaining them once they are in operation. This was the motivation for reconsidering the space shuttle.

The space shuttle program as now proposed is considerably different from that first recommended. The total development costs for the shuttle have been reduced from \$13 billion to \$5 billion, to be spread over some 6 years.

At the same time, the total annual NASA budgets needed to support this development will be maintained at approximately the present level for several years to come. The shuttle as now planned will not bloat or balloon the budget requests.

A reusable space shuttle should reduce the costs of each space launching by a factor of more than 10. And from each launching, one shuttle will be able to place several satellites in position out in space.

That contrasts with present practice. We now discard multimillion dollar launch vehicles after only one use. But the shuttle will provide a reusable, cargo carrying vehicle which will permit routine visits to space, with tremendous economies.

Also, NASA argues, the shuttle program will stand the test in terms of amor-

tization of initial development costs. During the 5-year period from 1964 to 1969, the average number of U.S. space launches was 51 per year. In the late 1970's when the space shuttle will first be available, the launch rate for NASA and DOD programs alone is projected at 55 to 60 per year. This projection does not include launches for other civilian and governmental organizations or for the international community which are expected to raise the final launch rate to 75 per year by the end of this decade.

Another point should be made regarding launch rate projections. The space shuttle demonstrates a cost advantage over conventional NASA launch vehicles at a mere 30 flights per year—a launch rate this Nation has surpassed every year since 1961—with the cost advantage of the shuttle increasing as the flight level climbs.

Moreover, I am convinced that NASA activities in such important areas as communications, weather, and earth resources—to mention only a few—will not be adversely affected by NASA undertaking development of the shuttle. This year's space applications budget, which increased approximately 3 percent over last year, will be able to continue to grow in a logical and orderly fashion.

With the final availability of the shuttle, this Nation should then be able to implement full coverage, full service operational systems in the many applications areas which are now being pursued on only a research level. Thus we will be able to economically place into operation our many applications concepts on a more accelerated schedule.

All of us look forward to the time when this Nation will have much more highly advanced weather forecasting, inexpensive and ample new communications capacity, more effective pollution monitoring and control, and more efficient means for detecting and supervising our natural resources.

These are only a few of the more compelling reasons for pursuing space. And these same reasons, in this fiscal year, dictate the development of the space shuttle.

The authorization bill now before us is the result of very careful analysis of every single program proposed by NASA, in our various subcommittees. I believe the \$3.4 billion we request here represents a well-balanced program that is sufficient to maintain the vitality of our important space effort.

Mr. Chairman, I most strongly urge approval of the committee bill without amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for 6 consecutive years the budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has declined. The budget proposed for fiscal year 1973 by your committee would halt that decline at \$3,428,950. In testimony before the full committee under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, NASA stated that there was only a difference of \$6.2 million be-

tween the NASA submission and the budget request submitted to Congress. Further testimony pointed out that at least \$161 million could be profitably employed in NASA 1973 programs.

I cite these facts to point out the critical position that NASA has over the past few years slipped into. In 1969 the President appointed a Space Task Force to evaluate what we must do as a nation to utilize and explore space. That distinguished group of Americans outlined a minimum continuing space effort to be at the \$4.25 billion level for fiscal year 1973. This same minimum program to be effective would rise to \$5.5 billion in 1976 and remain at that level for the remainder of the decade. The budget before you today is over three quarters of a billion dollars—\$0.77 billion—less than the bare minimum program recommended by the President's Space Task Force. To reach this level much is being scrapped. Apollo lunar exploration flights will have been terminated with Apollo 17 rather than Apollo 19. Only one Skylab will be flown, in 1973, with a second Skylab backup available but unutilized. A minimum, but significant start, however, will be made on a low-cost space transportation system—the Space Shuttle.

No increases were made in the manned space flight portion of the NASA authorization. This action was taken after the most extensive hearings ever undertaken by the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight. There was strong sentiment that the manned space flight portion of the budget authorization, which is \$134 million less overall than last year's authorization has gone too low. Both the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee and the full committee considered the testimony of NASA, industry, and other witnesses. Knowing the critical concerns that we all share for our general economics situation, the manned space flight portion of this budget is recommended without increase. In terms of effective programing and total costs this may prove to be false economy over the long run; however, it represents a "bare bones" budget.

I commend to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle the authorization recommended in this bill by your committee.

The following table summarizes the actions taken by the Committee on the Manned Space Flight portion of the budget.

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget line item	Fiscal year 1973 budget request	Subcommittee recommendation
Apollo.....	128,700	128,700
Space flight operations.....	1,094,200	1,094,200
Advanced missions.....	1,500	1,500
Total R. & D.....	1,224,400	1,224,400
Construction of facilities.....	128,485	128,485
Research and program management.....	327,767	327,767
Total, manned space flight.....	1,580,652	1,580,652

¹ Plus \$7,820,000 included elsewhere in the bill for rehabilitation modification, minor new construction, and facility planning and design.

Mr. Chairman, a detailed record of program plans and accomplishments has been compiled for the NASA manned space flight centers and contractors. The Apollo program has successfully concluded the lunar landing and safe return of astronauts on Apollo 11 and initiated a lunar exploration program with Apollo 12, 13, 14, and 15. Saturn IB vehicle production has been concluded and four vehicles transferred to the Skylab program. Saturn V vehicles and spacecraft production has been essentially completed. Of the five remaining Saturn V vehicles, two will be used for lunar exploration and one has been transferred to the Skylab program to be used to launch an orbital workshop in 1973. One will be maintained as a backup for the Skylab program and one complete vehicle will be placed in reserve.

The manned space flight portion of the budget has been approved for the fiscal year 1973 without change. It is the view of the committee that NASA has submitted a conservative, but minimal program for fiscal year 1973. Extensive testimony was taken and consideration was given to possible increases in the manned space flight portion of the NASA authorization. It was also noted that the total manned space flight budget recommended by your committee this year is \$57,828,000 less than the NASA requested budget of last year, and \$192,158,000 less than the amount authorized by this committee for manned space flight in fiscal year 1972. Mr. Chairman, in testimony provided by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Robert C. Seamans, Jr., it was noted that the Soviet Union is continuing to undertake an aggressive space effort. It is clear from testimony from senior industry officials, directors of the manned space flight centers, and from NASA headquarters' management that this budget has been "cut to the bone" prior to its submission.

The following program amounts are recommended in the budget:

APOLLO

NASA requested \$128,700,000 for completion of the Apollo lunar exploration program in fiscal year 1973.

The NASA budget proposed for Apollo for fiscal year 1973 will allow an orderly completion of the program with the two remaining Apollo lunar exploration missions, Apollo 17 and 18. Funds included in the budget provide for completion of all mission peculiar spacecraft and launch vehicle changes, science payload final preparations, and ground and flight support.

The committee recommends the full \$128,700,000 for the Apollo program in fiscal year 1973.

SPACE FLIGHT OPERATIONS

NASA requested \$1,094,200,000 for space flight operations in fiscal year 1973. The committee recommends the amount requested, \$1,094,200,000 for space flight operation for fiscal year 1973.

The budget proposed for space flight operations for fiscal year 1973 is \$421,425,000 more than funds appropriated for fiscal year 1972. This increase reflects increases in funding required to support the Skylab program which will be operational in 1973, to support initiation of

the development of the space shuttle, to provide for payload planning and development, and testing and mission operations associated with both programs.

The programs and funding contained with the space flight operations line item include:

SKYLAB

NASA requested \$540,500,000 for the Skylab portion of the space flight operations program and your subcommittee recommends this amount. Flight missions will begin in April 1973. During the year three Skylab crews will carry out the most extensive experiment program yet conducted in space, involving over 50 experiments in biomedical sciences, earth resources, astronomy, space physics, space engineering, and manufacturing technology.

SPACE SHUTTLE

NASA requested \$200,000,000 for the space shuttle program for fiscal year 1973. This amount is \$100,000,000 more than that appropriated for fiscal year 1972. Entrance into the shuttle development program is the basis for the amount recommended. During fiscal year 1972, entrance into the shuttle development program is the basis for the amount recommended. During fiscal year 1973, funding for the space shuttle development will be used for:

1. Continued high pressure engine design and development and supporting technology;
2. Initiation of orbiter detailed design, selected long lead procurement, and start of structural test program;
3. Initiation of booster detailed design and booster rocket motor development; and
4. Continued technology development essential to the shuttle.

ORBITAL SYSTEMS AND PAYLOADS

NASA requested \$23,000,000 for orbital systems and payloads program for fiscal year 1973. This program provides for the development of techniques, procedure, payload experiment definition, and concept development required for payloads which are shuttle associated. The committee recommends the amount requested.

SPACE LIFE SCIENCES

NASA requested \$25,500,000 for "Space life sciences", for fiscal year 1973. The committee recommends this amount for biomedical research, life support and protective systems, and biomedical instrumentation development.

DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND MISSION OPERATIONS

NASA requested \$305,200,000 for development, test, and mission operations in fiscal year 1973. This area of effort provides the support required for completion of development and initiation of the Skylab flight program in 1973 and initiation of shuttle development.

The major areas included in this item are:

1. Engineering test and support operation at the Manned Spacecraft and Marshall Space Flight Centers;
2. Skylab earth resources data management and Apollo lunar science program;

3. Reliability, quality assurance, and safety programs; and

4. Crew training, flight operations, mission control, and operations support.

ADVANCED MISSIONS

For fiscal year 1973 NASA requested \$1,500,000 for the advanced missions program. The committee recommends the amount requested so that future program concepts and requirements in space tug definition, space safety, and Apollo hardware utilization may be continued.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The basic construction of facilities program in support of manned space flight activities for fiscal year 1973 totals \$28,485,000. The amount requested is about \$10 million more than was appropriated for manned space flight construction for fiscal year 1972.

Most of the fiscal year 1973 construction request is devoted to meeting the early engine test, research and development, and manufacturing and final assembly facilities requirements in support of the space shuttle program. The request includes \$27.9 million for these purposes. No funds are included in the fiscal year 1973 program for launch, recovery, and refurbishment facilities.

Last year \$18.5 million was appropriated for space shuttle facilities, including \$13 million for main engine test facilities and \$5.5 million for facilities modifications required for the development of thermal protection systems now associated only with the orbiter vehicle. Work on these facilities is now underway.

Since the fiscal year 1973 construction request was compiled prior to the decision on the booster to be employed, it was structured in such a way to permit adjustment at a later date to meet the requirements of either the liquid-fueled or the solid-fueled booster. The decision reached by NASA on March 14, 1972, to proceed with the parallel-burn configuration using solid rocket motors has more clearly defined the scope of the shuttle facilities requirements for fiscal year 1973.

A summary of the requirements to support the initial stages of the shuttle program follows:

For major engine test facilities a total of \$7,960,000 is included to further modify altitude test facilities at the Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tenn., and rehabilitation of propellant and high pressure gaseous systems at the Mississippi Test Facility.

The construction request also includes \$14.4 million for research and development facilities at NASA field centers and consists of additions and modifications to existing facilities. Included are modifications to the entry structures facility at Langley; additions to the mockup laboratory and modifications to the acoustic model engine test facility at Marshall.

A total of \$5,540,000 is included in the construction request for manufacturing and final assembly facilities which are yet to be sited. Since the location of the booster facilities for the most part will be located at contractor plants, they cannot be specifically sited until the contractors

for the shuttle program have been selected. However, the estimates have been based upon known requirements measured against existing Government-owned facilities. Included are orbiter and booster assembly and subassembly facilities.

In addition to the requirement for facilities in support of the shuttle program, a project in the amount of \$585,000 has been requested for modifications to the fire protection system at the manned spacecraft center. This project is needed to provide detection and fire suppression systems for high density electronic systems areas within various buildings at the center, including the mission control area. The equipment to be protected is valued at \$260 million and is classed as mission essential.

The committee has also reviewed the manned space flight parts of agency-wide supporting type project packages included in the NASA bill. These amount to \$7.8 million and include \$355,000 for minor new construction, \$3,715,000 for rehabilitation and modification at NASA centers, and \$3,750,000 for facility planning and design of future construction requirements for the space shuttle.

The Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and the full committee have carefully reviewed the manned space flight construction request for fiscal year 1973 and consider that it constitutes a conservative list of requirements. During the course of the hearings it was learned that facilities requests from the field totaled approximately \$100 million. The request for \$28.5 million in basic construction requirements and \$7.8 million in supporting projects is modest and the committee recommends approval.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The research and program management authorization provides for the civil service staff necessary for in-house research and the manpower necessary to plan, manage, and support the R. & D. program. It also provides for the operations, maintenance, and administrative support of field centers.

For these purposes NASA has requested \$327,767,000 for the Kennedy Space Center, Manned Spacecraft Center, and the Marshall Space Flight Center. The request also provides administrative funds for operations at the Western Test Range, the Mississippi Test Facility, the Michoud Assembly Facility, the Slidell Computer Facility and the White Sands Test Facility.

The request for fiscal year 1973 is \$17.4 million less than funded for fiscal year 1972. The requirements developed by the field centers for fiscal year 1973 totaled \$339.9 million. During the budget review process prior to the submission of the President's budget to Congress, the request for manned space flight was reduced by \$12.1 million.

Of great concern to the committee is the continuing reductions to the civil service personnel complement that has occurred over the past 2 years. In fiscal year 1972 a planned reduction of 5 percent was included in the President's budget as submitted. After enactment of the fiscal year 1972 Authorization Act, the executive branch imposed another 3

percent reduction. In total, the personnel strength will have been reduced by 980 positions from end fiscal year 1971 to end fiscal year 1972.

The fiscal year 1973 request proposes a further reduction of 275 permanent personnel positions at the manned space flight field centers. NASA estimates that approximately 50 percent of these reductions can be achieved by attrition. The balance will be subject to reduction-in-force procedures.

At the end of fiscal year 1973 under the proposed reduction, the strength of the manned space flight centers will be down to 11,350 permanent positions. Scientists and engineers represent 51.4 percent of this total.

Of the \$327.8 million being requested, almost 72 percent is for personnel compensation and benefits. The balance is for administrative and technical support at the field center level.

The committee considers that the request, having been reduced considerably in the budget review process, is a minimal program and recommends approval as submitted by NASA.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill as recommended by the committee.

Ever since the first man-made satellite was thrust into orbit almost 15 years ago, there has been a continuing argument as to whether manned or unmanned systems can most effectively accomplish operations in space.

Advocates of robot spacecraft contend that modern, supersophisticated automated equipment is capable of performing most space tasks at a fraction of the cost of a manned system. The opposing school of thought responds that the admittedly greater costs of protecting humans in space are more than justified by man's ability to judge, observe, and forestall failures by corrective action.

I do not propose to rekindle the argument. Rather I suggest that advancing technology has negated it by providing an entirely new approach to space operations which combines the advantages of man in the cycle with a degree of economy hitherto unobtainable. It is the reusable Space Shuttle, which makes possible manned delivery, repair and retrieval of unmanned satellites and which, alternatively, can serve as a manned laboratory in which investigators may conduct those experiments or operations best managed by manned monitorship.

This system, approved by the administration and now pending congressional sanction, offers a number of advantages, among them:

ECONOMY OF DELIVERY

Because the shuttle system can be used over and over again, it will replace practically all of the one-shot-only launch vehicles currently in use, offering substantial reduction in the cost of delivering a payload to orbit.

PAYLOAD ECONOMY

The availability of a large-capacity, reusable "delivery truck" would influence areas other than delivery, such as simplification of payload design, extension of satellite life and reduction in failure

frequency, each contributing significantly to overall savings.

FLEXIBILITY

The carrier vehicle can accommodate almost any type of payload contemplated—human researchers with their equipment and experiments, scientific satellites or probes, and applications satellites. It can serve the needs of NASA, the Department of Defense, commercial users and foreign governments.

ROUTINE ACCESS TO SPACE

One constraint on space operations has been the need for elaborate prelaunch preparations, in some cases as much as five months of repetitive systems checks to insure reliability. This is principally due to the fact that the spacecraft's on-board equipment has never before been used. The reusable carrier vehicle will be serviced and maintained more like an airplane, reducing launch complexity and trimming turnaround time to above 2 weeks.

STIMULUS TO MAXIMUM BENEFIT FROM SPACE

Routine access to space, lower mission costs, and the new latitude the shuttle will provide payload designers, all combine to permit vast improvement in the capabilities of applications satellites, such as weather, communications, and survey systems. The shuttle offers added promise to the possibility of better managing our natural resources by means of space monitoring. Similarly, it may speed the day of the global environment-monitoring system.

MANNED SPACE FLIGHT CONTINUITY

After Apollo and its 1973 follow-on, Skylab, the United States will have no manned space program other than the shuttle. The continued presence of American man in space is essential, not only for the broader research capability manned operations permit, but additionally to maintain continuity and keep our options open for the future. With the shuttle, we can keep man in space without reverting to the heavy expenditures of earlier years. NASA has stated positively that the shuttle system can be developed within a budget plan approximating that of the current year, which represents one of the lowest levels of the past decade. Development costs, spread over 6 fiscal years, amount to about \$5.15 billion for two test spacecraft and their boosters. If Congress approves the plan, flight testing will begin in 1976 and the shuttle can be available for operational use in 1979.

The space shuttle is a two-element system composed of a booster and a spacecraft. The recoverable booster stage, consisting of two large solid-propellant rocket motors mounted in parallel, has a thrust output of more than 5,000,000 pounds. More powerful than any launch vehicle in the U.S. inventory except the mammoth Saturn V moonbooster, the twin booster allows the spacecraft to carry as much as 65,000 pounds of payload per flight.

The spacecraft, called the Orbiter, is essentially an "aerospace plane," a hybrid spacecraft/airplane. In appearance it resembles a delta-wing aircraft and dimensionally it corresponds closely to the

McDonnell Douglas DC-8 jetliner. Weighing some 70 tons, it is heavier than any spacecraft yet flown, including Apollo.

In operation, the shuttle is launched vertically by the combined energy of the solid booster stage and the Orbiter's three liquid-propellant engines with a total thrust of 1,400,000 pounds. At an altitude of about 25 miles, the booster stage separates to descend by parachute for recovery in the ocean. The Orbiter, manned by two pilots and two flight engineers, flies into space under its own power. The Orbiter's rear-mounted engines draw their propellants from a large external tank which is jettisoned when the craft attains orbit.

In space, the Orbiter maneuvers by means of two smaller engines, also mounted in the rear propulsion cluster, whose aggregate thrust is roughly comparable to that of the main Apollo engine which has performed so impressively on the lunar missions. For minor course corrections and adjustments of attitude, the Orbiter has a series of small thrusters located at the tips of the delta wing and atop the vertical tailplane. Normal mission duration will be 7 days or less, but orbital stay-time can be extended for manned operations to 30 days, by the addition of expendables such as water, food and oxygen.

Upon conclusion of its mission, the Orbiter flies back into the atmosphere toward its land base, protected during reentry by a new form of heat shielding which will last 100 missions, unlike the insulation on earlier recoverable spacecraft, which burned off during reentry. Once through the reentry phase, the Orbiter becomes an airplane, gliding as much as 1,100 miles to its base, guided by aerodynamic controls. During the final phase of the flight, jet engines permit adjustments to the approach path.

The Orbiter's entire center section, corresponding to the passenger cabin of a jetliner, is occupied by a large cargo compartment, or payload bay. For delivery of unmanned satellites, the payload bay is unpressurized; its "roof" consists of a pair of clamshell doors which open outward to permit deployment of the satellites. For manned laboratory-type missions, a special pressurized "sortie module" can be fitted into the payload bay.

Here are some examples of how the remarkably versatile Orbiter will function:

In injecting satellites into orbit, which is expected to constitute the primary workload of the carrier vehicle, the Orbiter can accommodate a very large satellite or a number of smaller payloads in the cylindrical bay, 15 feet in diameter and 45 to 60 feet long. Working in the unpressurized bay, space-suited flight engineers will give the payloads a final checkout before deploying them at preselected points in space. The ejected payload, of course, assumes the same velocity as its carrier and it is this velocity which counterbalances the pull of earth's gravity so that the satellite remains in the orbit in which it was injected.

The Orbiter's weight-lifting capability, together with the generous dimensions of its bay, permit delivery of any type of

civil payload currently contemplated, including general-purpose scientific spacecraft, special-purpose observatories, interplanetary probes, and communications, weather, earth resources, geodetic, navigational and air traffic control satellites. In addition, the shuttle is being designed with careful attention to the special requirements of the military services. We do not hear a great deal about military employment of satellites because of the classified nature of many of the payloads, but the Department of Defense launches space systems with greater frequency than does NASA, a factor which additionally underlines the need for shuttle development.

In another mode, the Orbiter has utility as a repair/retrieval vehicle for satellites already in orbit which have malfunctioned. The crew maneuvers the Orbiter to a close rendezvous with the satellite; the flight engineers, in extravehicular garb, exit through the open clamshell doors, "capture" the satellite by attaching lines, and haul it into the payload bay for examination. If the trouble is minor, it may be possible to repair the satellite on the spot and re-deposit it on station. Otherwise, it can be stowed in the bay and returned to earth for rework, then redelivered to orbit on a later flight.

Still another area of shuttle utility in handling unmanned spacecraft is the employment of the space tug, essentially a propulsion stage which can be used to jockey a satellite from one orbit to another. An example of the need for this service is the synchronous-orbit satellite, one whose path in space is synchronized with earth's orbit so that the satellite remains in a fixed position relative to earth. Synchronization requires that the satellite operate at an altitude approximately 22,300 miles from earth, a high-altitude orbit that demands additional launch energy. In practice, the satellite is usually injected first into a low-altitude orbit still affixed to an upper stage of the launch vehicle. At a given time, the stage's engine is fired to propel the satellite to its synchronous orbit.

The reusable space tug serves as substitute for the "kick" stage. The orbiter delivers the joined space tug/satellite to a point in low altitude orbit. Operated by command signals from the orbiter, the tug fires its engine, moves the satellite to its new orbit, disengages itself and returns to the lower altitude for pick-up by the orbiter. Initially, the tug will probably be an unmanned system, but a manned version compatible with the dimensions of the orbiter's bay is feasible should expanding space operations dictate its need.

With the addition of the pressurized sortie module, the orbiter becomes a manned space laboratory where scientists and engineers can work in shirt-sleeve environment for as long as 30 days. The module can accommodate up to 12 persons along with their experiments and other equipment. Since they play no part in the operation of the orbiter and since the shuttle is being designed for low acceleration forces during launch and re-entry, the passengers need not be trained astronauts. For the first time, investiga-

tors will be able to accompany their experiments into space and contribute to the greater research efficiency that man-mentorship enables.

Here again, there is military potential. For some time the Department of Defense has sought to evaluate, in actual space flight, the role of military man in space. The shuttle can make possible such an evaluation.

Finally, ever since man first ventured into space in 1961, there has been a never-filled need for a space rescue vehicle. A major reason has been the time required to mount and check out a manned spacecraft. With a fleet of five orbiters, which is what NASA contemplates for the inventory of the 1980's, and the inherent quick reaction of the shuttle, the system can be adapted to fill this long-standing requirement.

The economic advantages of the shuttle system are as broad as the operational gains. Clearly, the employment of a reusable launch vehicle affords savings of substantial order. But although this is the most obvious area of economy, it is not the greatest. NASA estimates that 80 percent of the savings promised in delivery and operation of unmanned spacecraft will stem from the shuttle's influence on satellite design and reuse.

One factor is freedom of design. Today, as in the past, satellite design is pegged to a particular launch vehicle on a cost-effectiveness basis. The launch vehicle's weight-to-orbit capability, therefore, imposes restrictions as to the overall size and weight of the satellite and consequently to the design of each individual component. To meet specifications without sacrificing performance, it is necessary to miniaturize instruments and equipment at considerable developmental cost.

The orbiter's large bay allows a relaxation of weight and dimensional constraints, permitting designers to use off-the-shelf equipment in some cases or, alternatively, to develop new equipment at substantially lower cost. One NASA official says:

We can put the satellite together like an alarm clock rather than a Swiss watch.

Additional savings are possible in the extension of a satellite's operating lifetime by repair in orbit or by retrieval for overhaul at an earth base. There is related economy in the matter of updating unmanned spacecraft, improving the capability of a particular type of satellite by incorporating advanced equipment which was not available at the time the basic version was being fabricated. Currently, the only way to update is to build a new satellite which frequently requires 6 to 8 years to develop, test and launch. With the shuttle, a replacement instrument or experiment can be developed within 6 to 8 months, because of the relaxed design specifications; it can be installed in orbit or the satellite can be retrieved for updating at the earth base.

Further payload economies are anticipated in the use of the orbiter as a test bed for instrument development. For example, consider the development requirements for a major spacecraft such as NASA's large space telescope, to be flown

in the 1980's to give the astronomer the capability to analyze the spectrum of stellar objects free of the distorting effect of earth's atmosphere. This system requires a large array of instruments, which must be designed, built, and tested. The testing is a lengthy and expensive procedure requiring a variety of special facilities, because the instruments must be examined under conditions approximating as closely as possible those under which they later will operate. The shuttle can be used to fly prototype instrument systems to orbit, reducing ground-test operations and facilities requirements and contributing to greater test effectiveness, because the systems will be checked out in the actual space environment rather than by simulation.

Additionally, there is the important consideration of the costs of failures, which continue to occur despite the most elaborate precautions to prevent them. A prime example of the risk-reduction utility the shuttle offers is the orbiting astronomical observatory program, one of the most costly of all unmanned spacecraft projects and also one of the most important from the scientific standpoint. Three OAO's were launched; one performed perfectly, but the other two experienced failures. In one case, a shroud jettison problem prevented the valuable OAO from attaining orbit; this would not have happened in the shuttle-delivery mode. In the other instance, the observatory's battery charger failed, rendering the experiments inoperable. Had the shuttle existed at the time, the OAO could have been returned to earth for repair and quickly restationed. Even the successful OAO, which operated as expected for its planned lifetime, could have been provided additional months or years of life by the shuttle; the problems which eventually cropped up were of such a nature that the satellite could have been repaired in orbit.

A NASA study of 131 space failures shows that 78 of them were related to the launch phase and therefore could not have occurred if the shuttle had been operational. In the remaining cases, where the satellites became inoperable or erratic after deployment, the payloads could have been saved by in-orbit repair or retrieval. Thus, the shuttle promises virtual elimination of total failure. Even should the shuttle itself malfunction, the Orbiter's crew could abort the mission and return to base with the payload intact.

Collectively, these influences of the shuttle on payload design and operation offer potential savings of a very large order. It is estimated that payload development costs can be reduced about 50 percent and these costs constitute the major portion of space program outlays.

There is one other economy factor connected with the operation of the Orbiter itself, rather than its payloads. Unlike all current and previous U.S. manned spacecraft, the Orbiter descends to a land base instead of splashing down in the sea. This eliminates the need for multiship recovery forces, normally on station not only in the primary impact area but also at other locations, against

the possibility that an emergency might dictate an alternate descent path.

What order of savings can be expected from employment of the shuttle? That depends to considerable extent on the frequency of shuttle missions, or the number of launches annually. In the first 12 years of space flight—1958-69—the United States sent into orbit an average of more than 50 spacecraft a year, including civil and military payloads together with launches for foreign nations and international consortiums. In the past 2 years, with American space activity at low ebb, the average has declined to 30 a year. The schedule for this year contemplates an increase to about 40 launches.

NASA has conducted a study of anticipated shuttle economies based on a "mission model" that assumes shuttle usage on 580 missions over a 12-year period from 1979, the first operational year according to the development plan, through 1990. That comes to an average of about 48 flights annually. NASA terms the mission model realistic. It may even be conservative, because of the potentially greater opportunities for deriving concrete benefit from space operations and because of the likelihood of increased foreign use of U.S. launch services with the shuttle's lower costs. At any rate, the study concluded that the combined factors of a reusable delivery system, reusable payloads, design simplification, and sharply reduced risk of failure add up to a saving averaging more than \$1 billion a year.

The economic features of the program are important, particularly to a legislator, but I do not suggest that cost reduction is the sole, or even the primary, justification for developing this system. The fundamental reason for carrying out the program is to make available a means for routine access to space, to remove the constraints imposed by an earlier level of technology, to progress from space adolescence to full maturity.

The shuttle can be the instrument for maintaining American preeminence in space and for realizing the broad range of benefits that advancing technology promises—those that are already visible and those that we cannot yet envision.

Mr. Chairman, the successes of our Apollo program, the success of our many automated satellites both for scientific exploration and practical application receive most of the attention of the American public and we often forget the significant contributions that the space program is making to our daily life.

The first manned lunar landing in 1969 has been acclaimed as the most important event of the 1960's, and the event in which Americans looked to themselves and the rest of the world as the kind of people they wanted to be. This great adventure, motivated by the desire to go where man had never been, to extend the horizon of man's scientific investigations, this adventure which has been the dream of earlier generations, gave birth to technological advance in virtually every field of engineering. This great adventure provided the driving force for peaceful expansion of scientific knowledge and the advancement of tech-

nology which are now contributing to the benefit of all mankind. In my reading the other day, I discovered the following listing of some current benefits of the space program in products and materials:

First. An energy absorber, Tor-Shok, was developed for the Apollo program and can be used to dissipate heat and absorb energy when an axial force is applied. The Bureau of Public Roads reports that six States have already installed highway guard rails equipped with these shock absorbers which reduce effective impact speeds from 60 m.p.h. to 5 m.p.h.

Second. The type I structural firefighter's suit features the latest fireproof materials developed in the space program. The new clothing includes thermal underwear, a coverall, chaps, two types of trousers, two jackets and two proximity suits which permit firefighters to move closer to the fire or even enter the flames if necessary. These suits are in use by the Houston, Tex., Fire Department.

Third. A reinforced plastic mortar pipe known as Techite is being used in fluid conveyance systems and is considered to be the first significant improvement in pipeline material in over 50 years. It was developed from knowledge gained in research and development of glass fiber rocket cases for NASA.

Fourth. Knowledge gained in NASA research has been adapted to the design and manufacture of a deployable lattice tower that stores compactly and is easily portable. The units come in several sizes and are useful as scaffolding, portable radio antennas, temporary mobile communications systems, instrument or camera supports and other uses where easy transportability is desired and permanent structures are not required.

Fifth. An outgrowth of research into superinsulation materials developed for the space program is the sportsman's blanket. These blankets have high heat reflectivity and can be used equally well to keep heat away or keep available heat in. Waterproof, windproof and weighing only 12 ounces, these blankets have many uses for the outdoors enthusiast. They can be folded to fit in a coat pocket.

And how much does the space program cost you? The current budget is 1.4 percent of the total Federal budget—roughly 15 dollars per person in one year. Compare this with the \$400 per person we spend on social programs, \$400 on defense, \$35 on alcoholic beverages, \$17 on tobacco, or \$16 on cosmetics. It is quite clear that the benefits of the space program, both direct and indirect, are providing each American with an excellent return on his investment.

For this and for many other significant reasons that are well-known to all of you, I advocate your support for H.R. 14070 and urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070. As we consider the fiscal year 1973 NASA authorization, it seems important to point out that the next major step, following the Apollo program, in our national space program of the 1970's is the flight of Skylab.

Just a year from now Skylab will be launched into earth orbit. The next day a crew of three astronauts will embark on the first of a series of earth orbital missions using the United States' first manned experimental space station, Skylab. This orbiting research facility has been created specifically to enable man to live and work productively in space for extended periods of up to 56 days. Skylab will be a major advancement in manned space flight providing up to four times as many hours of experience per mission in the clear weightless environment of space than was previously available with the Gemini and Apollo spacecraft.

Skylab circles the earth at an altitude of 235 nautical miles in an orbit that covers approximately three-quarters of the earth's land areas. It is large enough—the size of a two-bedroom home—to provide comfortable living quarters for the three astronauts, as well as the capability to accommodate more than 50 research and development experiments covering a wide range of scientific, medical, and earth resources investigations. The sun, other stars, and our own earth will be studied. Skylab is a program dedicated to the use of space and its unique environment to increase our scientific knowledge, pioneer new techniques to benefit mankind, and to provide for man's future well-being through a better understanding of the earth's vast resources.

NASA and the National Science Teachers Association have cooperated in a program to stimulate interest in science and technology through direct involvement of high school students in space research. As a result, in addition to the programmed experiments just described, a number of experiments and demonstrations will be selected to be flown on Skylab from more than 3,400 ideas proposed by high school science students across the Nation and overseas. The 25 finalists already have been chosen and the final selection will be completed by June 1 of this year.

As we approach the "one year to launch" schedule milestone, our assessment is that the launch date of April 30, 1973, can be met. As one might expect in a nonproduction program with limited vehicle hardware available for problem solving, we are experiencing some difficulties which require rescheduling and extra effort to maintain the key milestone dates. However, no known serious problems exist on any of the major assemblies that make up the Skylab orbiting cluster, and unless something unforeseen of significant magnitude turns up, we should meet the planned launch date.

The success of the Skylab program has been safeguarded by providing backup units for all major assemblies that make up the total Skylab vehicle. This backup hardware will be available to be launched within a year, if necessary, to complete or extend the objectives of the initial Skylab program.

Assuming that the first Skylab program is a complete success, a meaningful opportunity exists to extend or expand upon the knowledge gained in the initial program by utilizing the available, paid for backup hardware. In

addition, if desired, this second set of Skylab hardware could provide the means for the United States to establish a cooperative international space facility, carrying foreign experiments and the capability for universal spacecraft docking.

I have concentrated my remarks on what I consider one of the most outstanding programs that NASA will undertake in the near future. However, like the other programs of NASA, this is but one of the necessary building blocks to assure our preeminence as a space-faring nation. I urge your support of the bill before you today as a commitment to the necessity of our Nation being first in space so that we may be first here on earth.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN).

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070, the fiscal year 1973 NASA authorization bill. This bill will authorize \$3.43 billion for our Nation's space effort for the next fiscal year.

I strongly favor the action taken by the Science and Astronautics Committee and its members as they have given so much study to this bill over the past 2 months.

In examining the fiscal year 1973 NASA authorization I wish to commend the able leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER), the ranking minority member of the committee, and also the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), our committee chairman. Their bipartisan effort brings before you today a bill that can be justifiably supported by all. It is an austere bill. A bill with the essential, without the extras. It is a demanding bill requiring efficiency and effective management on the part of NASA.

In working with my distinguished colleagues on the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and with our outstanding subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), it became clear that more could well be provided for the manned space flight program. But as has been pointed out, we held the line.

The bill proposed represents a well-balanced program between manned and unmanned space research and exploration. But I emphasize also that the NASA request for fiscal year 1973 reflects a very critically constrained budget—lower than any other NASA budget reported out by the committee in the past 10 years.

As a result, NASA has been forced to make reductions and compromises to bring the budget below what is actually needed from a purely scientific and technical standpoint. I strongly feel however that the essential programs within the NASA effort have been retained and that this country will be able to maintain its dominant technological expertise in space.

I feel that a most significant point which my colleagues should weigh in evaluating this year's NASA bill is the return on investment offered to the taxpayer by money invested in the space program.

As an example, looking back 7 years

to the development of the first commercial communications satellite, we now see that space technology in communications has become an accepted way of life. Today we have a profitmaking international communications satellite network tying together over 50 countries of the world located on six continents. Since the advent of the communications satellite we have seen an annual growth in telephone traffic by a factor of more than 20, the introduction of live global television transmissions, and a decline in the cost of international communications by a factor of more than 25 times.

In the future, we can expect this country to have in operation communications satellites directed specifically to our domestic communication needs. These satellites will be able to provide full service communications including multiple channels of instructional and educational television tailored specifically for individual communities and school districts.

Likewise, in meteorology, we presently have in operation a NASA-developed satellite system which is producing 24-hour coverage on a routine basis of not only the weather, but the entire earth's climatic cycles. The information we receive from these satellites is available to any nation on earth which desires it. These weather satellites have saved thousands of lives and prevented billions of dollars of property damage—savings that can be fully documented.

In the future, observations of the weather by more sophisticated satellite systems should lead to a quantum jump in the accuracy and range of weather forecasts. I would point out that in the fields of agriculture, transportation, construction, and roadbuilding, the total estimated losses in 1970 due to weather were approximately \$15 billion. A nominal reduction of 20 percent in these losses as a result of satellite surveillance would be sufficient to pay for the entire space program for a single year.

These fields of meteorology and communications are only two among a large number of areas including navigation, earth resources, astronomy, celestial exploration, and even international cooperation, in which our space program is making a positive contribution to the Nation's health and welfare.

I would like to stress therefore that the space program has come into each and every one of our lives in many more ways than we commonly appreciate. Unfortunately, in fact, many people fail to realize that even the many spinoff benefits of the space program are literally endless.

From our first decade in space, there have been more than 10,000 total identifiable benefits provided by our work in space. These benefits have ranged from the field of materials to that of atmospheric science and include transportation, urban affairs, geography and geology to mention a few. The important point to realize is that the fields or areas which have benefited by space technology and space techniques are as varied and as numerous as the number of benefits themselves.

But to take full advantage of the potential of space, and to be able to con-

tinue to reap the benefits, requires a new approach. In effect, to continue to move ahead demands that a more economical means be realized for exploiting space. It is here that the shuttle emerges as the key to our future progress.

The shuttle concept represents a major step forward in technological and economic maturity. It is a piloted aircraft that can reach space, stay there to place or recover payloads in orbit, permit the crew to carry out research or operational tasks and then return to earth under its own power. After refueling and refurbishment, it is then ready for another mission.

With the availability of the shuttle, we will be able to stop throwing away our launch vehicles—each of which represents thousands of hours of skilled labor and engineering and millions of dollars of our resources.

In the first decade of shuttle operations, NASA estimates that \$5 billion will be saved in launch costs alone through the reduced costs of the satellites themselves. With the spacious cargo bay of the shuttle plus the less rigorous launch and maneuvering stresses, more conventional and less delicate scientific instruments can be used as the basis for our future space systems.

The space shuttle will also provide the means by which we will be able to repair and maintain satellites in orbit. This in turn will have the effect of increasing satellite system reliability and lifetime. No longer will we have to design entirely new satellite systems from one generation of satellite to the next. Rather, we will be able to utilize a modular approach to satellite design which will permit a continuous upgrading in the system's performance and capability.

Clearly, the shuttle will be the key to transitioning from the experimental and exploratory phase of space to the common, every day use of space for operations. By the end of this decade, commercial aviation will not be able to tolerate the slightest moment's outage from a navigation satellite. Similarly, our commercial television networks will demand the same high quality and uninterrupted performance from satellites that they presently demand from terrestrial communications systems.

Thus, the space shuttle is the only feasible means by which we will be able to guarantee the highly reliable and continually improved performance necessary to shift the full burden of service in so many areas to the satellite.

The more problems I have studied—whether in environment, medicine, earth resources, communications, agriculture, right down to national security, balance of trade, and international cooperation, I am pointed compellingly in the direction of the fuller exploitation of space.

To me, therefore, the space program is a people-oriented program directed to solving our most pressing societal needs. It provides a healthier economy, a cleaner and safer environment, national prestige and security, and generally enhanced quality of life. For the very reason that our work in space is directed to the people, I support the NASA space

program and particularly the new thrust to develop the space shuttle.

This Nation has the skill, the resources, and the vision to use space research and technology to elevate the spirit and welfare of mankind to a level never before believed possible. To turn our back on space and its potential is to turn our back on the future.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Aeronautics and Space Technology recommends an authorization of \$788,584,000 for that portion of the NASA budget request considered by the subcommittee. This amount is \$49,950,000—or 6.3 percent—higher than the budget request.

We strongly believe that there are good reasons for approving this increase which is largely for pushing forward more rapidly toward the solution of two critical problems facing aviation today: reducing aircraft noise and achieving better air safety.

In January of this year the committee reviewed in considerable detail the results of the Joint DOT-NASA Civil Aviation Research and Development Policy Study report—commonly known as the CARD study. A major conclusion of this report is that aircraft noise is the number one problem in domestic civil aviation today. Another major problem identified in the report is terminal air congestion—of which an important element is safety. Testimony taken during the special January hearings and during the regular authorization hearings demonstrated that more could and should be done in attacking these two critical problems.

NASA has \$9,000,000 in its fiscal year 1973 budget request to begin a development and demonstration program on modifying aircraft engines and aircraft to make them more quiet. This program will require about \$130,000,000 to complete the R. & D. However, the fiscal year 1973 amount does not permit an expedited program; it would not be possible to begin modifying civil fleet airplanes until at least the end of 1976. The committee determined that it was technically feasible to undertake an R. & D. program which could lead to initiation of civil fleet retrofitting during the latter half of 1975. Achieving such a schedule called for increased funding in fiscal year 1973.

Therefore, the committee recommends that \$41 million be added to the NASA request for the specific purpose of accelerating the R. & D. retrofit program by 1 year—without increasing total program costs. This action would represent a major step in solving what the CARD study demonstrated to be the No. 1 problem in civil aviation.

Turning to aviation safety, testimony showed that during a recent 5-year period, half of the accidents involving civil aircraft occurred during approach and landing. Of these, half occurred in low visibility weather. The FAA is planning to install a new microwave landing

system by 1978 which would permit commercial aircraft to make automatic landings all the way to touchdown and greatly reduce the chance of an accident.

However, it is also necessary that changes be made in the aircraft to achieve compatibility with the new landing system. NASA has a program for providing and demonstrating the airborne technology and systems engineering for automatic approach and landing, based on the new FAA microwave landing system. Yet, the present level of funding does not permit a rate of progress which would demonstrate the technology and systems engineering in time for civil aircraft, especially commercial civil aircraft, to be prepared for fully automatic flight at the time of deployment of the new microwave landing system in 1978. To speed up research to achieve aircraft compatibility with the new landing system \$3,750,000 was added when it becomes available.

Incidents and accidents involving aircraft encountering turbulence account for about 30 percent of the total number of accidents. The committee determined that an additional \$700,000 would help expedite obtaining solutions to the problem of detecting clear air turbulence. As more jet aircraft have gone to higher and higher altitudes, this type of turbulence has caused an increasing number of accidents.

Another type of turbulence has become a serious problem with the advent of the large jet aircraft. As a large jet lands and takes off it leaves trailing vortices of turbulence in the air behind it. These vortices persist up to several minutes and can be dangerous for aircraft—particularly small aircraft—following the large jet on landing or takeoff. With an increase of \$300,000, more research emphasis could be directed to investigating ways of reducing or eliminating this type of hazard.

Another major cause of air accidents is the midair collision. As the number of aircraft increases over time, the pressure to prevent this type of accident also increases. Although infrequent, the catastrophic nature of collisions between general aviation aircraft and air carriers warrant considerable attention.

While NASA has been active in this area for a number of years, the fiscal year 1973 budget included only about \$300,000 on collision avoidance.

It was the judgment of the committee that \$3 million should be added to speed up the availability of low-cost, reliable, collision avoidance devices and systems for general aviation aircraft. A major problem is to determine whether and how such devices should be related to collision avoidance systems used by the civil fleet aircraft.

Although most of my remarks to this point have been devoted to the solution of current major problems in civil aviation, I would remind the House that the greater part of the advanced aeronautics and space technology program is devoted to providing the reservoir of new technology for the future. It is as important that we continue with preparing to solve the problems of the future as it is for us to tackle the immediate

problems I have already discussed. Maintaining our world leadership role in aviation depends to a very large extent on maintaining and building up this reservoir of advanced technology.

In another area—technology utilization—the committee recommends an increase of \$1,500,000 to a total of \$5,500,000. For many years the committee has strongly supported this program and this support has been firmly endorsed by the Congress. This position has been taken because of a firm belief in the basic principle of the technology utilization program; scientific, technological and management knowledge acquired with public funds should be made available to the public sector for its benefit as quickly and efficiently as possible. The increased funds would be used to expand and initiate new engineering transfer projects primarily in urban structures, fire safety, transportation systems, energy conversion and environmental pollution.

In closing, I would strongly urge your support of this bill. It represents a good combination of solving immediate problems and providing the science and technology which will be needed in the future.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to preface my remarks on H.R. 14070 by noting that it has been a distinct honor and pleasure to serve on the committee chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

His continuing leadership and wisdom has enabled this committee to formulate this carefully constructed and highly scrutinized piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 14070, a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We have all heard the cry of those who insist it is time to reorder our priorities, to cut spending on what is believed to be nonessential and to increase the flow of money into programs designed to create a better quality of life for all Americans.

I am proud to state that I am one of those who has demanded a reordering of our priorities.

It is my firm belief, however, that the bill before us today represents a program that will create a better quality of life for all Americans.

It must be remembered that the reordering of priorities does not mean, and should not be construed to mean, the complete elimination of worthwhile programs in exchange for those thought to be more valuable.

Rather it means keeping our Nation's needs in perspective.

Aside from the direct benefits of space exploration, space technology has been responsible for numerous developments in the fields of mass transit, medicine, nutrition, communications, and education.

Yet, this list is only a small indication of the potential benefits to all mankind which will result from the continuation of the space program.

While this bill will allow us to continue

space exploration at a less than optimum level, it will, at the very least, permit this country to derive the direct benefits of space travel together with the secondary benefits that will accrue to all citizens.

The projects to be authorized by this legislation have already been discussed in some detail by my colleagues, but I would like to make a few additional comments.

The United States has demonstrated over the past decade its ability to respond to a challenge, a challenge that severely jeopardized this country's position as the predominant world power.

As a result of this challenge, the foundation has been laid and the initiative has been taken for far greater developments in the area of space exploration.

It would be an injustice to the citizens of this country, and perhaps to all of mankind, if our efforts to harness the assets of space exploration were to come to a grinding halt.

The space shuttle program is absolutely vital if we are to continue at a pace consistent with our talents and if we are to realize the value of our previous sacrifices.

The space shuttle represents, therefore, nothing more than a tool, a tool to be used to secure a better life for all people through the utilization of space technology.

What is of particular significance about the shuttle is that America is taking one giant step toward refining its space exploration.

Heretofore, the vehicles used in space exploration were not capable of reuse.

For the first time we are developing a reusable vehicle that will be capable of utilization time and again.

The development of such a transportation system will result in the saving of millions of taxpayer's dollars.

In other words, instead of riding hardware in our space travels we will be involved in true transportation.

The defense related potential of space is not overlooked by other nations, and it would be foolish for this country to do so.

I am firmly convinced that peaceful cooperation in space is possible only with a strong space program of our own.

Cooperation among equals is a far more desirable situation than one where a nation other than our own gains an unchallenged superiority.

Mr. Chairman, it is for the above-noted reasons that I strongly urge my colleagues to approve the committee bill without amendment.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELL).

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, before I address my comments to the bill under consideration by this committee I should like to note that this will be the last authorization bill coming from the Committee on Science and Astronautics for me, because I am retiring at the end of this session.

I should like to spread on the RECORD the very deep feeling I have of the privilege it has been to serve with the members of this committee, and especially our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). He has been a

very inspiring leader, and I have felt it a tremendous privilege to serve under him.

I believe all my colleagues on the committee will agree with me that the gap made by the tragic death of our ranking Republican member, Mr. Fulton, has been very adequately filled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER). He has certainly proved his ability and the qualities of his leadership with those of us who are in the minority.

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

Mr. PELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOSHER. I know I speak for the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), when I say that both of us appreciate those very heart-warming comments the gentleman from Washington just made.

It goes without saying that I can speak for a unanimous minority on the committee—in fact, for the whole committee—in saluting the gentleman from Washington for his diligence, his helpfulness, his cooperation and his wonderfully responsible and intelligent work on the committee. He has been a tower of strength.

And let me add, I also have long served beside Tom PELL on the Merchant Marine Committee, and there he has exemplified those same qualities. He is a most excellent, effective legislator, and a delightful gentleman.

Mr. PELL. I certainly thank the gentleman. I have felt it a privilege, as I said earlier—a tremendous privilege—to serve with the other members of the committee.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), the subcommittee chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve, who is probably the hardest working subcommittee chairman I have ever known. He made us meet early in the morning, and long hours more than once a day, in order to meet the committee time schedule; but he never sacrificed the care and scrutiny our committee put into those subjects that were under our jurisdiction. It has been a real pleasure for me to serve with the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELL. I am very happy and delighted to yield to my subcommittee chairman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would like to add my own commendation and appreciation to the gentleman from Washington. He has been a tower of strength in the areas of aeronautics and astronautics within the jurisdiction of our subcommittee. As the senior Republican member of the subcommittee, he has approached all questions very diligently and conscientiously. I would particularly like to pay tribute to the gentleman in the well for the tremendous work he has done in giving more prominence and attention to the area of aeronautics. I believe it is through the work and the interest of the gentleman from Washington that our subcommittee has indeed

moved forward to put greater emphasis on aeronautics in the entire space program.

We are going to miss him sorely not only on the committee but in the Congress. I would like to add my own warm feelings of personal appreciation of the very effective role which the gentleman from Washington has performed in this Congress.

Mr. PELL. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I know he, like I, has felt a tremendous feeling of satisfaction because of the fact that we have been able to increase the emphasis on those areas of safety and noise and air pollution and the other matters that concern us. This I think has adequately made up for what I referred to earlier as the long hours of tedious work we had in hearing the witnesses.

Mr. WYDLER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I know my colleague is going to retire from the Congress at the end of this session. Of course, that is a matter of great sadness to me personally. I just want to say on what will be the last occasion of consideration of a NASA bill while he is here that I have been with him and behind him on the subcommittee over the years, and this was something of great importance to me. I have learned a lot in having his valuable assistance. I know I will miss the gentleman and that the Congress will be the less for his leaving.

Mr. PELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman in the well an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GARMATZ. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PELL. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering about this. I understand there are about \$300 million being spent on the shuttle from here to the moon.

I wonder if we could get a little bit of that money for a train to go from Washington to Baltimore and then on to Philadelphia and New York. Can we not get some of that money transferred over to us in some way?

Mr. PELL. I am sorry. At this time I cannot speak too knowledgeably on the matter of wisely providing the moneys for rail transportation between Baltimore and Washington, but I assure the gentleman as long as I am in the Congress I will support him in this endeavors for rail service just as I have supported him in his efforts in maritime affairs, which have been outstanding.

Mr. GARMATZ. I don't think there is any question about that, and I thank the gentleman for that, but you know we are both leaving together, so if you can help us, that would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. PELL. I think the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and myself ought to form a group and have regular meetings and have an opportunity to review the past and look forward to the future.

Now, because of the limitations of time, I simply want to say that I support the bill and this program in toto.

I would like to speak specifically with respect to the subcommittee's work.

The NASA budget request, I am frank to say, was increased for fiscal year 1973 by approximately \$50 million. This increase was in two areas, aeronautical research and development and technology utilization. No increase was made in any area relating to space activity.

The committee increased the budget request for technology utilization because of the importance we place on this program. The technology utilization program is meant to transfer the new knowledge and innovative technology which results from NASA research and development programs to applications in industry, medicine, and other publicly important areas such as air and water pollution, and weather prediction.

The budget request for aeronautical research and development was increased in order to maintain United States leadership in the world aviation market, and to meet urgent domestic aviation requirements.

Our national air transportation system must be made unobtrusive to the environment, safer, and more reliable. We must insure that this Nation's airplane manufacturing industry will be able to continue contributing favorably to our balance of trade posture. Increased research and development must begin now in order to insure that our airline industry will be able to meet the air transportation demands of the next decade.

Under this program a concentrated effort will focus on a short takeoff and landing—STOL—experimental transport aircraft. Quiet engine work will be emphasized for the STOL aircraft and for conventional aircraft.

Other areas of emphasis will include noise reduction by improved flight procedures, advanced air transport technology, and vertical takeoff and landing—VTOL—research and test vehicles. These specific areas of emphasis will be supplemented by a strong technology program encompassing materials, structures, avionics, propulsion, aerodynamics operating procedures, and life sciences.

The most significant dollar increase, by far, is for research and development which will lead to the retrofitting of today's commercial airline fleet with engines that would lower noise levels down to new FAA noise limits. Almost every study generated in the past several years dealing with national aviation priorities has indicated that decreased jet aircraft noise should be a major United States goal.

The American public is in more and more instances filing complaints with the FAA and CAB, demanding airport operating restrictions, and initiating law suits against airport authorities due to excess jet noise. In increasing the NASA budget request in this important area, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is responding to justified and vocal public pressure.

In summary, the Committee on Science and Astronautics made no increase in space activity money requests.

Modest but purposeful increases were made in the areas of aeronautical research and development, and technology utilization: areas in which the American public has demonstrated great interest and desire for more rapid advancement.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER).

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, following an 8-month investigation, the General Accounting Office on March 31 upheld NASA's decision to award the space shuttle main engine contract to the Rocketdyne Division of North American Rockwell. I initiated the GAO investigation because I felt that Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, which had lost the original competition by six points, 711 to 705, had more experience in reusable engines and therefore offered a more cost-effective design for the space shuttle engine.

I was keenly disappointed by this decision. However, the decision has been made and I will abide by it.

Nonetheless, I feel it appropriate as we consider the NASA authorization bill to consider some suggestions on ways to alleviate the conditions that prompted this protracted protest.

One thing that strikes me more than anything else as I read the 107-page single-spaced GAO decision is the confused state of the Government's procurement law, especially as it pertains to negotiated procurements for sophisticated equipment.

A crucial part of the negotiated procurement process is the "discussions" which the procuring agency is required by law to hold with bonafide offerors before the submission of their final proposals. The purpose of this law—section 2304(g) of title 10, United States Code—is to require full-fledged negotiations in order to elicit, in a competitive atmosphere, the proposal most advantageous to the Government. What this means is that Congress wants the Agency to get the best buy for the taxpayers' dollar.

Pratt & Whitney argued that NASA had failed to meet the requirements set down by Congress by not discussing "deficiencies" in the preliminary proposal prior to submission of the final proposal. The GAO said this was not required by law. I think that it should be. To disallow discussion of proposal deficiencies and methods to correct those deficiencies, I submit, defeats the purpose of getting the best proposal possible.

Also, because of the highly sophisticated nature of these negotiated procurements, I think there should be an affirmative duty on the procuring agency to provide each competitor with equal access to all Government technology relevant to the proposal. We cannot hope to get the best proposal from offerors if they are not able to see and study the very latest technology developed under Government sponsorship.

And further, where the procuring agency underwrites the cost of the competition phase, the agency should be required to make sure that none of the

competitors receives a competitive advantage by simultaneous funding under separate but related Government contracts.

At a later date, I will present to the House and the Committee on Science and Astronautics some proposals for accomplishing these goals. My purpose is not to open old wounds, but to offer some suggestions on ways that we can restore confidence in our procurement procedure.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly lend my wholehearted support to this authorization.

I commend all of the subcommittee chairmen for the diligence with which they conducted our hearings.

Mr. Chairman, our space program helps us prevent human disaster from storms with weather satellites, our space program allows us to see and hear the world for pleasure and business with communications satellites, our space program allows us to navigate the seas with great accuracy with navigation satellites. Our space program extends man's horizons by exploration of the moon in the Apollo program, our space program gives us brief but revealing looks at the planets and stars with scientific satellites and deep-space probes.

With all of this, the scientific information, technology techniques and skills developed in our first decade in space has allowed us to more successfully compete in world markets, provided the basis for innovative products and provided the basis for making near space a place of high utility.

It is this last item that could well become the most important part of the space program in the 1970's and 1980's. I am talking about using space for man's direct benefit beyond communication, weather prediction, and navigation. Each of these, alone, justifies a substantial space program. Each of these, grew year by year as essential parts of our life and economy. But, what seems important to point out is the fuller potential of space—earth resource survey and management, space manufacturing, demographic analysis, space borne air and sea traffic control. In the somewhat more distant future, but perhaps as early as the late 1980's space-based electric power systems for earth use may also be added to this. Each of these areas of space utilization once developed, could by themselves, represent a sufficient basis for space activity by our country.

The fundamental question is whether we are preparing ourselves to take advantage of our opportunities. We started with a decade of space achievement and accumulated knowledge second to none. Our scientific explorations have continued into the 1970s at what I believe is a minimum level. Skylab, a manned near earth orbit workshop, will be operated in three visits in 1973. The start of a low cost earth orbital transportation systems is included in this year's budget.

Based on extensive hearings, conducted under the perceptive leadership of the

gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and in the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) on which I am pleased to serve, I am convinced that the bill before you is a minimum essential effort to prepare this Nation to realize the potential uses of space I have outlined.

This potential can best be illustrated by example. There are a number of products of high value which potentially can best be made in "zero gravity." Purifying vaccines to high concentration, growing crystals for electronic applications, and making specialty metal products such as low density, high strength alloys and truly spherical ball bearings all are potential space shuttle products. All of the better known current applications of space such as communications, weather prediction and navigation not only can be done better but more inexpensively. A low cost near space transportation system—the space shuttle—will allow us to routinely monitor and predict crop blight, flooding and runoff, forest resources, rural and urban land management problems and many other major conditions affecting our daily lives and standard of living.

Certainly, I have touched on only a few of the most important applications of the space shuttle. Its contribution to scientific investigation and exploration will be of equal value over the long term I am convinced.

This body, over the years, has set a high standard of consistent support for a strong national space program. The bill before us today deserves your full support.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the chairman for yielding and I also rise in earnest support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the increases for aeronautical safety in this bill. I believe the following information provides a self-evident basis for my support.

Approach and landing accident data—The following quotation is excerpted from the "Report of Department of Transportation Air Traffic Control Advisory Committee," volume I, December 1969:

"About one-half of all accidents occur during the approach and landing phase of flight, suggesting a need for improved landing aids and perhaps pilot education. In 1967, 31 of the 72 air carrier accidents and 3290 of the 6157 general aviation accidents occurred during landing and rollout."

In the 13-month period prior to January 1969, there were six major airline accidents during instrument approaches, with 168 fatalities. The total fatalities could have been much higher except for the fact that a Japan airline DC-8 landed in shallow water near San Francisco airport without loss of life. Damage suits and airframe losses alone from the loss of a single jumbo jet in a low-visibility landing can exceed \$100 million, to say nothing of the impact on the public.

The task of reconstructing accidents to determine if an automatic landing system would have prevented the accident is a very difficult undertaking. Accidents are usually the result of several factors, some of which are hard to quantify under different sets of operating conditions or assumptions. However, it is reasonable to expect that overshoots of the runway, undershoots of the runway, hard landing accidents, and loss of control on approach would have been prevented with an automatic landing system. Data on these types of accidents are summarized below from the National Transportation Safety Board Annual Review of Air Carrier and General Aviation Accidents:

Air carrier, general aviation		
1966:		
20	-----	1,415
1967:		
7	-----	1,559
1968:		
10	-----	1,507
1969:		
4	-----	1,137

Collision avoidance—National Transportation Safety Board Report NTSB-AAS-70-2 reveals that in the 11-year period 1959 through 1969 there were 251 midair collisions involving U.S. registered aircraft. Assuming the accident rates are the same for the next 10 years, we could expect the number to increase by 50 percent, that is 335 midair collisions.

Information made available since the NTSB report shows that 37 and 32 midair collisions occurred in 1970 and 1971, respectively.

An analysis of 133 midair collisions during the 6-year period—1964-69—revealed the following data:

116 collisions were between two general aviation aircraft.

8 collisions were between a general aviation aircraft and an airliner.

8 collisions were between a general aviation aircraft and a military aircraft.

1 collision was between two airline aircraft.

The above figures do not include midair collisions between two military aircraft. The USAF reported 91 midair collisions during the period 1964 through 1966.

In addition to the midair collisions, there were 2,230 near midair collisions reported by pilots in 1968 alone; 1,128 of these reports have been classified as hazardous to flight—approaches of less than 250 feet. Of these, 317 were classified as critical in which a high probability of collision existed, and an accident was averted only by the element of chance.

Startlingly, 86 percent of all near midair collisions occurred in broad daylight, with visibilities in excess of 5 miles. This bears out the results of our committee's hearings and reports that airways and terminal congestion is an extremely serious problem.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION REPRESENTED BY THE SPACE SHUTTLE PROGRAM

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 imposed a mandate by Congress directing NASA to conduct aeronautical and space activities so as to con-

tribute materially to cooperation with other nations and groups of nations. President Nixon, in 1969, reaffirmed this when he expressed a desire to include international participation in the cooperative development of future U.S. space programs. The space shuttle program provides an excellent opportunity for international cooperation in the development of the shuttle and associated vehicles, and then in the operational phase, participation in manned and unmanned missions and payloads. Such joint efforts can also further cooperation in space with the Soviet Union during the operational phase of the shuttle.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The United States, over the past decade, has made significant strides in international cooperation in space. Cooperative projects and associations have been developed in most aspects of our national space program. These activities have produced some 250 agreements with 35 countries and will, upon completion of current projects, result in joint expenditures by the U.S. and foreign nations of over \$500 million since 1961. Some two-thirds of this figure represents foreign expenditure.

However, in two areas, significant cooperative space projects have not materialized. These areas are the development of major hardware items, as in the Apollo program, and until recently, significant cooperation with the Soviet Union.

In view of the above, the space shuttle program, being the primary element of future space programs, offers the opportunity for international cooperation in the development of major hardware and significant cooperation during the operational phase, in missions and payloads with foreign nations including the Soviet Union. Dr. James C. Fletcher, Administrator of NASA, was recently quoted as stating relative to the Space Shuttle:

"We'll have the only system of its kind in the world and it could be that one day, we would even put a Russian payload into orbit."

For the past 2 years, the United States has given the advanced free world countries an opportunity to become acquainted with the major post-Apollo projects. Since September 1970, companies from England, West Germany and France, under funding from their respective governments, have been participating with the U.S. prime contractors on design definition studies for the Shuttle vehicles. As the shuttle program progresses into the final design and production phases in the mid-1970's, opportunities are available for international cooperation in the development and production of selected vehicle elements and subsystems, and of experiment modules to be carried into orbit by the shuttle.

In addition to joint participation in the development of hardware, cooperative programs in the development of payloads and participation in missions to be accomplished through shuttle launches can be realized. Such cooperative projects can include earth resources surveys, aircraft and shipping navigation, communications, weather watch and forecasts, and space exploration.

These cooperative projects will yield many benefits to both the United States and participating foreign nations. The key benefits to the United States lie in three main areas. First are the economic benefits from reduced development and production costs as a result of foreign contributions—Europe is considering contributing up to 10 percent of the cost of the space transportation system; an expanded mission base when foreign missions and payloads are considered; cheaper world communications; and improved balance of payments. Second are benefits in the technological and scientific areas from technology exchanges with foreign engineers and scientists and new technology and scientific findings resulting from foreign missions and payloads. Such technical exchanges will in many cases eliminate duplication of projects between nations and thus provide for more efficient utilization of resources.

Thirdly, political benefits should indeed derive from various nations working together for a common goal. The continued open and peaceful nature of the U.S. space program will enhance the U.S. role of world leadership for peace. U.S. Senator ALAN CRANSTON further emphasized this in February 1971, when he stated:

One of the main national considerations in the Space Program must be the strengthening and expansion of international cooperation in space. Through such efforts, space can help us wind down the arms race and bring all of the nations of the world into a new earthly concord of friendship and brotherhood.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to add my remarks to those of my colleagues concerning the regrettable retirement of our colleague TOM PELLY from this committee and this body.

I was privileged to serve with TOM PELLY on two committees, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House Science and Astronautics Committee during my entire period in Congress.

I have had the opportunity to observe him under every condition, and I have watched him and consider him to be a tower of strength not only in the space program—but also in the implementation of a brand new merchant marine whose ships will be on the high seas in the 1980's.

He has made a definite contribution to this body. In my opinion his retirement will be a loss not only to the district which which he has represented so long, but to his country as well.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1973.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, I would like to discuss NASA's unmanned space flight program. But before I get into the work of our subcommittee, let me say a few words about the space program, in general.

I am thoroughly convinced that the national space effort deserves the support of the Congress and the American people not merely because it has expanded man's understanding of his world and his universe, and promises to continue to do so, but even more important is its crucial role in advancing science and technology in the United States. As such, America's investment in space is an investment in the future strength of our country, and will help to assure that the United States will remain in the vanguard of the technologically advanced nations of the world.

Therefore, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, a vigorous space program is not simply a wise use of a relatively small percentage of our national resources, it is an essential investment in the country's economy, in our trade position, in our national security, and the welfare of our people.

Turning now to NASA's unmanned space program, our subcommittee has cognizance over two major divisions of NASA. The first is the Office of Space Science for which NASA has requested \$669.4 million for the forthcoming fiscal year. One objective of the Office of Space Science program is the increase of human knowledge of the earth's space environment, the sun and our solar system, the stars, and other celestial bodies.

Because the earth's atmosphere absorbs and obscures most radiations on either side of the visible range of the spectrum, observations in the ultraviolet, infrared, and other portions of the spectrum can be made only by instruments in orbit above our atmosphere. Using rockets and satellites, scientists have been able to make such observations and have thereby increased man's knowledge of the fundamental laws and principles of nature.

The knowledge that is acquired will ultimately help in the solution of many practical problems of men living on the surface of the earth. A good example is NASA's solar physics program.

Because the sun is the ultimate source of all energy on earth, a major portion of the physics and astronomy program has been devoted to gathering information and increasing our understanding of the dynamic processes of this "nearby star," and its tremendous influence on the earth.

It is expected that knowledge gained from studying the sun will aid physicists searching for an unlimited and pollution-free power source on earth; for the sun is a controlled nuclear fusion energy generator, and it is believed that understanding how the sun works will help scientists to produce and control nuclear fusion here on earth, and this will hopefully lead to a virtually pollution-free power source for mankind.

Moreover, solar energy impinging upon earth's atmosphere and surfaces causes the wind pressure circulation patterns which move weather systems around the globe. Thus, a greater knowledge of the sun's activity should lead to a better understanding of the dynamics of the earth's weather and climate.

Finally, the role of the sun as a source of heat and light for photosynthesis is all important—it is the basis for all food production on earth.

For all these reasons, extending man's understanding of the unique relationship that exists between the sun and our home planet is certain to have extremely important consequences for all mankind.

The major project for study of the sun during the 11-year period of the solar cycle is the orbiting solar observatory—OSO—project. To date, seven OSO spacecraft have been successfully launched. These have contributed greatly to the current scientific understanding of solar processes.

But there is much more to be learned, and NASA has undertaken a follow-on OSO project consisting of three larger satellites, which will carry more sophisticated instruments than the earlier OSO spacecraft.

Although testimony was received from NASA officials to the effect that the follow-on project may possibly be canceled in favor of other planned scientific investigations, the committee believes that the OSO project is fully justified and should receive the highest priority. The committee intends to monitor this project during the forthcoming fiscal year, and to urge NASA to continue with a vigorous solar physics program.

Another large-scale effort of the Office of Space Science is the work done in astronomy. Now that men are able to place instruments above the earth's absorbing and obscuring atmosphere, the science of astronomy, like solar physics, is making enormous strides.

Astronomy is one of the oldest recognized scientific disciplines. The study of the universe, its nature, and evolution, is recognized as one of the most demanding and rewarding of scientific endeavors.

Astronomical observations are made from high-flying airplanes, with instruments carried aloft by balloons, by sounding rocket experiments, and with satellites which orbit the earth. All these tools of the space age have contributed greatly to the advancement of the science of astronomy.

The orbiting astronomical observatory—OAO—project has achieved only one success out of three launch attempts to date. Yet, scientists assure us that this one successful spacecraft, still operational after more than 3 years, has provided data which astronomers will be analyzing far into the future.

OAO-2 added a new dimension to the science of astronomy by opening up a large window in the ultraviolet portion of the spectrum that was not available during centuries of ground-based astronomy which was limited to the visible range. It is expected that research and theoretical studies based upon the OAO data will provide much deeper insights into the nature and evolution of the universe.

The fourth and last of the OAO series will carry a 32-inch telescope into orbit this summer to make even more precise observations in the ultraviolet part of the spectrum.

Other regions of the spectrum are also known to hold many secrets of the universe. A new spacecraft is now under development called HEAO, an acronym which stands for high energy astronomy observatory. HEAO will make observa-

tions in the X-ray and gamma ray regions of the spectrum, and will investigate recent discoveries such as quasars, pulsars, and neutron stars. Testimony indicates that the scientific community considers this to be a most important and exciting project, and the next logical step in astronomy.

The relatively smaller, less complex, and less expensive spacecraft called explorers continue to be used effectively both for initial discovery of scientific phenomena, and for development of experiments. Many of the instruments ultimately flown on the large observatory class spacecraft have been tried first on explorers.

Explorers also have opened the door to cooperative scientific missions with other countries. Each cooperating foreign partner normally provides the spacecraft and much of the scientific payload, while NASA generally provides the launch vehicle, and tracking and data acquisition facilities, and occasionally some of the scientific experiments.

Finally, the so-called suborbital programs involve instruments which are flown aboard specially outfitted aircraft, or launched with sounding rockets, or carried aloft by balloons.

Sounding rockets are extremely important vehicles since they constitute the primary means for measuring vertical profiles of the atmosphere and for obtaining other geophysical data at altitudes below 80 miles where use of satellites is impracticable. They have been especially effective when used to complement physics and astronomy observations by satellites in the performance of coordinated investigations.

Unfortunately, the sounding rocket program is carried out at a relatively low level of activity contrary to the strong recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences to the effect that the effort should be approximately doubled. I feel certain that the committee would support a larger sounding rocket program, for these relatively inexpensive devices are highly productive, and constitute an essential element in NASA's scientific effort. NASA is aware of the committee's interest and we fully expect a more aggressive program to be submitted by the administration next year.

Now, I would like to speak briefly about the planetary exploration program. The authorization bill being considered today would approve \$321,200,000 for this program, the amount requested by the administration.

The goal of planetary exploration is the acquisition of new and more detailed information and knowledge of the origin, evolution, and dynamics of our solar system by launching spacecraft to the vicinities of the planets with a variety of scientific instruments.

This program has achieved a high degree of success beginning with the Mariner 2 flyby of Venus in 1962. Venus was visited again by a Mariner spacecraft in 1967.

To date, NASA has made nine attempts to launch probes to Mars and Venus, six of which have been successful.

We have had three successful fly-by

missions to Mars, one in 1964 and two in 1969. Two Mariner spacecraft were launched to Mars last May, each of which was designed to orbit the red planet for a minimum of 90 days. Unfortunately, due to a launch vehicle failure, the first of these two missions was lost. The second Mariner spacecraft was injected into orbit around Mars last November and has performed flawlessly. Most of the surface of Mars has been mapped, and a variety of scientific data has been acquired regarding the Martian atmosphere and topography that is still being analyzed.

The next Mariner spacecraft will be launched to the vicinity of Venus in 1973. After taking pictures of Venus and gathering scientific information regarding its atmosphere, the spacecraft will be accelerated by Venus' gravity and orbital velocity in the direction of Mercury, and thus the same Mariner spacecraft will be used to achieve our first look at Mercury, the closest planet to the Sun. Television pictures in both the ultraviolet and visual range of the spectrum will be returned from Mercury.

The most ambitious planetary mission of all will occur in 1975, when two Viking spacecraft will be launched and will soft land on the surface of Mars in 1976, the Nation's bicentennial year. Direct measurements of the atmosphere and the surface will be made by the Viking Lander. Special emphasis will be placed on obtaining biological, chemical, and environmental data relevant to the possible existence of life on Mars, past, present, or future.

The search for extraterrestrial life has been given the highest priority in the planetary exploration program. Scientists believe that if any form of life exists in our solar system, or has ever existed, or might evolve in the future, Mars is the most likely place.

Many secrets concerning the origin and evolution of the solar system will remain until the large outer planets are explored. Last year, NASA proposed a project to take advantage of a unique alignment of the outer planets—Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto—whereby fly-by missions could be made of as many as three of these bodies with a single spacecraft later in this decade.

These so-called grand tour missions would have been quite expensive, however, and NASA now has under study a less ambitious project to explore Jupiter and Saturn as early steps to a complete outer planets exploration program which has yet to be defined.

In the meantime, two Jupiter fly-by missions will be launched in 1972 and 1973 with smaller spacecraft called Pioneer-F and Pioneer-G for our first look at this, the largest of the outer planets. These spacecraft will also fly through the asteroid belt, and hopefully return information on some of the thousands of asteroids which orbit the sun between Mars and Jupiter.

Finally, a cooperative venture with West Germany has been undertaken to launch two Pioneer-type spacecraft closer to the sun than any other missions to date. This program, called Helios, is the largest international coopera-

tive project, and will provide our first opportunity to measure the intensity of solar radiation at close range.

The second major division within NASA whose program must be authorized each year by our subcommittee is the office of applications.

The space applications program is in the opinion of many the most important effort within NASA, yet, it is the one that has traditionally been funded at the lowest level.

NASA has requested only \$194.7 million to support space applications projects during fiscal year 1973, merely \$7.2 million more than NASA's operating plan for the current fiscal year.

This work leads to the development of those satellite systems which provide practical benefits to mankind such as communications, services, meteorological observations, and remote sensing of earth resources.

Under the terms of a reorganization of NASA which occurred in December 1971, a new office of applications came into existence, whereas previously it was part of a larger office.

The stated purpose of last December's reorganization was to give greater emphasis to the space applications effort, a purpose strongly supported by the members of the Science and Astronautics Committee, as well as the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, over the past several years. But this has been largely disregarded by NASA. In fact, as long ago as 1967, the Space Science Board concluded that it would be in the national interest to spend at least \$200 million, and perhaps as much as \$300 million per year on space applications, a small fraction of the NASA budget, both then and now, but a figure not yet reached by NASA even considering the effects of inflation during the intervening years.

The announcement of the creation of the new Office of Applications was greeted with enthusiasm by many in Congress who have long believed that public support for the national space program in the future will depend very heavily upon how successfully NASA develops these practical applications of space technology. Proponents of the space effort invariably point to the remarkable advances that have already been made in global communications, in weather prediction, and to the anticipated benefits from an earth resources survey system using satellites.

The members of the Science and Astronautics Committee are convinced that the best way to persuade American taxpayers that public funds should be used to support a national space program is to demonstrate, in hard economic terms, the usefulness of space technology in their everyday lives.

For these reasons, many members of the committee fully expected that the establishment of the new Office of Applications would be accompanied by substantially increased financial support of the space applications program.

Unfortunately, the budget submitted for that important program for fiscal year 1973 is only slightly larger than the

current fiscal year, and considering the effects of inflation, the funding requested for these activities will support work at about the same level of effort.

Mr. Chairman, it is my conviction that the current level of funding for space applications is inadequate, and I intend to urge a substantial increase in the budget for fiscal year 1974. NASA's stated goal of increased emphasis on space applications can be achieved only if sufficient financial support for this work is forthcoming.

So strongly do the members of the Science and Astronautics Committee feel about the importance of space applications that this bill recommends a \$4 million increase in the earth observation satellite project; the only project in the space science and applications portion of the budget to be increased this year.

The committee has, in past reports, expressed its dissatisfaction with the slow pace and narrow scope of the earth resources technology satellite project is finally reaching fruition with the approaching launch of the first of two ERTS satellites in June of this year. There is no follow-on project currently under development, however, and unless some action is taken soon, there will be a hiatus in the remote sensing effort following the launch of ERTS-B in 1973.

Mr. Chairman, it is not too early to undertake a follow-on development to the ERTS project. The earth observation satellite, now under study, is conceived as the follow-on to ERTS, but NASA has requested only \$1 million for this work for fiscal year 1973.

However, in its original submission to the Office of Management and Budget, \$5 million was requested for EOS so that phase C might be undertaken during the forthcoming fiscal year. The committee voted to restore the \$4 million cut imposed by OMB so that NASA will be permitted to proceed with this important project.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge all my colleagues to support the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1973. Personally, I wish the space effort were more aggressive, more vigorous than it is. A major American industry, aerospace, has declined to a dangerous point, and thousands of highly trained scientists, engineers, and technically skilled people are out of work.

This bill authorizes an austere space program, a program of about the same content and level of effort as the past 2 or 3 years. It is a matter of great concern to me that the U.S. program has declined to slightly more than \$3 billion per year, while the Soviet program appears to be about twice that size.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the day when the Federal Government can see its way clear to substantially increase its support of our national space program.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I think today we are really at the turning point in space. We are going from the point where space has been experimental to where it is going to be operational, and where we have gotten our money's worth

before now we will reap much more for our money.

I think basically the question before us today, will appear in the form of an amendment whose purpose is to kill the shuttle.

The shuttle will be the main workhorse for our manned and unmanned space vehicles. About 80 percent of the launches will be unmanned launches. No longer can we afford to fly a DC-9 once, and then throw it away. We have to reuse what we have. This in essence is what the shuttle does.

Let me give you one example about how the shuttle can save us money—not in terms of launching costs, but in terms of construction. We had a satellite which many of you might remember, called the OAO-1. It just did not work. We got it up there, but it didn't do the job. It cost us \$155 million, and that \$155 million was lost.

If we had used the shuttle we could have built that satellite for about \$25 million less. You do not need the expensive construction with the shuttle and can use off-the-shelf items.

Second, in placing the satellite in space we could have checked it out on the way up and found if there were problems. If we did put it up, and there was something wrong, we would have the ability to retrieve it. We could do this at a cost per launch of \$10.5 million, compared to the \$30 million for the OAO-1. You can take this example and extend it into all other satellites with the same cost saving.

A study was done on the economics by Mathematica that began in June of 1970. We spent over \$2.2 million on this study, which was conducted by some of the best economists and engineers in the world. Their conclusion—after nearly 2 years is that the shuttle does make sense economically—saving about \$1 billion a year.

I think there is another factor which we have to take into perspective, and that is that there is going to be a gap in the manned space program between 1973 and 1978. And the Russians are not quitting in space. With less than half of our gross national product, they are spending 60 percent more than we are, this year. They have had an 11-percent increase in their budget. They are employing 600,000 people in their space program, and the number of our space workers has fallen from 420,000 to less than 60 percent of our high.

This country is really out of the space program. In this period of time—1973-78—you will see some space spectacles from the Russians. Unless we act today in a commonsense way we are going to be reacting like we did when sputnik came upon the scene, spinning our wheels and wasting a great deal of money.

In conclusion I would like to say that I think this is a very good day to bring this bill up, with the astronauts going to be landing later today on the moon. It would be a great thing for this House to show its confidence in the astronauts and in the space program, to pass this bill to pass this shuttle. If so, perhaps tonight we can get a phone call up to the moon, from the President and tell them that

all systems are "go" for the future in our space program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN).

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding some time. I would like to just touch on a few questions about the space shuttle program which have bothered me, and the reasons why I am worried about this program and worried about whether or not we should have it.

Very simply, all that I am asking for are the answers to these questions that require attention.

For example, what is the tremendous excess payload capacity to be used for? The shuttle is designed to carry 65,000-pound payload. In order to meet NASA's cost-benefit ratio, predicated on a proposed launch schedule of approximately 50 launches per year, the shuttle would place better than 3 million pounds of payload into space. This is an incredible total when past years are considered. In 1969 and 1971, both big years for space, 390,000 pounds and 452,000 pounds were launched respectively.

It would appear that we are building a vehicle with about 10 times the excess capacity needed. To be sure, there are military missions in each of those years, with payload information classified, but even these could not begin to make up the difference needed.

This leads to the obvious question; what are we going to use the shuttle for exactly?

One obvious answer is the inclusion of a space station. As a matter of fact, space shuttle missions are projected for a space station the Mathematica study and in other NASA studies. In other words, the shuttle will serve the role of the camel's nose under the tent and lead to a vast and greatly expanded space program. Bear in mind, that NASA, after long advocating a space station program, eliminated that from this years program before the Congress. In a few years, of course, with the shuttle operating, NASA is very likely to argue that with the shuttle, the space station becomes logical. Thus, the need becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy for NASA.

On the other hand, the shuttle may be used for a greatly expanded military program. Recently announced dual facilities for the Air Force and for NASA for the space shuttle lend credence to an enhanced military program. Secretary Robert Seamans affirms he is very much in favor of the shuttle, but he does not want it in his budget and as a matter of fact, places a very low priority for the shuttle—behind the F-15 or B-1 projects.

Thus, it would appear that NASA is building something for the military that they feel would be nice to have, but are quite unwilling to fund it from their own pocket. Payload capacity and thrust and other technical changes nevertheless have been incorporated by NASA into the space shuttle in order to accommodate military missions.

All of this effort apparently to secure additional support and a justified role.

Another question that needs a firm answer is: What is the real cost of the space shuttle?

Current estimates project a \$5.15 billion development cost for two shuttles. But the total program projects some 580 launches over 12 years. If we accept the 100-mission role for each shuttle as realistic, then at least five more will have to be built and will cost an added \$1.3 billion for a total of \$6.45 billion, based on estimates—not firm costs—subject to change.

But now we have only bought the space vehicles. It will cost something to launch them. NASA estimates \$10 million per launch. At \$10 million per launch for 580 launches, the cost of launches over the next 12 years is \$5.8 billion. And the total cost of the space shuttle is now \$12.25 billion.

But this is only a part of the picture. Payload costs must be included. With a shuttle capable of putting 3 million pounds of payload into space each year, the aggregate potential payload totals about 36 million pounds. Present costs per payload are about \$20,000 per pound. Even if we are conservative and place only 20 million pounds into space, the cost—at about \$2,000 per pound—reaches \$40 billion for payload alone. This cost added to the shuttle development totals about \$52.25 billion.

Obviously, not all of this cost is added on to the shuttle. We are not going to save some 50 billions of dollars if the shuttle is canceled. Space exploration will go on and some of this money will be spent in any event.

But the central point is clear; if we go ahead with the space shuttle, we will be committing ourselves to a very expensive and expanded space program. Make no mistake; this is a program in search of a mission and the missions needed to justify its existence will be found. The additional uses are being used to demonstrate that the cost per mission will justify the shuttle.

But the cost figures are manifestly suspect. It should not go unnoticed that the authors of the NASA-sponsored economics study—Dr. Oskar Morgenstern and Dr. Klaus P. Heiss—concede that "considerable cost uncertainties exist" with regard to the shuttle program. The figures paraded by NASA constitute a frail reed for fiscal support. We must allow for cost overruns that are so prevalent these days in many Government-funded programs. Apollo came in under cost estimates but only because three missions were canceled. Cost estimates should be recognized for what they are—estimates—and no one is going to put his personal and professional reputation on the line for these figures.

Aside from the inconclusive cost estimates, another question arises: What are the supposed savings to be derived from using the space shuttle?

Two ways are possible to view these savings; one is through the cost per pound of operations. NASA asserts that this cost will be reduced from the present \$1,000 per pound to lift a payload capacity—if this capacity is not used then the cost-per-pound increases and supposed savings lost.

In addition, the cost-per-pound saving fails to include the development and

costs of the vehicles; it includes only launch costs. The true cost including development would be more like \$500 to \$600.

The second way of viewing the cost savings is to look at the launch costs. NASA continues to assert that launch savings of billions will accrue due to the relatively modest \$10 million plus launch costs for the operative shuttle. The fact of the matter is that neither the smaller launch vehicles—like the Scouts—or the very large ones—the Saturn modes—will be replaced by the space shuttle. Last year, 1971, of the 30 launches more than half comprised either the very small or the very large vehicles. The dismal fact is, unless the space program is vastly inflated over the next 10 years, we will not save money on launch costs with the shuttle.

Other equally weak arguments are put forward by NASA to justify the shuttle:

We hear that it will repair satellites. But satellites are obsolete within a very few years' time thanks to rapid technology.

We hear that it will rescue men from space. But without a shuttle, there will be no one to rescue.

We hear that the shuttle will save money from mishaps that occur. But there will have to be many, many mishaps or major disasters to justify this role.

We hear that the capacity of the shuttle will allow bigger, more standardized parts. But the practice of using less-than-best equipment—or big and sloppy technology as NASA implies—is less than realistic in an advancing technological world. The payloads still have to be space qualified.

We hear a great deal from NASA's high-priced pitchmen with vague and glowing promises. But we ask for facts.

We hear much about what the shuttle will do. But all that it can do, we are already doing.

We wish to know the answers to the questions that have been raised today in the Congress. Many respected scientists and leaders across the country seek similar answers. The questions that have been raised deserve answers before we approve this program.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, the austerity of the NASA budget proposed to us for fiscal year 1973 is well known to the House. The needs to reduce the operational costs of utilizing and exploring space are well understood. The opportunities available to us as a nation and the world to utilize near space are known from our communications, navigation and weather satellite successes. Our ability to explore is unexcelled as is currently being demonstrated in our Apollo program which so shortly will be concluded. Skylab to be flown throughout 1973 portends the great advantages that man obtains from a laboratory-workshop in near earth orbit. Our satellites make a limited number, but highly fruitful sci-

entific excursions to the planets. Yet our greatest stumbling block to realizing the full potential of space is low-cost, two-way transportation with high payload flexibility.

This budget contains the initiation of the development of the space shuttle—a low-cost, two-way transportation system. Others have and will point out that the shuttle is the cornerstone of a sound automated and manned space flight program.

What seems important to point out is the impending development of the space shuttle has direct, measurable short-term contribution to our national life over the next 4 to 7 years. Not only will the shuttle contribute to our well-being after completion of its development in 1979 but more importantly it will contribute this year, next year and in all the years through its development from 1972 to 1978.

A number of analyses have been made of what will be the contribution of the space shuttle development to the economy. It is useful first to know what a dollar spent in the space program today is estimated to do for our economy. One dollar spent on our space effort generates \$2.50 in gross national product. That same dollar, because of the multiplier effect, generates \$2 of personal income and \$1.50 of consumer outlays. The tax receipts from the goods and services, personal income and consumer outlays generates 50 cents in taxes. The net result is not only a contribution to our economy but a tax return reducing the cost of the dollar spent on the space program to 50 cents.

Knowing the multiplier effect that space program expenditures have on the economy, what will a \$5.15 billion expenditure over an 8-year period on the development of the space shuttle contribute to our economy? A conservative evaluation of the contribution of a \$5.15 billion 6-year shuttle program indicates a \$12.9 billion addition to our gross national product. Personal income contribution would be \$10.9 billion with consumer outlays of \$7.9 billion. The net Federal tax return from this activity would be of the order of \$2.6 billion returning half of the original investment of \$5.15 billion in the program.

Not all Federal activity is or can be such an outstanding contributor to our economy. For example, if \$8.3 billion were invested in space shuttle, residential construction or directly in consumer spending it is estimated that the economic multiplier effect of such an expenditure in each one of these areas would generate \$17.5 billion from shuttle development, \$14.5 billion from residential construction, and \$16.8 billion from direct consumer expenditure. I am not suggesting that residential construction or consumer expenditure be curtailed but rather that development of the space shuttle is an economically sound investment of the taxpayers' money. Based on these same analyses at least 35 of our 50 States would share directly in the shuttle development program while all 50 States share in its economic contribution.

Much more can be said as to the space shuttle's and other NASA programs' con-

tributions to this Nation in the years ahead, but I would only urge your support of the bill before us today as the minimum necessary program for NASA in fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the authorization bill pending before us. The committees and the subcommittees have gone into extensive work in hearings, traveling to many places throughout the country to try to ascertain the facts as they relate to the various items in the bill.

I would like particularly to speak to the Space Shuttle, and particularly to answer some of the questions that have been raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin. One of the problems which the gentleman mentioned as having plagued him with respect to the Space Shuttle was the excess pay load capacity. If the gentleman will read the Mathematica report, he will find that 67 percent of the pay load capacity is in propellant.

That is answered in this very factually written mathematical report. Even Dr. Klaus P. Heiss who was a director and did this study, has refuted that argument in many places since that time. There will be about 150 Department of Defense missions over the 10 years that it will be included. About 143 of the other missions will be in the area of physics and astronomy. About 43 will be in the area of earth observation. About 69 missions will be in communications and navigation, and 97 are called sortie or short-term laboratory missions, 19 of these to be in the area of planetary missions. There will be 90 missions possibly in space station applications and 128 missions for other agencies such as the Department of Agriculture and others in connection with earth resources.

So I do not think we can say we need to turn this over to the military, as was pointed out by Dr. Heiss in some remarks that he made. Our railroad system does a considerable amount of work for the military, and yet I do not think it is necessary to turn our entire railroad system over to the Department of Defense.

One of the other items that was mentioned was the cost of the program. We pay as we go along. We buy the minimum amount. We do not buy it all in 1 year. It was contended that the \$5.15 billion development costs for the shuttle are soft and the direct costs could exceed this cost by many times, as stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think it is important to point out that the development costs have been estimated by the most reliable methods by contractors and NASA over the past several years.

I do not think you can say that in the Apollo program there has been a cost overrun and I do not think you can say there will be a cost overrun in the shuttle program.

It has been claimed that regardless of these studies, the cost of the shuttle would be exceeded by many billions of dollars in figures used by NASA. I would like to quote from a letter by Dr. Klaus P. Heiss, director of advanced technology economics, Mathematics Corp., to the Universe Astronautics Foundation, Inc., on this subject:

As a matter of fact, the economic case for the present space shuttle system for expendable space transportation is so strong that within any reasonable range of cost uncertainties, the space shuttle system is definitely the preferred choice.

He went on further to say:

Again, with the danger of being misquoted, I would like to state that our estimates of the non-recurring costs of the Space Shuttle System range anywhere between \$6.5 and \$8.5 billion. NASA, at present, estimates the Space Shuttle development costs at \$5.15 billion for the parallel burn solid rocket motor Space Shuttle System. Thus, even the "success" of critics of the Space Shuttle System is showing potentially higher Space Shuttle costs would not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the Space Shuttle System should be rejected on economic grounds. As a matter of fact, I am convinced that the presently proposed Space Shuttle can and will be developed at a cost below \$7.5 billion.

NASA has estimated they can do it for \$5.15 billion.

So I think that as far as the cost is concerned, we are well within the ballpark, and the cost is not going to be an escalating matter.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question or an observation?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida brought out the fact that people say our railroads are also used by the military. As a matter of fact, the railroad systems of the United States were started after the War between the States stimulated them, and they helped to build this country. We would never have had them if it had not been for that fact.

We can cite the case for the motor car, also. In World War I when I first went into the service, we had horse-drawn artillery and horse-drawn carriages, and before we got out of the war, we had motor trucks, and the motor trucks helped also to build this country.

The thought has occurred to me that a big communications satellite costs about \$5 million, and it goes up and stays up for 3 or 4 years, and it still costs \$5 million. But it could be brought back down and refurbished for maybe less than half or one-tenth that much, and then be put back into operation. The shuttle is going to be doing this. It is going to be the workhorse of space and save those satellites that gather the information that make space one of the most valuable assets the world has seen.

Mr. FUQUA. I might say the gentleman is making a very accurate statement. It is not necessarily the payload that the space shuttle sends into orbit that counts. It may be the satellite it retrieves and saves from which the ultimate saving will come. This is a very significant part of it.

Not only that, but the best estimates indicate that the cost reductions of construction of satellites up to 50 percent by having a shuttle to launch the satel-

lites into orbit, so here we get additional savings from the program.

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

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I noticed a previous speaker was concerned about the economics. There is a tremendous secondary impact on economics from this shuttle program. For example, the State of Wisconsin stands to gain \$59 million in direct shuttle contracts. This will increase the Wisconsin State product by \$118 million and raise the annual aerospace employment in Wisconsin by more than 1,600 people.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman from California.

There are many States, I was going to say, which will benefit by this. For every dollar we spend in the space shuttle program, approximately \$2.50 will be put back into the economy by the multiplier effect with which I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin is familiar.

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

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well and, the gentleman from California, and his explanation. I am one of the supporters of the space effort and the shuttle program. I have heard explanations about how it will contribute to our ecological efforts and the efforts generally to clean up the environment, and if it is said also that it will be helpful to our military and our defense efforts, I say good for it. I know one of the primary objects is to improve conditions for mankind on this earth. I am all for it; I am proud of the work of this committee and the pioneering genius and dedication of our American aerospace team.

Mr. FUQUA. I know the gentleman from New York is expressing the good judgment he has exhibited continually in the past.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070, a bill authorizing funds for the continuation of our space program in fiscal year 1973.

At this very moment, Apollo 16 astronauts John Young, Charles Duke, and Ken Mattingly are orbiting the moon, increasing our knowledge of the solar system.

While this is the most visible return from our investment in space, the application of technology adapted from the space program carries over into other fields.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

For example, NASA has undertaken a project which would greatly reduce aircraft engine noise. Originally, NASA sought to reduce engine noise below the B-707 and DC-8 aircraft levels, but tests have concluded that an even greater reduction is feasible.

In the bill that we are debating today, a quiet and clean engine for the STOL—short takeoff and landing—aircraft will be developed. The goal of the program is to develop and demonstrate an engine which emits noise levels much lower

than the quietest engines in civil operations today.

NASA and industry studies indicate that noise reductions in the current first generation jet transport aircraft fleet can be achieved through design modifications to the engines. In conjunction with the Department of Transportation, NASA plans to initiate an experimental investigation of design changes to these engines and demonstrate certifiable, retrofitable modifications to aircraft current in service.

Development and demonstration of the modified quieter engines would be completed in time to begin retrofitting the civil air fleet during the latter half of 1975.

These increased efforts to reduce noise pollution created by civil fleet aircraft are well appreciated by those of us in the Los Angeles area who know firsthand the consequences of airport noise.

The residents of the communities which surround the Los Angeles International Airport have suffered physically, emotionally, and economically from the noise generated at the airport.

I am pleased that the committee has emphasized the importance of strengthening our efforts to reduce aircraft noise pollution, and I have the utmost confidence that the aerospace team will conquer this problem with the same competence and efficiency that it has conquered other problems.

SPACE SHUTTLE

Perhaps the most important provision in this bill, in terms of our future in space exploration, is its commitment to develop the space shuttle, a commitment with which I thoroughly agree.

Currently, only four more crews of American astronauts will journey into space in the next 20 months—Apollo 17 spacemen who will land on the moon this year and astronauts who will make three flights next year in an earth-orbiting space Skylab.

When the last Skylab astronauts splash down, scheduled in December 1973, no American will venture into space again until the first shuttle flight in 1978. The Nation has no other manned space program manned or on the drawing boards.

Thus, the key to our future space exploration is the space shuttle—a reusable space vehicle, which will sharply reduce the cost of operations.

Initially, the shuttle will be employed to transport the satellite to orbit, to service orbiting satellites, and to rescue stranded astronauts.

The reusable space shuttle will radically reduce the cost of space operations. Rather than placing a payload in space at a cost of \$800 to \$4,000 per pound, which is currently the case, the shuttle can transport a satellite to orbit for approximately \$120 per pound.

With the savings resulting from the shuttle, it is expected that the shuttle will greatly increase the use of space by government agencies and commercial users and, thus, enhance the use of space for the practical benefit of mankind.

This will enable us to better survey the earth's resources, monitor and predict weather, improve worldwide com-

munications, enlarge our knowledge of the earth and our solar system, and perhaps, even harness the sun's power as a source of pollution-free energy.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I support our space program, and I believe that H.R. 14070 is a progressive measure designed to continue our successful exploration of the earth and the solar system. In addition, the knowledge that is gained from this effort is a benefit to all mankind.

We must continue to reap the great harvest of benefits that space holds for mankind, and we must continue to find methods, such as the space shuttle, which will reduce costs while allowing a greater variety of missions.

I support this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage, and reject the efforts to gut the space program by deleting the space shuttle.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. space explorations and the technology developed as a result of these efforts have come to symbolize the high level of technical advancement to which our Nation has reached. We are justly proud of these efforts.

The full value of these efforts is not culminated in the successful Apollo moonshot, nor even in the establishment of a space shuttle. The technology and the skills developed in these efforts are applicable to many of the now unmet needs of our society.

The December 3, 1971, announcement that an Office of Applications was being established within NASA was welcome news. So, too, was the statement made at that time by NASA Administrator James C. Fletcher that:

The applications of space technology to solving problems here on Earth is perhaps NASA's most important new thrust.

Included in this authorization is \$198 million for this effort, accounting for just over 5 percent of the total NASA authorization, which will allow application of space technology to the needs of the earth sciences, communications, weather, earthquakes and aircraft noise and traffic.

The goals outlined for the immediate future are modest and well within what I believe to be the technical ability of NASA. After a successful initial effort, I am hopeful that the applications can be broadened. In cooperation with the Department of Transportation, NASA attention should be focused on the transit problems facing our urban areas. In his state of the Union message, President Nixon also asked that NASA technology be used in this field by saying:

A nation that can send 3 people across 240,000 miles of space to the moon should also be able to send 240,000 people 3 miles across a city to work.

I find disturbing the indications in the committee report accompanying this bill that, despite the urging of the Science and Astronautics Committee, the admonition of the President and the strong congressional support for the Office of Applications, efforts to increase this part of NASA's program are being met with reluctance.

NASA's potential in providing direc-

tion and technical assistance for these practical applications is enormous. Continued expenditures for space exploration simply because "it is there," or expenditures limited to just outer space applications will be increasingly difficult to justify.

We are being asked to authorize \$3.5 billion. This is well below the \$5 billion figure of 1965, and is about equal to the amount appropriated last year. Yet when we evaluate priorities, we should view these expenditures not in relation to the amount spent in years past, but in accordance with how we may best utilize limited Federal resources.

I urge NASA officials to explore new areas where their technical expertise could have early practical applications and to vigorously pursue these new applications.

Not included in the space application budget, but of interest to many of the residents in my district is the increased effort in the aircraft noise reduction experiments. After mistakes in past planning for areas surrounding our existing airports, I am confident that the worst of the land use mistakes will not be repeated. Unfortunately this does not eliminate the noise for the people living and working on the edges of existing airport runways. Through the experiments on quieter engines, the retrofitting of existing aircraft and improved flight procedures, aircraft noise can be significantly reduced. I am particularly pleased to note the plans for increasing this effort in fiscal year 1973.

I am supporting the NASA authorization because I believe these efforts can be of immediate value, and because I am confident that in future years the applications of our space efforts will find constructive uses in solving many of the problems which exist on earth now.

I am strongly suggesting, however, that in future years I and many of my colleagues will be asking for a closer accounting of our space efforts, and we will be asking for an increased participation on the part of NASA in solving our "non-space" problems.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070, the authorization for fiscal 1973 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The committee has taken great pains to analyze and question the administration's requests in detail and has reported a bill authorizing continued spending for our space program which is both fiscally responsible and effective in terms of our continued advancement on the frontiers of space.

I wish to emphasize my support for the space shuttle provision of H.R. 14070. I realize that some of my colleagues in the House have reservations about the space program in general and hesitate to support new hardware ventures. I urge my colleagues to look at the shuttle in the context of the overall space program. To continue our adventures and quest for knowledge in space over the next several decades without the shuttle would increase the cost by billions of dollars. In the first 12 years of shuttle operation, we will save approximately \$13 billion. The savings associated with the shuttle

result from lower launch and satellite maintenance costs, from a substantial reduction in the cost per pound of sending a payload into space, and from the reusability of the shuttle.

The implementation of the space shuttle concept beginning in 1978 will prove to be a watershed in the history of the space program. The program will move from experimental to operational in nature. The shuttle will enable us to make practical applications of our space accomplishments and add new dimensions to many scientific disciplines.

I would also like to point out to my colleagues in the House who have raised questions about the practical value of NASA that in this year's authorization is \$50 million for the development of jet noise control devices. I would hope that the importance of such a project would be clear to all. Ample medical studies on the effects of noise indicate not only hearing loss, but also maladies of the nervous and digestive systems.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make clear to my colleagues my support for the Sky Lab project, which will begin operations about this time next year. This program will give us a clearer understanding of man's capabilities to perform for extended periods of time in space.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that the bill reported by the Committee on Science and Astronautics is both financially responsible and programmatically effective.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of H.R. 14070, the bill authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1973.

After working with the other distinguished members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I think it can safely be said that we have reported an authorization bill which will provide us with a maximum return on every dollar invested. Though the NASA authorization for space activities has been cut back to provide for development of the space shuttle and Skylab, the programmed launches and experiments will add considerably to our knowledge of the universe and man's position in it. New programs utilizing our satellites for dealing with global problems of water resources, crop disease, weather variations, and natural disasters—to name a few—will enable us to manage, control, and preserve our environment for future generations.

I am especially pleased that the committee approved an additional \$49 million for aeronautical research and development in the areas of noise abatement and collision avoidance systems. The image of NASA as "the space agency" should be carefully balanced to bring out NASA's valuable pioneering work in aeronautical design—the development of a clean, quiet aircraft engine is the most outstanding example. It is my sincere hope that NASA will continue in this leadership role and coordinate with other Federal agencies for the benefit of Americans in the sky and on the ground.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, today

we are debating the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Today, with two Americans again landing on the moon is an appropriate occasion to assess the accomplishments of our space program and decide whether or not we are going to continue this adventure or become stagnant.

Critics of the space program argue that we must take care of our problems on earth. While sharing their desire to tackle the problem we have, I do not feel that the two areas are mutually exclusive. If Columbus had waited until the problems of Europe were all solved before trying to find a quicker route to the Orient, we might still be on the European Continent. Out of the space program have come many tangible programs to improve the quality of life on earth.

Improved weather forecasting through satellites has saved many lives through early detection of hurricanes and other storms. Through communications satellites the people of the world are in constant touch with each other. Through these satellites the American people witnessed the arrival of President Nixon at Peking airport after 20 years of confrontation between our two nations. If we are truly to move toward world peace it will be due to the greater understanding that has come from this type of communications revolution.

In the area of medicine many of the technological achievements of space have been adapted for earth use. Techniques for treating heart patients and new instruments to improve eye surgery are directly related to the Nation's space program. Space technology has also led to devices that will give greater mobility to handicapped individuals who do not have full use of their arms or legs.

Now we must decide if the space program is to continue. The next step in the space agenda is the space shuttle. This will give the space program the capability to fly missions at a much lower operational cost. Once in operation, this reusable shuttle will reduce the cost of a launch from the current \$125 million to \$10 million. This lower cost will open the use of space to other nations, Government agencies, and for commercial use. There can be no doubt that many new advances will be developed out of the space shuttle program.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070, authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Our Nation's space program has made true and lasting contributions to the development of knowledge and the technological processes which are important to the advancement of all citizens.

The research effort which has been associated with the space program has resulted in breakthroughs in every area of human concern and deserves the full support of all who are interested in better living conditions here on earth.

I am particularly proud to know of the significant research effort which has been provided by Alabama A. & M. College at Huntsville. This institution of higher learning has provided vital facilities and talented research personnel to

advance the space sciences. Dr. Richard D. Morrison has contributed meaningful leadership to the institution and to the total space community in Huntsville, Ala. He is to be commended for his foresight and industry in coordinating and bringing into action the many talented people he has available at Alabama A. & M. College.

I recommend support of the committee's report for funding of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration program.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I support every penny recommended in H.R. 14070 authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Our Nation needs increased emphasis on the scientific and technological research provided by our space program.

This effort is valuable to all of us concerned with the advancement of man and the betterment of the quality of his life on this earth. The benefits in techniques, procedures, and devices have accrued to practically every area of man's concern since the start of this program. Applications of space research have enhanced the life of each citizen and will continue to do so in the years ahead.

I am intimately acquainted with the dedicated service of those associated with the space effort at the Marshall Space Center in Huntsville, Ala. Marshall is the largest of NASA's installations in terms of Government activity and personnel.

It is good to know of the committee's recommendation for construction of facilities at Marshall connected with the space shuttle program. The capable and dedicated personnel at Marshall have much to contribute to the realization of this important national program.

The space shuttle holds great promise for new economies in space operation and still greater benefits for those of us who remain on the earth.

Because of the prospects for vastly improved environmental monitoring from space and more sophisticated testing devices and processes on earth, the NASA effort deserves particular support from those concerned with the environment.

I am confident that the chairman and the committee share my view that even greater resources should be devoted to our Nation's space effort. The committee has accomplished a difficult task in bringing before us a very tight proposal. The committee deserves our full support in their efforts.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070. The direct and indirect benefits which society has derived from our space program have greatly enhanced the quality of life in our Nation.

The NASA budget which the Committee on Science and Astronautics has approved for this coming fiscal year is a modest one. However, it is one which will insure that our Nation will continue to maximize the public benefits which we derive from our space program.

I am not in favor of a space program which places no premium on expense. As with everything else, we must con-

tinue our space exploration in an orderly manner, gaining maximum knowledge and effectiveness from our money and human effort. However, it is saddening to realize the extent to which some who are more interested uttering clichés and making noise than in using thought and farsightedness regarding what is best for our country have succeeded in undermining our space effort.

There have been many significant benefits derived by our society from the space program. Electronic miniaturization, computer technology, large propulsion systems, and the general state of our technology have been greatly advanced through our space program. But these advances are sometimes hard for us to appreciate fully, because we as individuals may not be directly involved with computers or electronics or other high technology items.

However, there are many examples of space program benefits which we as average American people can appreciate. Those of us who are outdoor enthusiasts, campers, or fishermen may now be using a new type of blanket which weighs less than 3 ounces, is strong enough to use as a stretcher, and can be folded small enough to fit in our shirt pocket. This blanket is warmer than wool, is windproof and waterproof. It is made of a special metallic-coated plastic which was derived from the "skin" developed for early NASA communications satellites.

Those new slipcovers and draperies of which we are so proud in our homes, are attractive, functional, and home washable. They are an outgrowth of research in fabric materials performed for our space program.

Our plastic coated pots and pans which we use in our kitchen are a result of research directed at protecting our spacecraft from the extreme heat of launch and reentry.

The benefits to our everyday lives in the fields of communications, transportation, and weather prediction require little elaboration. Space offers our most promising means of detecting and controlling air and water pollution.

This country was born and raised on the strength of hopes and dreams, on the urge to explore and expand man's horizons. We opened the frontier, we found new ways to produce food, to cure disease, and to house and clothe our people. We have become a great nation because we have a heritage of exploration and problem solving. Space is our new frontier and our new challenge. We must not deny ourselves the opportunities which will arise from its exploration and utilization.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose this legislation which authorizes \$3.43 billion for the space program. My opposition to this bill is directed to the multimillion dollar down-payment on the space shuttle.

While a case might soon be made on the space shuttle, it does not appear that the evidence submitted at this time supports a commitment of the billions of dollars which may ultimately be involved in this program. This is the point of no return on this multibillion-dollar proj-

ect. Further study and delay may save billions for the taxpayer.

This is only the beginning of our commitment to the space shuttle project: We must have something to put in the shuttle. The shuttle will have a payload capacity of 65,000 pounds. NASA estimates that, to produce savings over conventional rockets, the shuttle will be flown about 45 times a year. NASA also estimates that approximately 80 percent of the shuttle's cargo will consist of satellites, or about an average of 52,000 pounds of satellites per flight. Yet the annual total weight of all NASA satellites for the years 1966-70 averaged only 15,000 pounds, or one-fourth of the capacity of one shuttle flight. With a total yearly capacity of nearly 3 million pounds, the shuttle apparently will rarely run at anywhere near full capacity. If only a single 2,000 pound satellite—which is heavier than most—is carried at each launch, the total weight per year will represent a 6-fold increase over present unmanned flights, and the cost per satellite will be \$12,500 per pound, as compared to \$700-1,000 per pound today. Such a situation seems to preclude any savings in the space program by the use of this shuttle. To make this program at all economical, we must spend a massive amount of money to provide payloads for the shuttle. How much money? Rand Corp., in a study compiled for the Air Force, estimated total expenditures for the shuttle program would be over \$140 billion. Can the U.S. afford to spend such a sum for use in space? The answer, Mr. Chairman, is a definite "No."

The proposed space shuttle program is not an end in itself—it is only the beginning of an expensive new commitment to the space program. We must exercise prudence and demand more overriding evidence that this project is justified at the present time.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the NASA authorization for 1973.

The United States is first in space and our national prestige in the space program is at an alltime high. Our increased knowledge of the scientific and technological improvements also cannot be denied. But, aside from the expansion of our knowledge of space, there have been many spin-off benefits for all men.

The new satellite and airborne systems now being developed which can pinpoint the early stages of crop disease and insect attack, find the ugly sources of water pollution, track the cancer of urban sprawl, and even reveal the locations of valuable mineral deposits and other natural resources on which all our citizens depend. These systems are the means of feeding people who would otherwise go hungry, of preserving their environment against destruction.

There are so many other fringe benefits beyond these important and obvious ones. They include the application of space technology to medicine, where now many lives are saved in surgery, cardiac treatment, and intensive care because of the discoveries made in space research. There are the lifesaving improvements in highway safety that have followed

from aerospace discoveries. And there are dozens more. Yet these just hint at things to come in vital areas such as actual control of earthquakes and the weather, which may well result from our long-range study of the moon and our neighboring planets.

The money our country has invested in this program is very small in comparison to the endless benefits we will receive.

I, therefore, give my complete endorsement to the passage of H.R. 14070 authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14070, the fiscal year 1973 authorization for NASA.

I know that my colleagues are aware of the many benefits the space program has provided to the American public. It should therefore be further encouraging to the Congress to see NASA emphasizing programs which hold the promise for even greater returns in the future. These are the many applications programs in the areas in which there will be immediate and identifiable benefits. Specifically, NASA is pursuing activities on a high priority basis in the fields of earth resources, environmental protection and surveillance, and communications and navigation.

One program of particular significant value is the earth resources technology program—ERTS. The ERTS satellites are designed to provide a comprehensive global survey of the earth's resources. The principal value of the program is the opportunity to develop the means to intelligently and effectively manage our global resources.

The ERTS satellites will be able to make continuous observations of the earth from space so as to permit a fuller assessment and a greater understanding of the changes taking place. These spacecraft will be able to record and analyze information about the natural resources of the earth on a scale never before thought possible.

The ERTS activities of NASA represent just one of a number of earth observation programs carried out within the total area of science and applications. Under this one category of earth observation, NASA will be working to provide new knowledge in the practical areas of predicting the weather, monitoring and supervising agricultural crop growth, tracking hurricanes, and monitoring and detecting natural resources of our planet.

The second major area of NASA work within science and applications includes planetary exploration. This work entails placing scientific satellites in space to observe the other planets in the solar system as a means by which to increase our general knowledge of the origin, evolution, and dynamic processes of the universe.

One program of particular importance is the orbiting solar observatory—OSO—project which is designed to study sun spots, solar flares, and other phenomena that occur on the sun during the 11-year solar cycle. In order to understand and predict the occurrence and intensity of solar radiation, it is necessary to ob-

serve the sun with instruments above the earth's absorbing and obscuring atmosphere.

The sun is the source of all energy on the earth making possible life on this planet. Therefore, study of the sun, its radiation, and its interaction with the earth's environment will provide the knowledge instrumental to further understanding our earth's ecosystems.

Also within science and applications is NASA's work in astronomy. Basically, this activity will involve placing instruments in orbit and pointing them outward toward the solar system to observe the broad spectrum of radiation from the sun and stars. A fourth category of NASA effort includes communications and navigation. NASA programs here are directed to developing space hardware to test and demonstrate global information transfer as well as techniques to locate and help guide ships and aircraft on the surface of the earth.

In the early years of our space program, the public and the Congress heard much debate regarding the benefits that would someday be derived from our research and development work in space. I emphasize to my colleagues that these benefits are no longer merely a promise. They are now hard and immediate realities. The space program has recorded major contributions in medicine, environment, ocean and earth resources, weather, communications and education, products and materials—in short, the space program has come into each and every one of our lives in more ways than we can imagine.

But even more significantly, the many space benefits which we are already taking for granted are being added to on a day-by-day basis. In the general area of science and applications in particular we can expect to see a number of major scientific discoveries and worthwhile applications emerge from the missions now being initiated. These programs that NASA is presently engaged in will play a vital role in solving the most pressing of our societal needs and in building a better life for mankind here on earth.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1973 NASA authorization bill is the product of the most detailed review of every single program proposed by NASA. H.R. 14070 reflects a well-balanced space effort, maintaining the strength of our country.

I strongly urge approval of the committee bill without amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

- (1) Apollo, \$128,700,000;
- (2) Space flight operations, \$1,094,200,000;
- (3) Advanced missions, \$1,500,000;
- (4) Physics and astronomy, \$152,600,000;
- (5) Lunar and planetary exploration, \$321,200,000;
- (6) Launch vehicle procurement, \$191,600,000;
- (7) Space applications, \$198,700,000;

(8) Aeronautical research and technology, \$211,890,000;

(9) Space research and technology, \$64,760,000;

(10) Nuclear power and propulsion, \$21,100,000;

(11) Tracking and data acquisition, \$259,100,000;

(12) Technology utilization, \$5,500,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, as follows:

(1) Rehabilitation and modification of aeronautical, airborne science, and support facilities, Ames Research Center, \$1,065,000;

(2) Rehabilitation of Unitary plan wind tunnel model supports, control systems, and model preparation areas, Ames Research Center, \$760,000;

(3) Rehabilitation and modification of utility systems, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$590,000;

(4) Rehabilitation and modification of roadway system, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$610,000;

(5) Modifications of, and additions to, spacecraft assembly facilities, Kennedy Space Center, \$8,100,000;

(6) Modification of Titan Centaur facilities, Kennedy Space Center, \$2,040,000;

(7) Rehabilitation of Full Scale Wind Tunnel, Langley Research Center, \$2,465,000;

(8) Modification of central air supply system, Langley Research Center, \$1,175,000;

(9) Environmental modifications for utility operations, Langley Research Center, \$650,000;

(10) Modification of high temperature and high pressure turbine and combustor research facility, Lewis Research Center, \$9,710,000;

(11) Modification of fire protection system, Manned Spacecraft Center, \$585,000;

(12) Warehouse replacement, Wallops Station, \$350,000;

(13) Space Shuttle facilities at various locations, \$27,900,000;

(14) Rehabilitation and modification of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$500,000 per project, \$11,580,000;

(15) Minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$250,000 per project, \$1,720,000;

(16) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$8,000,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," \$700,800,000.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 1(g), appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required at locations other than installations of the Administration for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used in accordance with this subsection for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the

House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(c), not in excess of \$10,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and not in excess of \$25,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for rehabilitation or modification of facilities: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a), not in excess of \$250,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for any of the foregoing for unforeseen programmatic needs.

(h) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Administrator or his designee within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 30 and June 30 thereafter the names of any nonprofit institutions of higher learning which the Secretary of Defense determines on the date of each such report are barring such recruiting personnel from premises or property of any such institution.

Sec. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1) through (15), inclusive, of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (16) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such ac-

tion until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee, unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whether feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

Sec. 6. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of

the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act. If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(c) (1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent, disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions.

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1973".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this bill calls for \$3,428,950,000 for the next fiscal year. If my figures are correct, the administration's revised budget is \$3,407,650,000, which puts this bill as it is before us today above the Nixon budget.

If my figures are correct, there was actually appropriated, for this fiscal year 1972, \$3,298,035,000. In other words, it is proposed to spend even more in fiscal year 1973 than in 1972.

Does anyone disagree with those figures?

So we have before us a bill at a time of growing financial crisis in this country not only above last year's spending but also above the budget request.

It seems to me that somewhere, someplace along the line, somebody is going to have to cut some of this spending if this country is to avoid a financial debacle. It is impossible to go on spending, no matter how much the desire to do so, for more trips to the moon, and save this country from financial collapse.

I am reminding the Members once again that the debt ceiling will have to be increased again in June or July of this year, and this time it will undoubtedly be boosted to a half trillion dollars; in other words, \$500 billion.

When is there going to be some fiscal sanity displayed in this place? When?

It is dramatic to send men to the moon, but that is not going to buy bacon and beans on this earth. I went through one real depression, and I do not want to go through another.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. All of the money that is spent for the space shuttle or spent in the space effort is spent in the United States, and it supports the economy of the United States. If the workers in New York State, in California, at Cape Kennedy, and other places, did not have the dollars they earn out of this they would not be able to buy Iowa corn and Iowa feeds, and I wish the gentleman would kindly take note of that.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman is a follower of the philosophy that the more this Government borrows and spends, and the greater the debt the more prosperity for the country.

It does not make any difference how much debt we have. It does not make any difference that the Government is paying out \$22 billion a year in interest on the Federal debt. The only consideration is that the more we spend the more prosperous we are.

I do not subscribe to that philosophy or theory for one single minute. No one operates a private business on that basis and no one can conduct his private affairs that way and expect to stay out of jail or the poorhouse. It will be impossible to maintain a system of free Government and continue this kind of spending.

It cannot be done.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is far out of line. It ought to be cut and cut deeply. The members of the committee ought to have cut it in terms of the ability of the people of this country to pay for it, for the only way it will be paid for is out of borrowed money, and you know it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will commit this country to a space shuttle program that will cost untold billions of dollars and it will project that spending into a financial future that is already at the point of crisis. As I have previously stated, the Nation's deficit and debt is already orbiting in the space of inflation.

I am going to vote against this legislation and I am going to continue to voice my protest against this sort of thing at every opportunity.

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

I was very much interested to note in the committee report that the NERVA nuclear rocket engine program has been terminated. Whereas the Committee on Science and Astronautics recommended and obtained an authorization last year in the amount of \$67.7 million, and that was increased to \$70.7 million in conference, this year's bill authorizes \$21.1 million. I would simply like to direct this question to the chairman of the committee. What has happened to NERVA?

Mr. MILLER of California. You would have to ask the administration, I am afraid.

Mr. RYAN. It is very interesting, Mr. Chairman. After some \$2 billion or more have been sunk into that program over a period of years, a project which I opposed before this House on a number of occasions, the committee itself has now found it advisable to terminate the program.

Mr. WYDLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course, I commend the gentleman on the point he is making for the reason that in the years he served as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics with great distinction he was indeed one of the members who questioned the value of the then proposed NERVA program. As to that program he can feel confident today his views at that time were apparently justified, because in the main part it has been abandoned. So I think he can rest easily with this bill because it justifies his prior opinion.

Mr. RYAN. I should like to commend the gentleman from New York on his efforts during that period of time. He shared my concern about the NERVA program.

But I do note that on page 95 the reports says:

Development of the 75,000 pound thrust NERVA engine is being terminated . . .

I wonder how many other boondoggles are strewn throughout this \$2.6-billion bill—projects upon which the committee is insisting today but will abandon tomorrow.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 118]

Abourezk	Foley	Morgan
Anderson, Tenn.	Fountain	Morse
Annunzio	Fraser	Nix
Ashley	Gettys	Peyser
Aspinall	Griffin	Poage
Bingham	Hanna	Podell
Blackburn	Harvey	Powell
Blanton	Hawkins	Price, Tex.
Brooks	Hays	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Quillen
Carey, N.Y.	Holifield	Rhodes
Carney	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Celler	Hosmer	Saylor
Chamberlain	Howard	Scheuer
Chisholm	Hull	Seiberling
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Shipley
Clay	Jones, Tenn.	Sisk
Colmer	Kee	Spence
Conyers	Kyros	Springer
Crane	Landrum	Staggers
Culver	Long, La.	Stanton
Curlin	McCulloch	J. William
Dent	McKevitt	Stanton
Dickinson	McMillan	James V.
Diggs	Macdonald	Stephens
Dowdy	Mass.	Stokes
Dulski	Madden	Stubblefield
Dwyer	Mann	Terry
Edwards, La.	Martin	Udall
Eshleman	Mathias, Calif.	Wampler
Evins, Tenn.	Melcher	Ware
Findley	Mills, Ark.	Wilson
Flynt	Minshall	Charles H.
	Moorhead	Winn

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14070, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 336 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the bill which is pending was considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and ask unanimous consent to address the House out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RALPH NADER'S QUESTIONS

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take but about 30 seconds.

I would like to invite the attention of the Members to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that is under your chair here today, today's RECORD, and invite your attention to page 13530 wherein you will find the questions that are being asked of Members of Congress by Ralph Nader's outfit. It may help you in preparing your answers when they call on you if you are inclined to answer any of these questions. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ASPIN

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The amendments offered by Mr. ASPIN are as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$1,094,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$894,000".

Page 3, strike out lines 16 and 17, and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

Page 6, line 24, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

Page 7, line 11, strike out "(16)" and insert in lieu thereof "(15)".

Page 11, insert the following new section after line 25 (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

"Sec. 7. The Administrator, acting through the National Academy of Sciences, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the proposed Space Transport System (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Space Shuttle"), and to report thereon to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate, in order to assist the Congress in determining whether and to what extent funds should be included for the Space Shuttle in a subsequent authorization Act. Such study shall include—

"(1) a determination and evaluation of the military applications of the Space Shuttle;

"(2) a determination and evaluation of the scientific applications of the Space Shuttle;

"(3) the most accurate possible determination of the total cost of the Space Shuttle

and of the various benefits to be conferred thereby, with a cost-benefit analysis designed to compare such cost with such benefits and thereby to place each in its proper perspective;

"(4) a determination of the probable economic impact of the Space Shuttle, including its impact on unemployment; and

"(5) an analysis of whether and in what ways the expenditure of an equivalent amount for housing, education, mass transportation, and similar purposes might produce a larger or smaller net benefit to the Nation."

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering the authorization for NASA, and a part of that authorization is \$200 million for the space shuttle.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. ASPIN. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Do I understand the gentleman has two amendments?

Mr. ASPIN. No; they are both one amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is it not the intention of the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to have the two amendments considered together?

Mr. ASPIN. I did not make such a request, but I intend for them to be put together. They are on two pieces of paper, but they are supposed to be one amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has one amendment and we intend to make a point of order against one of them.

Is it not the proper procedure to have the two put together and be considered together?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the amendments and determines that this is indeed more than one amendment and, without unanimous consent, could not be joined.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman made the unanimous-consent request, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. ASPIN. I did not. I was considering them as one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make that request now?

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I make that request at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to considering the gentleman's amendments en bloc?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection to combining the amendments and then, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the whole amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that the gentleman's amendment directs the Administrator of NASA to make a study of housing and, for sure, this is not germane to the space authorization bill. The last paragraph of his second amendment, I assume, directs the Administrator of NASA to make a study of housing.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin may be heard on the point of order.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, what the amendment does is ask the people in NASA to instruct the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study, and I would like to see a rather broader application of some of these questions with reference to the money being spent in the Space Agency. It does not instruct the Administrator of NASA to conduct the study, but asks that the National Academy of Science conduct the study and then provides for a broader spectrum of the questions that they should study.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. May I read the exact language that is in the amendment. It says:

The Administrator, acting through the National Academy of Science is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study—

And it gets down to housing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The final paragraph of the amendment requires studies, investigations, and analyses of subjects which are not carried in the bill under consideration and not even within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Astronautics which reported this bill.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL: On page 2, in line 10, immediately before the semicolon insert the following: "(no part of which may be used in the Republic of South Africa)."

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, something is rotten in the Republic of South Africa.

We are all familiar with the evils of the South African practice of apartheid. We read regularly in the newspaper of the latest repression of the black majority there. We hear the horrifying, but true, stories of repression and arrest of those South Africans—white and black—who dare to speak out and condemn this racism. Indeed, we hear that some of our most distinguished black American citizens have been insulted there and barred from public places that are reserved for whites only.

Here in the United States, our Government has pledged itself to end discrimination. Progress in the arena of civil rights here at home is at times slow. Sometimes we take a backward step for each step forward. Nonetheless, almost all Americans are committed to the goal of social justice and equal opportunity. As President Nixon stated on February 25 of last year:

Both our statements and our actions have, or should have, made it patently clear to all

concerned that racism is abhorrent to the American people, to my administration, and to me personally. We cannot ignore the tensions created in Africa by the denial of political self-determination. We shall do what we can to foster equal opportunity and free political expression instead. We shall do so on both moral and practical grounds, for in our view there is no other solution.

Is not it strange, then, that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should be exempted from the fight to end racism?

The U.S. commitment to our space program has been based in large part on the desire for a better life for all mankind. Innovations in medicine, nutrition, technology, and education have stemmed from our exploration of the universe. Today, with Apollo 16 engaged in its lunar mission, we come even closer to the vision of this better life.

The continued operation of our NASA tracking station in Johannesburg, South Africa, however, compromises American integrity and completely undermines our stated goals of equal opportunity and equal justice.

The United States has negotiated an agreement with the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research—CSIR—under which the council operates the Johannesburg tracking station for NASA. The personnel are hired by the council and are paid through appropriations passed by this Congress each year.

At our Johannesburg tracking station, the facilities are segregated, from the dining room to the restroom. There is a dual pay scale under which the top salary paid to a black employee is \$1,428 while the bottom salary paid to a white employee is \$1,680. NASA's explanation is that black and white employees have different duties. There are no blacks in any of the training programs there. Neither is there collective bargaining.

In his 1971 foreign policy report, Secretary of State William Rogers declared:

South Africa's relations with the United States have continued to be impeded by its discriminatory racial policies, enforced separation of the races, and complete monopoly of political power by the white minority. The absence of moves toward racial justice continues to prevent any meaningful acceptance of South Africa by most African states.

Aside from NASA and our Embassy, there is virtually no official U.S. Government presence in the Republic of South Africa. The truth is that NASA has a very close relationship with the South African Government. As a result of pressure from some Members of Congress, NASA has taken some tentative and totally inadequate steps toward asking the South African Government to modify its apartheid policy in the Johannesburg tracking station. In a letter of March 9, 1972, Willis H. Shapley, Associate Deputy Administrator of NASA, informed our distinguished colleague, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, that:

NASA has been working with the South African authorities to attempt to bring about improvements, within the existing framework in South Africa, in the working

and living conditions, and opportunities, of nonwhite employees at the tracking station near Johannesburg.

"Within the existing framework" means, in this case, a NASA-CSIR agreement to provide additional segregated housing to black employees, to make segregated primary education available to the children of black employees, to build a segregated social center, to provide midday meals at the tracking station for black employees instead of requiring them to go home for lunch, and to provide some medical services for black employees and their families instead of requiring them to travel 20 miles to the provincial hospital.

It is ludicrous, Mr. Chairman, to consider that "progress."

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RANGEL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, if this type of racism were taking place in any NASA facility in the United States outraged voices would be heard from both political parties, and from all parts of the United States.

The truth is that we are participating in this with American dollars, and we have heard from NASA indicating that they have to work within the existing system. "Within the existing system" certainly has a bearing on where America is in the moral fight. We heard from NASA's Associate Administrator, Mr. Gerald M. Truszynski, on February 29, when he indicated that throughout all of the visits that we have had of technicians who went to South Africa from 1961 to 1969, there have been some 243 visits made by NASA personnel. In 1970 there were 28 visits. And yet NASA has not seen fit to send one black person to our station in Johannesburg, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Truszynski has indicated that there are black NASA personnel working in all parts of the world in connection with our tracking stations.

I am not asking under my amendment that we exclude the approximately \$3 million which is authorized for the South African Government CSIR from the budget. This money will still stay in. The money is not being removed, and this would not have any effect at all on the American space program. I say that because we find that in the Malagasy Republic, which is just 6 degrees north of Johannesburg, we have facilities that could be used for this very same purpose, and they have not demonstrated the racist policies of South Africa.

We also formerly operated a NASA facility in Zanzibar. The question before us today is a moral one: Will the Congress permit our tax dollars to continue to be used to pay for racism, or will we continue to try to allow the world to believe that we still think about people as well as progress in our scientific programs?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has again expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, the station that the gentleman is speaking of has exactly one NASA employee. The government there employs 61 blacks and 221 whites.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a situation we can influence, something we can directly control. This is an arrangement between two governments, that of South Africa and our own.

No one can say there is any racism in my soul. I have voted for every civil rights measure brought to the floor of the House. I simply think it ridiculous for us to attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the South African Government when the only basis for our interest is a single NASA employee who is unaffected by the South African situation.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I want to point out, however, that the author of this amendment in the subcommittee, on which I have the honor to be a member, did some very effective work, and directed some very penetrating questions on this whole subject. I would hope, though, that if we are going to eliminate Johannesburg as a tracking station that we would also eliminate Chile, which has a Communist government, and Ecuador, which seizes our fishing boats, and I wish the gentleman would bulk them in all together.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I think that this Congress is sophisticated enough to take on one moral problem at a time, and I think I would be susceptible to any suggestion concerning any nation that is violating the rights of men.

What bothers me is our State Department, and the advice of our President that these conditions are abhorrent to all that we believe in in America, and they will sit down at the table with these people who are openly violating the moral fibers of mankind, and which is against all the mandates of science. So there is no question but notwithstanding our individual positions on what is morally right, the fact remains that our State Department has set down a racist nation under cover of scientific progress.

Mr. BELL. I would like to reply to the gentleman. NASA chooses its own personnel. If this is a basis of difference between two governments, perhaps the question should be brought up by the foreign policy experts.

Mr. WYDLER. I just want to point out that the station we maintain in South Africa is not maintained there for the benefit of the South African Government or any of its policies. The station is maintained there for the benefit of the United States of America.

Mr. RANGEL. At the expense of black lives in South Africa.

Mr. WYDLER. We get the benefit of that station. We need it for the safety of our astronauts. It is our country that gets the benefit from the station. We are

not doing it to benefit the Government of South Africa.

Mr. BELL. I might add that the base is furnished by South Africa.

Mr. COLLIER. As long as we are trying to agree on a solution of our problems here at one time, would the gentleman accept an amendment to his amendment which would also take care of the situation in Chile, where we have the problem to which the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) alluded to previously?

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Congressman, it is all I can do to work up my one amendment, but I would be glad to join in support of yours.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I know nothing of the integration or segregation of this tracking station. I would like to reiterate what the gentleman from New York said, that this station was placed there because we had to have something in that area for a tracking station. We cannot leave a gap around the world where we do not have our flights monitored. If we adopt the amendment, then we must go to a tracking ship in the area or station airplanes in the area.

It just is not a racist thing, as far as our committee is concerned. We need a tracking station there for our space flights.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. These stations are located geographically irrespective of the government in the area where they are located. They must be located along certain geographical lines. Some of the most successful tracking stations we have are those in Spain. They are making a great contribution to our program. They are managed by Spanish people, and I am certain it has not been so long ago, and is still in the minds of many people, that the Spanish Government was not fully accepted in this country.

Wherever the tracking stations are located, they are located at those places because of their geographical positions. The ones in Spain would be best located in Morocco, but Spain is as close as we can get to Morocco. We want a station as far south in Africa as we can get, and that is why it is located where it is in Africa.

I will place my record of 28 years in Congress on the racial issue related to any question. I do not go out and make speeches about it. The Constitution of the United States says that all men are created equal. This is the thing I preach.

But I cannot see how you are going to do the things you have got to do and decide that you cannot do it because geographically the part of the country in which you want to place a tracking station happens to be under a government we do not like.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the manned space program of NASA

today has in it three tracking ships which, as I said before, are very expensive. If we proceed to do what was suggested, we would get a secondary tracking station for another expensive operation. As I have said, I do not know anything about integration and segregation in that tracking station, but that is not the way to approach the situation.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. We must remember that these areas are owned by the government in control. We are there only by sufferance. We are not in any position to tell another government what to do.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are faced with a profound moral question. It is not a question of whether or not we deal with a government that we do not like—the Government of Chile, the Government of Spain, the Government of South Africa—because I think it is recognized that we will be dealing with countries whose form of government we do not like for very practical reasons. That is not what is involved here.

What is involved is that we have a U.S. facility, a facility operated by NASA, which, instead of applying the rules that we would require in this country or in some other country, submits to the segregation rules of South Africa.

What, for instance, would be the response in this country if the Northern Irish Government said to the United States, "You have a facility here but you may not employ Catholics, or if you do, you will pay them at less than what you pay the Protestants." We would say, "That is an outrage, we cannot do that. You will either permit us to treat them equally, or we will remove the facility, because while you may do this, we may not use our moneys for that purpose." Or take the situation when not so long ago certain Arab States said, "You may not have a Jewish soldier in this facility." At first, the Congress went along with that—and then, as some Members may recall although I was not here at that time, the Congress said, "No. We will not let you determine for us how we shall treat people on our particular facility."

And so, today the black community rightfully asks how can we sit here and permit Government moneys to be appropriated and used in a discriminatory way—in a way that would be deemed unconscionable if demanded by Northern Ireland vis-a-vis Catholics and Protestants or by Arab States vis-a-vis Jews or non-Jews? It seems to me that this is the great moral question. It is not simply a question of dealing with a government that we disagree with.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, all of us are aware that there is American corporate involvement in South Africa. I personally deplore American private corporate involvement which sustains or assists economic development and growth of a nation committed to racist policies, a nation committed to a notion that human beings are not equal human beings.

But here we have an important and much different question before us: whether we will take public action to commit public funds to a nation whose policies, at least on their face, when placed in juxtaposition to our own, totally contradict the position we have publicly assumed.

How can we justify our action on the EEOC bill, or how can we justify our action on the Civil Rights Act, or how can we justify the fact that in this country we have established as a matter of law the minimum wage when we provide Federal funds and public dollars in a nation committed to seeing black human beings as second-class people.

I think this is a great political and moral question before us.

Let us not walk out of this Chamber morally bankrupt and without political integrity. I do not believe we can call ourselves Americans committed to democracy and committed to equal justice and equal treatment of all human beings and then allow funds to go to South Africa.

The only justification I have heard in the past 20 minutes for maintaining this station in Johannesburg is to protect safety of astronauts. I certainly do not want anything to happen to astronauts, but I raise this rhetorical question: Why are we so committed to a program that would allow the astronauts to walk in the tranquillity of the moon when we have not found the ability to come together on the floor of this Congress to adopt policies that would enhance our ability to walk as brothers and sisters on the face of this earth?

Why are we so concerned about safety of the astronauts and not concerned about the safety of human dignity of millions of people?

I think we have no alternative but to strike down this legislative provision.

There comes a time in the history of a country when it must live up to its stated principles and its stated goals. If we say that all human beings—black or white, brown, red or yellow, men or women, Christians or Jews—are really true human beings in the sight of God and man in this country, then we must take those same policies throughout the world.

I think we have no alternative but to vote for this amendment to remove the Republic of South Africa from this bill.

The moral and political question is whether public dollars, voted by U.S. Congressmen in the people's branch of the Government, representing some blacks and other racial minorities in this country, some women, some young people—all of whom are treated less than human beings with full freedom and dignity in America—should be used for this purpose.

How do we take these dollars and put

them into South Africa, which has policies totally in opposition to the policies we have taken on the floor of the Congress?

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment placed before us by my distinguished colleague from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for offering the amendment. Action to cause the U.S. Government to cease subsidizing racism in South Africa is long overdue.

The amendment would cut off funds for two American space facilities in South Africa. The issue is clear—if NASA continues to operate the tracking station in Johannesburg and the smaller optical tracking station at Olifantsfontein, the United States would be continuing to subsidize racism and discrimination.

There is no doubt about the fact that apartheid is the established policy at these two space stations. Willis H. Shapley, NASA Associate Deputy Administrator, in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, stated that medical systems and dining areas are segregated at these two facilities and that black and white employees are paid on different salary scales. In addition, Mr. Shapley admitted that not a single black American NASA employee has ever visited our Johannesburg tracking station. From 1961 to 1969, 243 NASA employees visited the Johannesburg tracking station and 28 such visits were made in 1970 alone. Can it be that NASA was unable to find one qualified black staff member to send to South Africa, in light of the fact black NASA personnel are sent to our other overseas facilities? Surely, it is evident that our space administration's policy in this matter is being dictated by the discriminatory policies of the South African Government.

Passage of this amendment will not impair the space program. I understand that NASA could use another site in southern Africa at Tananarive, Malagasy Republic, only 6 degrees north of Johannesburg. However, failure to adopt this amendment will be a disservice to our ideals of equality. Morality dictates that the U.S. Government terminate NASA's use of tracking stations in South Africa as long as segregation and discrimination are practiced in connection with their operation.

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

I should like to say this: What I have heard on the floor of the House today concerning this amendment is far from accurate.

It is quite certain that the Congress of the United States passes all of the laws referred to by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) to control things in this country and to eliminate any type of segregation or any type of favoritism.

I definitely resent the fact that the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) indicates there are areas in this

part of the country today where we do not have equal opportunity for all.

I would like to add, if we are going to start doing business with and have as our allies only those people who subscribe to our theories and to our way of democracy we are going to become mighty lonesome in this country.

I can also say that whether or not we have this tracking station in South Africa is not going to make a bit of difference in the policies of South Africa, but it is certainly going to endanger our space program not to have it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I usually share a lot of the views of my colleague from Berkeley with respect to civil rights and the rights of the impoverished and the need for equal opportunity, though not necessarily the right or the need to equalize, but I do not believe we should use the space program as a vehicle to vindicate civil rights theories or to use civil rights as a basis to kill the space programs, which is really the intent of this amendment.

We use American dollars in South Africa to support an embassy, and I would suspect we use American dollars over there for probably 100 international functions.

We need this space station there to make the space program go. I do not believe anybody should be misled that this is a civil rights vote in any way, shape or form. It is a clear effort to kill the space program, and I believe the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I certainly will.

Mr. RANGEL. This question has been asked by many people, and certainly nobody is more excited about our space program than I am. However, certain questions have been asked of those in charge of NASA. They said this would not seriously affect our space program. It is unfair to say that this amendment is directed at killing the space program. We have statements in the record—and I have them in my possession now—where it is clearly indicated they said we can go ahead with our space program notwithstanding the fact that we did not have that station in South Africa.

Mr. LEGGETT. We can proceed, but not with as much safety as we had before.

Mr. RANGEL. That is not so. We have documentary proof in our records, I can tell you, taken from Mr. Truszynski, who is more familiar with the program than you and I, and I think it is unfair for you to say this amendment is intended to kill the space program when I intend to vote for it.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman. Certainly you have researched this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ASPIN

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a series of amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc and be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we have not seen the amendment. It was just handed to us, and therefore I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ASPIN: Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$1,094,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$894,000".

Page 3, strike out lines 16 and 17, and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

Page 6, line 24, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

Page 7, line 11, strike out "(16)" and insert in lieu thereof "(15)".

Page 11, insert the following new section after line 25 (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

"Sec. 7. The Administrator, acting through the National Academy of Sciences, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the proposed Space Transport System (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Space Shuttle'), and to report thereon to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate, in order to assist the Congress in determining whether and to what extent funds should be included for the Space Shuttle in a subsequent authorization Act. Such study shall include—

"(1) a determination and evaluation of the military applications of the Space Shuttle;

"(2) a determination and evaluation of the scientific applications of the Space Shuttle;

"(3) the most accurate possible determination of the total cost of the Space Shuttle and of the various benefits to be conferred thereby, with a cost-benefit analysis designed to compare such cost with such benefits and thereby to place each in its proper perspective;

"(4) a determination of the probable economic impact of the Space Shuttle, including its impact on unemployment;"

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order against the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order against the amendments.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was introduced earlier without the specific section that the gentleman from Texas raised objection. That part has been stricken from the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to do two things. It proposes to take out of this budget the \$200 million

that is authorized in this budget for the space shuttle.

The second thing it proposes to do is to direct the Administrator of NASA to conduct a study through the National Academy of Sciences to answer specific questions and to report back within a year so we can decide at that time whether we are going to spend further money on the space shuttle.

So, what this amendment does is to defer the money to be spent on the space shuttle for 1 year while we consider the study done by the National Academy of Sciences.

Mr. Chairman, a study of this kind by the National Academy of Sciences is very important, because there are a number of unanswered questions about the space shuttle. In the first place, there are unanswered questions about the mission of the shuttle.

The shuttle is designed to carry 65,000 pounds of payload on every flight. The estimate is that there will be 50 flights a year which means 3 million pounds of payload a year.

In 1969, which was a very good year for space, we put into orbit only 380,000 pounds. In 1971 we put into orbit only some 450,000 pounds.

Mr. Chairman, the question is, what are we doing with all that excess payload capacity? The Mathematica study which was referred to earlier talked about using the total capacity, but in that capacity was the space station.

If we build a space station, we can use the capacity. If on these shuttle flights we go to 90-percent military payloads we can use the capacity.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are voting on this amendment without knowing what that capacity is going to be used for.

The second question is what effect there will be on employment by this space shuttle.

It has been estimated that there are 580,000 aerospace workers and engineers unemployed.

This program will only employ some 50,000. It will spread that employment over 30 States and it will only be for 2 years at the most. Therefore, this program is not going to make much of a dent on unemployment.

Is this, really, the right way to spend \$5.1 billion? To create employment for only 50,000 people on a short-term basis?

The final and most important set of questions deals with the cost of it. NASA says it will cost \$5.1 billion. But, that is just for two shuttles. To conduct the number of space launches that NASA has programed we will need three more space shuttles. So, that is an extra \$1.3 billion. But, now, we have only bought the equipment. We have not had any launchings. What is it going to cost to launch this shuttle? NASA says \$10 million a launch and there will be 580 launches at \$10 million a launch which will come to a total of \$5.8 billion. Now the grand total for the cost of the shuttle is \$12.25 billion.

But, we have not spent any money on payload. Therefore, we must add on the cost for the payload. If you figure the payload will be 65,000 pounds per launch and that payload costs run anywhere up

to \$20,000 a pound, then we are up to a figure of many, many billions. That is what we are buying with this program. I am not saying that if we vote down this program we are going to save that amount because, clearly, we will spend some of it—not all these costs are add-on costs. However, the problem is that if we vote for the space shuttle we are committing ourselves to a very, very expensive proposition in the range of \$50 billion or \$60 billion, perhaps, over the next 10 or 12 years. If we vote for the shuttle we are committing ourselves to these large expenditures and have lost all flexibility.

We have not yet counted the possibilities for cost overruns. The Apollo program had no overruns, but that was achieved by canceling a couple of the flights. The military does this frequently. They keep the cost of the program the same by buying fewer planes or tanks. We are going to have cost overruns, very likely, in this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not insist upon my point of order.

Our country wants the space program. I am a layman, I have listened to all of the testimony of the scientists, engineers, and our top Government people who tell us that the shuttle is the program that we should follow. If we run out of money for the space shuttle, we will not have a space program. So I urge the Members to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the space shuttle is not just an ordinary transportation system, it is the keystone system which will allow our Nation to harness the benefits of space technology which have now come within our reach, thanks to the innovative space research of prior years.

The shuttle will provide us with the most economically feasible method for continued space travel.

The benefits to be derived as immeasurable, in weather research, communication, navigation, environmental preservation, and the proper utilization of ever-dwindling earth resources. The entire scientific community will benefit.

The shuttle will give us the capability of carrying not only vast arrays of scientific equipment and instruments into space, but also the nonastronaut scientists themselves.

Moreover, when speaking of the space shuttle it is not possible to forget its military application. This system will permit this country to man an effective deterrent, coupled with a quick reaction capability.

I emphasize to the Members that I strongly support the shuttle. I feel it is essential for this program to be implemented if this country is to continue as a dominant force in advanced science.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) has spoken of repairs. One of the economies of the whole space shuttle program is that we will be able to launch the vehicle in order to make repairs on

vehicles previously placed in orbit. That is economy. We have approximately 400 vehicles now in orbit. Half of these have been rendered inoperative solely because we have not had the means to repair them properly.

The space program offers one of the highest economic multiplier effects of any Federal dollar investment. Specifically, the space shuttle program will directly employ 75,000 people and will utilize the skills of over 12,000 contractors and subcontractors involving over 30 States. Indirect job opportunities will be given to over 200,000 people. The combined gross products of the 30 States involved in this program will be in excess of \$10 billion. Over the 12-year period from 1979 to 1990 there will be savings of over \$5 billion in direct launch costs.

NASA has spent over \$180 million and utilized the skills of over two dozen contractors on the very things the gentleman is talking about.

This has all been discussed thoroughly by the subcommittee, and we have all decided that we want a space shuttle. To do otherwise would be to waste the money that we have already spent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to join with the gentleman in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while Apollo 16 orbits the moon, the American space program faces a crisis here on earth. Now that the Apollo program is drawing to a conclusion, the time has come to determine the future of American space exploration.

I believe that H.R. 14070, the NASA authorization bill, represents a reasonable and appropriate ordering of our national priorities. It offers a balanced program which will not only further our scientific knowledge, but will also allow us to apply this knowledge to the goal of improving life on earth.

I commend the Science and Astronautics Committee for its understanding of the need to apply our space knowledge to earth problems. The committee has increased from \$9 million to \$50 million the authorization to help reduce noise pollution levels of civilian aircraft through quieter engines. This action directly follows from the reasoning of the Noise Control Act which states:

The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to promote an environment for all Americans free from noise that jeopardizes their health and welfare.

The committee also added \$7.45 million for aircraft safety such as improved landing guidance systems and collision avoidance research, and \$1.5 million for utilizing space technology in other areas.

H.R. 14070 also includes \$198.7 million for the application of space techniques to vitally important areas such as earth resources surveys, meteorological and geodetic satellites, and global atmospheric research. Much of the \$211.9 million for Aeronautical Research and Technology will support improvements

in our air transportation systems to make them competitive, safer, more reliable, and relevant to future transportation demands.

H.R. 14070 provides authorizations for the space shuttle program—a project that will yield the maximum benefits from space exploration at minimum costs. This project represents a new generation of scientific research and development which is necessary to meet the needs of the 21st century. The dividends from the space program will substantially benefit all our citizens.

The space shuttle program provides both long term and short term dividends which justify this expenditure.

An immediate benefit will be the creation and retention of thousands of jobs. In fact, the program will provide some 50,000 badly needed skilled jobs—with the estimated multiplier effect of two additional nonaerospace jobs for each aerospace job—a boon to the lagging economy in many areas of our Nation, including my own State of Connecticut. For example, in our State the allocation of contracts for such components as the life support system, engine and vehicle control equipment, and related mechanical and electrical systems could provide 2,000 additional jobs. With the estimated multiplier effect of two additional nonaerospace jobs for each aerospace job, the space shuttle provides the stimulus which the Connecticut economy desperately needs.

Long-range benefits will be many. For example, the United States is presently losing the lead we once held in producing high technology goods and products, a decline that has greatly contributed to our balance-of-payments difficulties. The space shuttle will stimulate high technology research in industries, some of which are only tangentially connected to the space program. By improving our technology and applying it to nonspace needs, we will be able to regain some of the lost ground in such areas as electronics and aviation. The advantages for our economy, as well as for improving the quality of life in our Nation, are clear.

In fact, the scientific and technological spin-off benefits from space exploration include, among others, the areas of communications, pollution control, aviation, medicine and surgery, electronics, weather and sensor satellites, food processing, and agriculture.

In the April 1972 issue of Foreign Affairs, Robert Jastrow and Homer E. Newell noted some of the economic benefits which applied space science will provide. For example, they estimate that better weather forecasting could save the agriculture, transportation, and construction industries \$2.6 billion a year. Detection of mineral deposits by improved earth satellites could yield \$2 billion a year. An IBM report estimates that \$840 million annually could be saved in the United States alone through detection of plant diseases.

Two years ago, Dr. William McElroy of the National Science Foundation told a House committee that:

Civilized man cannot long survive on this planet without increased creation of new knowledge and its enlightened use.

The present space program has initiated the creation of knowledge which will one day revolutionize the lives of everyone.

In its support for the space shuttle, the Christian Science Monitor noted:

We would argue that a space shuttle program, because it is so practically linked to fulfilling man's age-old vision of mastering the heavens, will unleash more constructive human energy than it will consume. And this excess will make meeting earthside demands the easier.

To eliminate or postpone the space shuttle would in effect, shelve the important breakthroughs of the past decade.

Because I believe that the space shuttle will provide untold benefits for all mankind, I do not believe that the Congress should defer the authorizations contained in H.R. 14070. Therefore, I intend to oppose any amendment to this bill which would delay the space shuttle.

As Dr. Wernher von Braun has stated:

Scientifically and technologically * * * we have built the foundations for America's greatest age. Space offers the opportunity to fulfill the requirements of the spirit while we increase our capabilities to meet the material needs of ourselves and fellowmen.

I support H.R. 14070, and with it, man's next "giant leap" into space, as well as a better life here on earth.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) and also those of my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) and to state further that anyone who had the opportunity last Sunday to have heard Mr. von Braun down in Florida describe this program would be, I am sure, entirely convinced of its soundness.

Rejection of the space shuttle would be in fact an abandonment of our entire space program, and all activities connected therewith.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. I would just like to say there is no earthly use in sending to the National Academy of Science for a study. All the relevant information available to our nation concerning this show is available in the space agency. We have that information available now. There is nothing more to study regarding it. This body can make up its mind whether it wants a shuttle or not.

Time to say that we are going to have some other person study some material for next year is just an insult to the intelligence of this House.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Aspin amendments which would defer the space shuttle program for 1 year, a postponement that will afford the National Academy of Sciences the opportunity to conduct an indepth study of this program.

At present, no reliable cost estimates exist for this program. NASA's claim that the total cost of the space shuttle will be \$5.15 billion has been challenged by a number of eminent scientists. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert an excerpt from a letter written to me by Nobel laureate physicist Dr. Ralph Lapp in which he gives his estimates of the total cost of the space shuttle program:

Given an impending \$40 billion deficit, taxpayers ought to be interested in the true costs associated with the Space Shuttle which President Nixon announced on Jan. 5, 1972.

Dr. Fletcher of NASA stated that \$5.5 billion will go into RDT&E, plus a 20% override, and 0.3B for a launch site. NASA pinpoints an orbiter unit cost of 0.25B and claims a 100 reuse capability. However, the investment costs of the booster are evaded. NASA says \$50 million each but does not define reusability. Since NASA claims that each launch will cost less than \$10 million, I would judge that booster costs have to be pared to less than \$5 million per mission i.e. at least 10 uses of a single booster.

Here's some bewitching math—if one makes some Simple Simon estimates of investment costs (orbiters and boosters) and also operations costs, it's impossible to get total systems costs below \$10 billion. Now if each mission costs less than \$10 million, this must mean that NASA is planning 1,000 Shuttle missions. Each Shuttle will have maximum payload of 65,000 pounds. Thus if we assume only 50,000 pounds per mission this means a commitment of 50 million pounds to space. But NASA in the past several years has averaged about 10,000 pounds of unmanned payloads per year!

NASA's claims, echoed by President Nixon, is that the transportation charges for lifting things from earth to orbit are limiting factors in space activity. The basic justification for the Shuttle is that NASA claims costs can be reduced from \$700 per pound to \$100 per pound placed in a low earth orbit. I submit that NASA has the problem upside down—it's the cost of the payloads that is excessive—by its own testimony last year this runs \$20,000 per pound and higher.

This Shuttle flim flam overlooks the fact that 50 million pounds of payload, even if costs can be reduced to \$1,000 per pound, would be 50,000,000 x 1,000 = \$50 billion. That's a more accurate index of what's behind the Shuttle. Not to mention jobs for the ailing aerospace industry.

Moreover, Dr. Oskar Morgenstern and Dr. K. P. Heiss, the two authors of the NASA space shuttle study, stated in testimony before the Senate Aeronautical and Space Committee, that "considerable cost uncertainty exists."

Second, although NASA officials cite the increase in jobs that will result from the space shuttle program, the fact is that only 50,000 new jobs will be created to be spread out in 30 States. This figure can hardly be considered a strong argument in the program's behalf.

Finally, the program's precise mission has yet to be defined by NASA. As I said on June 10, 1969, during the debate on the NASA authorization bill, when I offered an amendment to reduce the amount authorized for the NERVA nuclear rocket engine program, before authorizing money for a specific program "we should be aware of what NASA intends for the future. Although no specific decision may have been made, once the investment has been made, NASA will argue, 'There is so much money invested in this program that the investment will

be completely wasted if we do not continue.'"

Again on April 23, 1970, when I offered an amendment to strike money for the NERVA program I made the same point. And today after an expenditure of some \$2 billion the NERVA nuclear rocket engine program has been abandoned.

The same argument should be made regarding authorizing money for the space shuttle program. Congress will be asked to support vastly expensive missions in order to justify the original development cost. Once the initial expenditure has been made, the next step becomes inevitable. Let us not err today by authorizing a project which will entail increasingly large outlays of money—a project for which no mission has been defined and the costs of which are so speculative.

It is essential that our national priorities be reordered and our resources devoted first to meeting the unmet needs of our society on earth.

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

Mr. Chairman, when the space shuttle program came up in the first session of the Congress, I opposed it. Earlier in this session, I appeared before the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee to oppose it. Today, I rise again to ask that it be deleted from this bill, at least for this year.

According to NASA, the shuttle will cost the American taxpayers "only" \$8 billion to produce—\$5.5 billion for research and development for the first two spacecraft, \$1 billion to cover increasing costs and unforeseen research and development needs, and \$1.5 billion for three additional craft. As with the SST issue before this, Congress is confronted with the necessity of determining whether our scarce resources should be spent on the development of five space shuttles, at \$1.6 billion per craft, or on the curing of our ever-increasing domestic social ills. I would remind you that the President recently vetoed as "fiscally irresponsible" a bill that would have provided only \$2 billion for child-care centers.

I think, before we agree to commit the billions of dollars that this authorization will ultimately lead to, we have to ask ourselves:

What role will the space shuttle system play in our future?

Who will actually utilize it?

What are the true costs involved in constructing and operating it?

I think most of all, we ought to ask what is the price that the citizens of the United States will have to pay for it in terms of the resulting inattention to the steady decline in the quality of life within our society, including deficient educational, medical, and correctional facilities, insufficient and inhuman housing for the impoverished, the needy and the elderly, and the collapse of our mass transit systems?

We should not allow NASA to continue to drain our economic limited resources by shooting billions of dollars worth of

hardware into space while our other needs go unmet.

Just what purpose will this elaborate system serve? If we investigate the proposed figures listing the increase in payload poundage per year for this system, our skepticism is indeed aroused.

In 1969, there were 37 space launchings, carrying a total payload of 381,400 pounds. According to NASA predictions, the payload level for future shuttle flights would increase to the astronomical figure of over 2.6 million pounds of payload per year between 1978 and 1990. It is obvious that the shuttle is being designed to facilitate far more than mere manned space exploration.

Could this system possibly serve as a primary transport of heavy military equipment for use in outer space?

It has been estimated by the Mathematica report, which approves the shuttle system, that the military will use over 23 percent of the program's missions and capabilities for its own purposes. Even Air Force Secretary Seamans stated, on April 1, that the shuttle "could accommodate both DOD and NASA," and pointed to the fact that the shuttle is designed to carry over 2.6 million pounds of payload annually, which would easily accommodate the payloads of the military. The Defense Department, however, does not plan to have one penny of the cost of this project come out of its measly \$76 billion annual budget. I believe that we in Congress must investigate the military plans and possibilities of this shuttle system before we authorize any further funds for it.

At a time when money is so scarce, we cannot afford to squander our funds on exorbitant projects; this is doubly so when we are unaware not only of their benefits, if any, but also of their intended uses. My friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), who is the chairman of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, writes in the current issue of *Aerospace* that—

The shuttle is being designed with careful attention to the special requirements of the military services.

Are we not supposed to be making agreements with other nations not to use outer space for military purposes?

When this legislation came up on the floor last year, there were denials that the space shuttle is going to be used for military purposes. If it is, we have to know just what these military purposes are. Will our space frontier be cluttered with heavy military armaments to serve another effort on our part to confront our so-called enemies? Is that what we are about? Are we not doing something in the way of peace and attempting to end the war in Vietnam? Should we not attempt to aid our cities, urban areas, and rural areas?

How can I return to my district, be confronted by a worker who can barely feed his family, and tell him that his hard-earned tax dollars are being employed for Defense Department purposes under the guise of a NASA civilian project, which will in any case offer him only the most abstract benefits?

How can I tell an elderly woman liv-

ing in the squalor of a broken-down tenement that she must continue to live in filth until she dies, so that we may experiment further with the civilian and military uses of space?

It is time that we survey the trend in values that the legislation before us represents. This is a great country, but it cannot remain great while we continue to ignore the decay of our cities and the neglect of our citizens by reason of "maintaining American preeminence in space." The advancement of science and technology is truly worthwhile, but now is the time to harness these forces and reap their benefits to better the lot of individual citizens in this country.

Millions of our fellow citizens are unemployed. It is true that the shuttle program will create 50,000 jobs, but this is a drop in the bucket when we look at the overall figure. Let us use this \$200 million to employ 50,000 unemployed people—or 50,000 aerospace workers, for that matter—to build the day care centers needed for 1.3 million welfare children under the age of 5. As I stated when I appeared before the distinguished subcommittee which wrote this legislation:

If we were to take less than one-fifth of the total expenditure cost of this . . . space shuttle, we could construct over one and one-half million new low and moderate income housing units—triple the number being constructed today.

Let us use these funds to help eliminate the pains of hunger found in the stomachs of our poor, our handicapped and our elderly.

Let us use these funds to help provide the transportation which these people so sorely need.

Let us use these funds to offer bilingual education to the 5 million children who are in need of it.

Let us use these funds to improve the quality and availability of health services in our country, so that we may all be healthy and not suffer the agony of disease.

This list is practically endless, and I certainly do not mean to imply that we can cure all of our problems for \$200 million, but we must at least have the courage to begin to tackle these problems. We cannot allow projects such as the space shuttle to push the needs of our people under the rug, for it is these needs which must occupy the top rung on our ladder of priorities.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered here by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is a very valid one. I think we should not authorize it, we should not do so before there is further study and testimony brought in which gives some answers to these questions.

I therefore support the amendment.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendments.

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

Mr. ESCH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman from New York, as well as others in the New York delegation, might be interested in some information that I have received. New

York will gain \$47 million in direct shuttle contracts. The program will increase the New York State program by \$915 million and raise aerospace employment by 12,000 people.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, whenever I listen to our national debate on the future of the space program I somehow conjure up visions of a similar one which must have taken place within the court of Ferdinand and Isabella nearly 500 years ago. I am sure there were courtiers then who said, "but we do not know whether he will find the way. Maybe all the money will be wasted." Some undoubtedly argued that there were serious problems existing in Spain which needed instant attention. Perhaps still others were cautious about how much the Government was spending and urged that the fantastic project be dropped in order to bring the royal budget into balance.

Similarly, a year later when Columbus returned from his journey, the skeptics must have continued to greet him with scorn. After all, though he had found something he had not brought back any great quantity of gold or rich spices—just a couple Indians and some new plants.

Yet the discovery which Columbus had made was to expand the horizons of the world and to improve the quality of life everywhere. It was Columbus' discovery which initiated and inspired much of the progress made in the next few centuries. It was to inspire both bold new ideas and bold new ways of life.

So, too, has it been with our space program. From the beginning the skeptics have urged that money should be spent instead on "urgent domestic priorities." Many have argued that we simply cannot afford the costs in light of our budget deficits. We all have realized that we really do not know just what we will find and how it will apply to us here on earth. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we should not be short-sighted. Our resources are great. We need not turn our backs on any segment of this Nation, including our great cities. To proceed with this project does not mean that we are going to neglect these grave responsibilities. I have faith that as Americans we will respond affirmatively to these challenges.

Our explorations of space, like Columbus' journey to the Western Hemisphere will expand the horizons of the entire world and, I am convinced, will improve the quality of life everywhere. Already, the spinoff of presently ongoing space programs have made vast advances in medical science, in miniaturization, in weather prediction—and thus protection of populations from violent storms—in the location of natural resources, in the location of plant diseases and their control, and many others.

In the next few weeks we will begin debating a new concept of space travel which will determine whether or not the United States will take advantage of the tremendous opportunities and challenges of the new horizons we have found in space. We will decide, like the Spaniards of old, whether we should exploit our

new discoveries, or whether we should forego their possibilities.

I strongly feel that we should accept the latest challenge and that we should embark on the new method of exploring the outer reaches of space science.

Space exploration, as we all know, has been extremely expensive. The cost will continue to be high—almost prohibitive—as long as we continue to use today's expendable, one-shot launch vehicles. The kind of extensive manned and unmanned program which could result in so many important discoveries to improve life here on the earth will be impossible unless we find some means of reducing the cost of space exploration.

The space shuttle, as proposed by NASA is our chance to reduce those costs to an acceptable level. The space shuttle represents an entirely new basis of transportation for men and materials from earth to outer space and back. It will take off like a rocket, fly in orbit like a spaceship, and land like an airplane. It will not only take materials and satellites and men into space and serve as their spacecraft, but it will return to earth intact. It is completely reusable.

The space shuttle will expand our space horizons in many ways. First, and perhaps most obvious, it will reduce the cost of putting a payload into orbit, an effort which presently costs from \$700 to \$1,000 per pound. The shuttle will reduce that cost to \$100 per pound. It is estimated that over the initial 12 years of operation, the space shuttle will save the Nation \$12 billion in launch and payload costs.

However, far more important than the money saving aspects of the shuttle are its contributions to making our space program more flexible and more useable in solving the difficult problems we face in the decades ahead. The space shuttle will reduce drastically the amount of training that a person will have to undergo in order to participate in a space flight. It is projected that, within a short period of time, the space shuttle will become a sort of commuter plane for scientists and technicians. It will not be necessary for each of them to be trained in all the essentials of space flight. Thus, if a particular mission involving plant disease is undertaken, agronomists can be transported into space to do the work. Or, if we are having difficulty with communications satellites, we can send our best communications technicians into space to examine the orbiting communications satellite and repair it.

In short, the shuttle will make manned space flight far more productive in scientific discoveries and in practical applications. It will give us a working presence in space. It will also make unmanned space exploration more productive through the repair of unmanned instruments, and perhaps through the collection of actual films rather than just radio signals of the photographs taken. The shuttle will remove the barriers between manned and unmanned research and unify them into a more effective whole.

Additionally, with the shuttle's easy and routine access to space, scientists and astronauts of many nations could be

taken into orbit with their experiments to join firsthand in space studies. Thus the expertise of the scientists throughout the world can be brought to bear. In the area of science, perhaps more than in any other, international cooperation and friendship have transcended national borders, hostilities, and philosophies.

One important aspect of the space shuttle proposal will be its contributions as a spur to our economy. The leadership momentum this country has maintained in the past has depended upon the "cutting edge" provided by our major national technological programs which have focused our advanced management/scientific/engineering/production talents on the achievements of specific capabilities at specific times. The shuttle program is well suited to replace Apollo as the cutting edge which is required to maintain our national technological superiority.

I sometimes think when we discuss money spent on the space program that many believe the money is sent off in a Buck Rogers-like vehicle to float through the vacuum of the far reaches. To the contrary, every dollar spent on the space program is invested here on earth. A recent economic study indicated that \$10 billion invested in the space shuttle over a period of 15 years would result in almost \$27 billion in additional indirect stimulation of our economy.

It is well, when we discuss this new proposal, to review the many areas in which the space program has already made significant contributions to our quality of life. The space shuttle can, in every case, expand the practical applications and usefulness of these space research programs. Briefly, the major areas of contribution are:

First. Communications—satellite communications has, within the decade, moved from novelty to accepted convenience. World Olympics, Presidential visits to China, and other historical events, made possible only through use of communications satellites, are now accepted matter of fact by the general public.

Second. Weather—meteorological observation via satellite has provided one of the most significant advances in weather reporting in the Nation's history. Until the advent of earth satellites 80 percent of the earth was subject to only scattered weather observations. Reliable long-range weather predictions of 2 weeks or longer should be attainable using weather satellites.

Third. Navigation—satellite navigation systems can provide global coverage. They are practically invulnerable to weather, available day or night, and are capable of responding instantaneously.

Earth orbiting navigational satellites discern ship and aircraft positions much more accurately than previous systems. In our fast moving environment of air traffic, such a capability is essential for traffic control, and collision avoidance. With satellite assists, controllers can pinpoint an aircraft's position within approximately 1 mile.

Fourth. Agriculture and forestry—observation via satellite will offer a substantial improvement in the kind of crop and fire observation that was initially made possible through aerial photogra-

phy. The satellite method makes possible regular periodic observation on a routine basis.

Using satellites and their remote sensors, man will be assisted in his management of food crop and timber resources. He can monitor the health of timber resources, aid in determining the best time to plant and to harvest for maximum yields, detect potential damaged crops, help improve land use, conduct crop inventories, spot plant blights before they spread, and be forewarned of impending droughts, erosion, and floods.

Fifth. Astronomy—astronomers have heretofore been limited in their observations of space by the earth's obscuring atmosphere. Observing equipment placed outside the earth's atmosphere will aid substantially in understanding celestial mechanisms. Manned attendance of astronomical instruments within the shuttle orbiter will allow for modification, adjustment, maintenance, repair, and film recovery and replenishment.

Advancements such as this will assist in transforming astronomy from mere data collection to a better understanding of the universe.

Sixth. Earth resources—the space shuttle will offer man a new and comprehensive view of the earth's resources. It will be a view that will contribute to conservation, as well as utilization.

Man will be able to monitor mineral resources such as iron, copper, and gold. Nonmetallic deposits such as sand, gravel, limestone, oil, and gas will also be observed from the space shuttle. Electromagnetic energy and the electrical properties of rocks and terrains will be much more satisfactorily observed from the shuttle than is presently possible from the limited height of aircraft observation.

The infrared scanners which will be utilized in the space shuttle will be able to track thermal pollution in overheated waterways, follow forest fires through the thickest smoke, and, coupled with other sensors, will monitor oil spills and solid waste dispersal. Utility companies will be assisted by the shuttle through detection of such things as hot spots in transmission lines and location of underground geothermal sources, which have been suggested as pollution-free sources of energy for powerplants.

Forest services and agricultural groups will be benefited by the shuttle's ability to detect crop and plant diseases. The very same film that is used to detect these crop and plant diseases will also be used to detect local underground faults.

Air pollution will be observed by the shuttle and it will become an invaluable tool in charting corrective action as it reports the movement and diffusion of pollutants and the effects of weather and climate in the creation and dissipation of pollution.

In short, the space shuttle will provide the human race with its first opportunity to take an inventory of the planet. Man will be able to know exactly what is on his planet in the way of plants, animals, forests, land, water, minerals, and people. He will be able to determine the stresses that he and nature are placing on this planet, and

hopefully be able to establish a harmonious relationship between himself and his surroundings.

Seventh. Oceanography—two-thirds of the earth's surface is covered by the oceans. They can be viewed in their entire scope only from a distant point in space. This distant point of view, which the shuttle will provide, will be utilized to increase our understanding of the oceans, to utilize them as a medium of transport, to detect their influence on weather and climate, and to evaluate them as fishing grounds.

The continually changing state of the sea requires that information, in order to be useful, must be gathered quickly. This is feasible only using satellite techniques.

Eighth. Pollution control—the increased use of outer space afforded us by the shuttle will aid us in locating and minimizing pollution of the oceans and major lakes. It will detect the heat and content changes that typify pollution growth, and will continue to detect disease and insect growth patterns.

Ninth. Space manufacturing—the shuttle's cargo bay, and ability to service stations in space will make it an ideal mechanism for aiding in the development of products that are more easily created in the weightlessness and hard vacuum of space. These possibilities include foamtype steel that has the strength of solid steel yet the lightness of balsa wood and the growth of crystals for industrial uses.

It is my firm belief that 500 years from now when future generations are discussing history, they will point to our decisions to pursue the exploration of space with the same kind of respect which we accord to the decisions our ancestors made to explore the new world. For all of mankind, space is the new world, the new frontier. An investment in the space shuttle is an investment in the future.

To summarize I would point out to the gentleman that I, too, have raised many of the same questions which the gentleman discusses in support of his amendment. From all I have studied, however—and I have personally spent a great deal of time in reviewing NASA and contractor material on the subject—I do not believe that we will be able to capitalize effectively on our space science and applications opportunities without the availability of the space shuttle.

Many of our most important missions in both the science and applications areas because much more costly and needlessly complicated without the shuttle. To continue in space without the shuttle system would mean we would never be able to realize the full return on our investments in such major areas as space communications, navigation, meteorology and geodesy.

The next generation of fully operational applications systems will also be prohibitively expensive. I am talking now in terms of programs in such fields as natural resources management, pollution monitoring, weather modification and climate control, television distribution, natural disaster prediction and

avoidance, and public health and safety to name a few.

The many commercial systems which we might otherwise be able to implement and operate will be greatly reduced in scale if not eliminated unless we are able to reduce the costs of operating in space. This then is the prime motivation for the space shuttle—to permit a fuller utilization of space in addressing the many pressing needs of society.

I therefore urge that this amendment be rejected and the \$200 million allocated for the shuttle program for fiscal year 1973 be approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are several arguments not generally made by NASA or by many supporters of the shuttle that I should like to discuss.

One is the gross misconception that all too often is accepted in our society today, that money spent for NASA projects is lost money that does not help our unemployment or our poor. This misconception seems to picture the NASA program as taking trunks of money to the moon and leaving them there; and having that money do no earthly good to anyone. Nothing could be further from the truth. NASA programs are among the healthiest in terms of stimulating the economy and providing jobs for engineers and scientists and craftsmen and laborers and a myriad of service industries across the Nation.

Every State benefits from the NASA programs, and the economic health of hundreds of communities is dramatically improved. It makes no sense to cut constructive employment programs such as NASA or the space shuttle, and then appropriate money for welfare. To even the most insensitive person to the great scientific benefits of the NASA programs, it is at the very least one of the most worthwhile mechanisms for providing employment.

I want to discuss with the Members now another facet of the shuttle that has not been presented. One point the President made in his statement of support for the shuttle, almost in passing, was that the shuttle would be valuable in solar energy research. Mr. Chairman, I am chairman of the Task Force on Energy of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, chaired by the gentleman from California, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER. During recent months, we have been conducting extensive "briefings-in-depth" on the energy crisis into which this Nation is slipping. One obvious conclusion of our studies is that soon after the year 2000 our Nation must transfer its reliance to large blocks of essentially pollution-free electric energy from inexhaustible sources—such as nuclear fusion or satellite solar energy.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no informed Member of this House who would, during this hour when our astronauts are orbiting the moon, belittle the concept of satellite solar power, but we must understand this will be a tremendously large project costing huge sums of money over several decades.

This project in itself may actually dwarf the cost of the shuttle.

Already there are four corporations which are, in concert, initiating a series of research programs for satellite solar energy. They envision colossal satellites with solar panels several square miles in area, in synchronous orbit 23,400 miles above the earth, converting sunlight into microwaves and beaming them to earth to be converted into usable electricity.

One such satellite is proposed to supply 10 million kilowatts of pollution-free electricity.

Mr. Chairman, the benefits of this sort of project—satellite solar energy—will be almost beyond comprehension. However, solar satellites will require the space shuttle; and an orderly program will call for the shuttle for research in the near future; and later as a part of the satellite solar program itself.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to throw one more ray of light onto the discussions of the space shuttle. There are many other reasons why it should proceed. All of them require a little vision, a little looking into the future, and a little appreciation of what scientific research can mean to the future of this Nation.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I endorse what the gentleman from Washington said from the technological viewpoint of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We are very well aware that the Nation benefits greatly in many respects from the continuation of programs of this sort in general and the space element in particular.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope the Committee will reject this amendment. I say that with all the conviction I can command, because in my judgment to delay and cut back this program at this time would really kill the space program.

This has really been an amazing achievement of American science, American industry and American Government working together as a team. It took a very long time to assemble this team, but unfortunately, because of the necessities of the limits on appropriations, a great many people who contributed so much to this program are being dismissed and laid off, and the know-how and the intellectual skill which have been accumulated are being lost forever.

Today, if we delay for another year, we will never regain the momentum which the space program now has.

Many people like to say that the space program is a boondoggle and like to associate it with something far from the problems of the earth. I believe they are wrong. I like to feel that I have been aware of and conscious of the problems which confront us as human beings and as a nation on this beautiful earth of ours. But I also know that this program has made its greatest contributions toward solving the problems of earth itself.

The gentleman from Washington very properly pointed out a minute ago, in the limited period of time available to him, the upcoming crisis in energy this great Nation faces. All of us know we do face an energy crisis. How long it will be with us and what its implications may be no one at this time can foretell, but it is a fact that every source of energy must be exploited and every source of energy must be explored. There is tremendous energy that will ultimately come from outside the earth. It is pollution-free energy.

In addition to that, the science of communication, the science of transportation, the health of our people have all been immeasurably improved by this program.

Finally, but certainly not the least, this program is the age-old quest of mankind for knowledge, to improve his situation on earth, to learn about whence he came and to where he ultimately may be headed.

The strength of this Nation and, for that matter, the strength of the people who inhabit the earth is derived from the incomparable and insatiable quest of mankind for knowledge. That is what this program is all about.

I have complete confidence in the members of this great committee. They have worked long, hard, and diligently, and have brought to this Chamber a bill with almost the unanimous support of their committee. I know they are not wasteful human beings. I know they would not support a program which did not contribute directly to the benefit of those of us who live here on the face of the earth.

I believe the program they have recommended here today is a balanced one, one that will maintain space technology, one that will keep together this incomparable team and make it possible for us to continue the march toward solving the problems of mankind.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I want to commend the distinguished majority leader for the statement he just made. As he says, in the limited time we have today we cannot possibly tell all of the possibilities of benefits we are going to derive from this program.

One thing I myself feel you have hit upon is that this country has never refused to take a challenge to explore the unknown and to explore for the purposes of gaining scientific knowledge.

I think you are correct that if we fail to fund it this year we will never regain the momentum we have, and we might kill the program.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment.

All or most of the arguments have been made, but I would like to add my own observations and comments.

It would be very ill advised to postpone a decision on this matter because it would get us back into what we have done too frequently in the field of military weapons development and in many other scientific developments, that is, where we start something and stop it mid-way, we break up the organization, and then at a subsequent date try to reassemble and get the momentum going again. In other words, a peak and valley program.

Science and technology are expensive operations. The cost of the program is high enough as it is, but a start and stop, peak and valley operation, would be astronomical in cost.

We are prepared to proceed. We ought to do it on the schedule that has been announced. If we do, we will do it at the least cost and with the greatest possibility of success.

Second, although this program is being monitored by a civilian agency, I think it is being monitored effectively. We admit that there are some military potentials and some military ramifications. We should not apologize for that under any circumstances. If there is a spin-off that is beneficial to our national security, we are fortunate that that is the result.

Also, I think, from my information, this is a good illustration of cooperation and coordination between a civilian agency on the one hand and a military operation on the other. We have continuously sought to accomplish that. In the past we have had some bad examples where the military was going off in one direction and the civilian agency in another, both with more or less the same objective. In this instance it is a case where we have a single over-all objective, and there will be both military and civilian benefits.

I think we should carry this program out as planned and as programed and seek to do it as cheaply and effectively as we can, with the greatest cooperation. As I understand the program, it is designed in that way.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) to defer funding for the space shuttle program. I think it should be made clear from the outset that the basic question involved in the gentleman's amendment is not whether we want to continue with a specific NASA project—the space shuttle—but whether we want to continue a space program of the kind we have maintained over the last decade and one-half at all. For if we do want to continue a space program of approximately the current magnitude in terms of launches per year and the like, then there is no question that the space shuttle is desirable and necessary, and that

it will allow us to carry on such a program over the next two decades in the most efficient manner possible in terms of budgetary outlays.

While the critics of the shuttle program have blithely tossed about some horrendous figures as to possible overruns, I have yet to see any convincing evidence that these figures are even in the "ball park." I think we must recognize that NASA is not the Defense Department, and that it has a "track record" far superior to the latter institution in estimating the costs of its major projects, and then in coming out on or before target. I will discuss this whole question of possible overruns and cost-benefit ratios in more detail in a moment. But suffice it for now to say that the evidence points to a savings of \$5 to \$8 billion over the next 20 years in the space program if the shuttle is developed and put into operation.

Mr. Chairman, I would not deny for a moment that we are confronted with an important question concerning future national priorities as we consider this amendment. But the space shuttle in itself is irrelevant to that question. The real question is whether or not the 1.3 percent of the Federal budget that we are currently devoting to the space program as a whole can be justified by the spur to technological progress and the spinoff benefits that this program has yielded over the last decade, and will likely continue to yield in the future. I think the answer to that question is "yes." In my view, investment in the space program will not only yield a high rate of return in terms of longrun national benefits, but can also play an important role in our efforts to solve the very problems—poverty, environmental degradation, urban decay—that the critics of the program say deserve first claim on Federal expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I make this assertion, because I am afraid that many of our current enthusiasts for reordering national priorities have a rather simplistic and naive view of what will be necessary to find solutions to the great problems that confront us as we move into a new decade. Put simply, this view is based on the assumption that the amount of new Federal money that we throw at a problem symptom such as the decay of our central cities, or inadequate housing, is a direct measure of the progress we are making in arriving at a solution to these problems, and is an indicator of our national commitment or lack thereof to deal with them.

Nothing could be more mistaken. National priorities cannot be measured by means of simple budgetary classifications and arithmetic. The great domestic problems that we face today are far too complex and stubborn to yield readily to new Federal spending panaceas; if we have learned anything from the vast disappointment of the Great Society period it should be that. Solutions to the problems of poverty, of the environment, of urban decay, of full participation in American society by our long deprived minorities can not be obtained by means of mere budget shuffling alone. At bottom, they are related to the health and pro-

ductivity of the entire American socio-economy—of both the public and private sector—and until we begin making progress on those larger problems, the battle will not even have yet been joined.

Mr. Chairman, the sine qua non of progress toward the solution of these great national problems is a healthy, productive, and growing economy, and an economy that can remain viable and competitive in international markets. To take just one obvious example, during the 1960's the number of Americans below the poverty level was reduced from nearly 40 million to about 24 million. And the great bulk of that progress was accounted for by a vigorous and growing economy—far more than all the poverty programs combined.

Unfortunately, there is grave doubt at the moment as to whether the American economy can ever pull out of its current slump, and once again resume the vigorous sustained expansion that we experienced during the mid-1960's. Structural changes in the labor force have made it increasingly difficult to reduce the unemployment rate to the 4-percent target without unacceptable inflationary pressures. The continued shift from a goods producing to a service-oriented economy dims prospects for reestablishing the kind of long-term productivity growth rate that we have historically maintained. Rapidly changing job market needs and opportunities have far out-paced the ability of the labor force to adjust to these changes, and this mismatch only compounds our unemployment and inflation problems. The dramatically increased investment costs of our new environmental goals—goals that are absolutely essential—have reduced the amount of capital available for the expansion of production and job opportunities; investment and job opportunities that are required by our expanding population and labor force, and that will be essential if our standards of living are to continue to rise, if new governmental revenues are to be available in sufficient quantity to finance neglected public needs, and if the over-all income pie is to continue to expand. Finally, the growing strength and competitiveness of other nations in the international market have caused great disruption and problems in many of our domestic industries, and have unleashed a protectionist trend in the Nation, which, if successful, would only compound our economic difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, solutions to these problems should command our attention as a No. 1 national priority as we move into a new decade. For if the current "stagnation" afflicting the economy persists, if our competitive position continues to decline, if our current GNP continues to fall almost \$70 billion short of its potential, and governmental revenues fall short by a proportionate amount, our great problems will go unresolved, no matter how much budget shuffling we do and no matter how heated the rhetoric over national priorities becomes. All the myths and mistaken notions to the contrary, we are not an affluent society, and our great problems can only be solved as the sum of our national resources expands. To use the language of the game

theorists, the national priorities question is not a zero-sum game in which some of the claimants must always gain at the expense of others. The situation is more nearly a mixed-interest conflict in which everyone can come out ahead if we make the right kinds of decisions about allocation and investment of our national resources.

Mr. Chairman, modest investment in the space program is one of these current mixed-interest decisions. More than any other governmental program, it has encouraged and spurred the kind of technological progress and development that is essential to continued economic health and growth. And too some very important degree, I think it can be said that without this continued scientific and technological spur, without the incentive to accomplish the technological "impossible" that it has provided, without the great teams of the best scientific engineering and technical minds that it has harnessed, without all of these important assets—the job of arresting the current decline of our economy will be all the more difficult if not impossible. These are the basic reasons why we must continue with the space programs and why it makes imminent sense to go ahead with the space shuttle project.

Mr. Chairman, the space shuttle has been subjected in recent months, to critics who have pointed to an "authoritative study" which was conducted by employees of Project Rand that concluded the shuttle was not justified on economic grounds. It is unfortunate that those who have taken the time to criticize the shuttle on the basis of this report did not take the time to read a disclaimer printed on the title page of the report which stated that the work did not represent the policy of Project Rand, but rather that of the authors alone. George M. Low, Deputy Administrator of NASA, has further pointed out that the study was based primarily on data 3 years old and did not take account of recent technical and economic studies of the shuttle and shuttle payloads.

NASA and the Air Force did in fact authorize an official study to be conducted of the program by Mathematica, Inc., the results of which have only recently been completed. The major conclusion of that report stated:

The development of a Space Shuttle System is economically feasible assuming a level of space activity equal to the average of the United States unmanned program of the last eight years.

Their report also stated that the non-recurring costs for a fully reusable shuttle program could be permitted to run as high as \$14.2 billion and still cost less than the current launch program. This is obviously much higher than the current estimates of \$5.5 billion and moreover it assumes a 10-percent-per-year economic rate of return on investment which in Mathematica's words is:

Among the highest discount rates ever applied in the evaluation of public investment in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the space shuttle is a necessity over the long haul, for if we

want to continue the space program, we must reduce costs by increasing the reuse of launch vehicles and payloads. The space shuttle will allow us to do just that; it permits us to reuse boosters that power payloads into orbit as opposed to the conventional one time use of boosters. It will also eliminate the need to sacrifice satellites that fail to operate. The shuttle will be able to return the satellite to earth and place it back into orbit once a repair has been made.

This repair capability could represent a tremendous savings as NASA scientists estimate that of the \$16 billion spent on payloads since the commencement of flight activity in 1958, 6 percent or \$1 billion could have been saved had we had the facilities the shuttle affords us.

In addition, the cost per mission of the shuttle at \$10.5 million is less than every existing launch vehicle—except the giant Saturn V—although its cargo bay is far greater than any of them.

The cost effectiveness of the shuttle can be most clearly seen when we examine the difference in costs between placing payloads in orbit through conventional launch vehicles and the space shuttle. The cost declines from a range of \$900 to \$5,600 per pound for conventional launch vehicle, to \$160 per pound with the space shuttle. The net savings from the shuttle's lower launch cost and the reuse design simplifications of payloads the shuttle makes possible are estimated at \$13 billion over the period 1979 to 1990, or an average of \$1 billion per year. This estimate was based on an average of 50 flights per year through NASA and DOD usage, but can be permitted to slide to an annual usage of only 30 missions per year and still represent substantial savings. Thus, even if the total investment cost of space shuttle research and development reaches \$7 billion, we would still save \$6 billion over the next 20 years if we continue the overall space program at current levels.

Some critics have said that the current production cost of the space shuttle which stands at \$5.5 billion with a 20-percent cost overrun cushion is actually going to be much higher. Senator MONDALE has suggested a figure as high as \$12 billion. While I would certainly agree that we must carefully consider potential overruns in evaluating the program in light of the experience we have had with a number of recent defense projects, I think it is also important to remember that NASA's track record on estimating project costs has been much better than that of some of the other agencies. In 1962 in its first congressional submission of cost estimate for the Mercury program NASA stated a figure of \$256 million, while coming through at \$268 million. Once again on the Gemini program NASA pointed toward \$1.225 billion estimate but came through slightly over \$1.282 billion. In plain English, the cost overruns for these two space projects were only a fraction of 1 percent, a far cry from the 50 percent to 100 percent overruns that some critics of the shuttle program are glibly bandying about.

Moreover, in 1961, before the detailed

designs and specifications for the Apollo program were even started, before all of the developmental research problems had been assessed, NASA said it would cost between \$20 and \$40 billion to place men on the moon and return them safely to earth. In fact, NASA succeeded in its mission for \$19 billion, an amount even less than their initial conservative estimate. Assuming that NASA has learned a little bit during the past 12 years in computing costs and overruns, I think it is reasonable to believe their \$5.5 billion estimate, based on completed designs and specifications, is fairly close to accurate.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is also important to note that the space shuttle in no manner represents a commitment to a large-scale manned space program. The shuttle can in fact be justified on its potential contributions to programs relying entirely on unmanned spacecraft. The research and development of the shuttle, the initial required investment and subsequent operations can be supported within the current framework of the NASA budget, about 3.4 billion in 1972 dollars. Decisions on future manned space programs, such as Skylab or further exploration of the moon, can be made entirely separate from the decision on the shuttle. The primary purpose for developing a space shuttle is to save the taxpayers dollars in each and every launching of a payload, both manned and unmanned.

Mr. Chairman, another argument rallied against the space shuttle is also of little substance. Contrary to the remarks of some critics the shuttle does not represent a hazard to the environment in any way. The shuttle cannot and should not be likened to the now defunct SST program. The purposes and effects of the two programs are vastly different, yet some continue to draw analogies between them.

The environmental impact of the SST was examined within the context of a fleet of 500 SST's flying 7 hours a day, every day. In marked comparison the space shuttle would fly only 50 flights per year. Certainly this is a great difference in flying times and obviously the exhaust product quantity would be much less. The amount of water vapor that would be exhausted by the shuttle is only one five-hundredths that of the SST fleet. The majority of the SST exhaust products would be released continuously within a narrow band of altitude at 65,000 feet. This would tend to concentrate these products in a very rarified region with little vertical mixing, according to NASA scientists. These particles would very likely remain in suspension for as long as 3 years. On the other hand, the shuttle exhaust products, mostly water vapor, will be evenly distributed from sea level to orbital level, thereby averting the alleged SST situation.

The critics also continue to voice concern over the sonic boom effects that allegedly would be created had the SST flown. The theory for the SST was that the shock wave created by the supersonic speed of the plane would travel along the ground beneath the aircraft

within a predictable lateral band and on a continuing basis during most of each flight. These conditions simply do not apply to the space shuttle. The flight phase of its mission is at orbital altitude in a near vacuum where sonic booms as such cannot be produced. Sonic booms might be produced during launch and reentry and to avoid subjecting large populations to any possible noise, the trajectories of the shuttle have been computed to be over oceans and less densely populated areas. Information gathered from the Apollo flights have given scientists at NASA enough understanding and confidence in the situation that it is firmly believed that the sonic boom will not represent the threat it did during the development of the SST.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes.

I am a member of the committee and I am also a member of Mr. McCormack's task force on energy.

I oppose the amendment, but I want to point out a couple of things and ask a couple of questions.

In answer to some of my liberal friends, I might say that no one is more concerned about our misplaced national priorities than I am. However, I do not think this is necessarily the right target.

You know, an advertising expert will tell a corporation that 50 percent of all the money you spend on advertising is wasted, but if you ask them which 50 percent to cut out, they cannot tell you this in advance because it is impossible to determine, and that is somewhat in the nature of scientific research, including the space program.

In the hearings before the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee which appear on pages 632 and 633 there is information as to the projected use of the space shuttle. It is projected that for the period of 1979 to 1990 there will be 589 missions of a scientific nature, plus 150 Defense Department missions.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), whether it will be possible in future consideration of NASA budgets to ask the Department of Defense and to ask the Office of Management and Budget to give serious consideration to having the Department of Defense in the Defense budget bear a pro rata share of the cost of developing this shuttle, because there is a substantial part of the cost in that area. If we are going to have a proper accounting to the American people, it seems to me that a part of the cost should be included in the Defense Department budget.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have that assurance at this time. We have an arrangement today where the Department of the Navy does the recovery of our astronauts and the NASA repays the Navy for their expenses.

Now, the expense for the Department of Defense in the shuttle will not occur

until about 1979, but it is understood—and I am sorry that the gentleman is not on our subcommittee because we had the Secretary of the Air Force before our subcommittee and we talked about this matter—but I can assure the gentleman that the Department of Defense is going to pay for the things they get from NASA from this space program.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASPIN) there were—ayes 11, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, 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. 14070) 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, pursuant to House Resolution 928, he reported the bill back to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14070 to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

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 motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 277, nays 60, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—277

Abbott	Fish	Morse
Adams	Fisher	Mosher
Addabbo	Flood	Moss
Alexander	Flowers	Murphy, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, Gerald R.	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Ill.	Ford,	Natcher
Anderson, Tenn.	William D.	Nedzi
Andrews, N. Dak.	Forsythe	Nelsen
Archer	Frelinghuysen	Nichols
Arends	Frenzel	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Frey	O'Neill
Aspinall	Fulton	Passman
Baker	Fuqua	Patman
Baring	Garmatz	Patten
Barrett	Gaydos	Pelly
Begich	Gialmo	Pepper
Belcher	Gibbons	Perkins
Bell	Goldwater	Pettis
Bennett	Gonzalez	Pickle
Bergland	Goodling	Pike
Betts	Grasso	Pirnie
Bevill	Gray	Poff
Biaggi	Green, Pa.	Powell
Blester	Griffiths	Preyer, N.C.
Boggs	Grover	Price, Ill.
Boland	Gubser	Pucinski
Bolling	Gude	Purcell
Bow	Hagan	Quile
Brademas	Haley	Rarick
Brasco	Halpern	Rees
Brinkley	Hamilton	Reid
Brotzman	Hammer-	Rhodes
Brown, Ohio	schmidt	Riegle
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanley	Roberts
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Robinson, Va.
Buchanan	Hansen, Wash.	Robison, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Harrington	Roe
Burke, Mass.	Harsha	Roncalio
Burleson, Tex.	Hastings	Rooney, N.Y.
Burton	Hathaway	Rostenkowski
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roush
Byrnes, Wis.	Heckler, Mass.	Roybal
Byron	Heinz	Runnels
Cabell	Helstoski	St Germain
Caffery	Hicks, Mass.	Sandman
Camp	Hillis	Sarbanes
Carlson	Hogan	Satterfield
Carter	Hollifield	Schneebell
Casey, Tex.	Horton	Scott
Cederberg	Hosmer	Sebelius
Chappell	Howard	Seiberling
Clancy	Hunt	Shriver
Clausen,	Jarman	Sikes
Don H.	Johnson, Calif.	Springer
Clawson, Del	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Cleveland	Jones, Tenn.	Steele
Collier	Karth	Steiger, Ariz.
Collins, Ill.	Keating	Steiger, Wis.
Collins, Tex.	Kemp	Stratton
Conable	King	Stuckey
Conte	Kuykendall	Sullivan
Corman	Kyros	Symington
Cotter	Leggett	Talcott
Coughlin	Lent	Taylor
Crane	Link	Teague, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Daniels, N.J.	Lujan	Thompson, Ga.
Danielson	McClory	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	McCloskey	Thone
Davis, S.C.	McCollister	Tiernan
Davis, Wis.	McCormack	Ullman
de la Garza	McCulloch	Van Deerlin
Delaney	McDade	Vander Jagt
Denholm	McEwen	Veysey
Dennis	McFall	Waggonner
Derwinski	McKay	Whalen
Devine	McKinney	Whalley
Donohue	Mahon	White
Dorn	Mailliard	Whitehurst
Downing	Mallory	Whitten
Drinan	Martin	Widnall
Dulski	Mathis, Ga.	Williams
Duncan	Matsunaga	Wilson, Bob
du Pont	Mazzoli	Wolf
Eckhardt	Meeds	Wright
Edmondson	Melcher	Wylder
Edwards, Ala.	Metcalfe	Wylie
Edwards, Calif.	Michel	Wyman
Ellberg	Miller, Calif.	Yatron
Erlenborn	Mills, Md.	Young, Fla.
Esch	Mink	Young, Tex.
Fascell	Minshall	Zablocki
	Mollohan	Zion
	Monagan	
	Montgomery	

NAYS—60

Abernethy	Jones, N.C.	Randall
Abourezk	Kastenmeier	Rangel
Abzug	Kee	Reuss
Andrews, Ala.	Koch	Rodino
Aspin	Kyl	Rosenthal
Badillo	Landgrebe	Roy
Broomfield	Latta	Ruppe
Burlison, Mo.	Lennon	Ruth
Chisholm	Long, Md.	Ryan
Clay	McClure	Scherle
Dellenback	McDonald,	Shoup
Dellums	Mich.	Skubitz
Diggs	Mayne	Slack
Fraser	Mikva	Snyder
Gross	Miller, Ohio	Thomson, Wis.
Henderson	Minish	Vanik
Hicks, Wash.	Mitchell	Wyatt
Hungate	Mizell	Yates
Hutchinson	Myers	Zwach
Ichord	Obeys	
Jonas	O'Konski	

NOT VOTING—96

Annunzio	Gettys	Rallsback
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Rogers
Bingham	Griffin	Rooney, Pa.
Blackburn	Hall	Roussetot
Blanton	Hanna	Saylor
Blatnik	Harvey	Scheuer
Bray	Hawkins	Schmitz
Brooks	Hays	Schwengel
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Shipley
Carey, N.Y.	Hull	Sisk
Carney	Jacobs	Smith, Calif.
Celler	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Iowa
Chamberlain	Kazen	Smith, N.Y.
Clark	Keith	Spence
Colmer	Kluczynski	Staggers
Conyers	Landrum	Stanton,
Culver	Long, La.	J. William
Curlin	McKevitt	Stanton,
Dent	McMillan	James V.
Dickinson	Macdonald,	Stephens
Dingell	Mass.	Stokes
Dow	Madden	Stubblefield
Dowdy	Mann	Terry
Dwyer	Mathias, Calif.	Udall
Edwards, La.	Mills, Ark.	Vigorito
Eshleman	Moorhead	Waldie
Evans, Colo.	Morgan	Wampler
Evins, Tenn.	Nix	Ware
Findley	Peyser	Wiggins
Flynt	Poage	Wilson,
Foley	Podell	Charles H.
Fountain	Price, Tex.	Winn
Galifianakis	Pryor, Ark.	
Gallagher	Quillen	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Stokes against.
 Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Waldie against.
 Mr. Price of Texas for, with Mr. Bingham against.
 Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.
 Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Conyers against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Dow against.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Nix against.
 Mr. Roussetot for, with Mr. Quillen against.
 Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Bray against.
 Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hull.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Hall.
 Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Jacobs.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Terry.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Schwengel.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Scheuer.
 Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Peyser.
 Mr. Rogers with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Ware.
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Dowdy.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Kazen with Mr. Chamberlain.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Rallsback.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Carney with Mr. J. William Stanton.
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Fountain.
 Mr. Curlin with Mr. Spence.
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. McKevitt.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Wampler.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Price of Texas.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. ARCHER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRESS REPORT ON APOLLO 16

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the latest information we have on the astronauts is that the LM has lost yaw control. The other vehicle is standing by. They are now about 900 feet apart. They proposed to bring the craft back to 30 feet apart and attempt to correct the problem. If control can be regained within 10 hours, they will proceed with landing. If not, they will then decide whether to return to a docked position and return to earth.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 13361, AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13361) to amend section 316(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ABBITT, McMILLAN, JONES of North Carolina, WAMPLER, and MIZELL.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority leader's inquiry, we have completed the legislative program for this week, and I will ask to go over until Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, and there are three bills:

H.R. 2895, to convey land to National Firefighting Museum;

H.R. 9769, medical records; and
 H.R. 11032, benefits to the blind.

For Tuesday, H.R. 13034, the Fire Research and Safety Act Authorization, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 14108, the National Science Foundation Authorization, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and Thursday, we will have House Resolution 918, providing information on Indochina. This is a privileged resolution with 1 hour of debate.

We will also have two appropriation bills, one the House joint resolution for the dollar devaluation appropriations, having to do with the change in the gold requirements, and the other the second supplemental appropriations bill, for fiscal year 1972.

Following that: H.R. 12202, the Federal Employees Health Benefits, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate, and H.R. 13591, the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases. This is also with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

On Friday, we will receive former House Members, as announced on March 28.

Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESS MUST LEAD IN VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 9 years since I took the oath of office in this Chamber. Throughout these years—day in and day out—our deliberations have been carried on in the shadow of one overriding issue—the war in Vietnam.

In 1967, a reassessment of my views on our role in the war led me to feel that we were moving too slowly toward a peaceful settlement. It was even then evident that the human and financial resources required by our war effort were having serious repercussions here at home. U.S. domestic problems were becoming critical through neglect. In 1968, after years of fruitless escalation, President Johnson announced a bombing halt. His decision came amid growing recognition—both public and official—that our Nation's interests in that war had been overstated, our commitments had been overextended, and our involvement had been overboard.

During the presidential election campaign in 1968, the standard bearers of both the Democratic and Republican Parties promised to end American involvement in the war. Although their approaches may have differed significantly, both candidates made such promises. Because it became a subject of considerable controversy, we recall very well the declaration of then candidate Richard Nixon, that he had a "plan" to end the war.

Four years later, we are again involved in a campaign for the Presidency, and the war is still going on. It is true that American ground combat forces have been cut back by some 400,000 to a point where about 85,000 ground troops remain. It is true that the ground combat role has been substantially shifted to the South Vietnamese. It is true also that American ground combat casualties in recent months have been sharply reduced.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the war shows no sign of being near an end.

While our ground troops have been withdrawing, our role in the air war has grown at an alarming rate. In 1968 there was war in Vietnam, but today, war rages throughout Indochina. We have helped extend the war into Cambodia and Laos. Tragically and shamefully, we in Congress do not really know how deeply American personnel and funds are involved in military actions in Cambodia, Laos, or Thailand. We apparently are financing CIA mercenaries in one or all of these countries. I do not believe that any Member of this House could state confidently that he or she knows just how extensive our involvement may be. Can any of us say with confidence how many hundreds of millions of dollars for clandestine warfare are concealed in the budget?

Now, after the many inconsistencies which have marked the execution of the highly-touted Nixon peace plan, the war

has been accelerated once more. After raising the hopes of all of our citizens that American boys would be coming home, we have amassed naval and air strength larger than at any time since the war's peak combat level during the Johnson administration. We have resumed intense bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong in a hazardous exercise in brinkmanship.

There is far too much at stake—the lives of millions in Indochina and hundreds of millions throughout the world—to engage in games of chicken in Indochina or anywhere else. The resumption of bombing in North Vietnam can only undermine the commendable gains President Nixon has made this year in the field of international diplomacy. I applaud his efforts to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China. I look forward with hopeful anticipation to his visit to the Soviet Union. But, even if the bombing attacks pass without creating serious consequences for these diplomatic efforts, I deplore the frivolity of such hazardous actions.

This week I listened carefully to Secretaries Laird and Rogers as they made successive appearances before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I was startled by the policies and attitudes expressed by both. I had thought these policies permanently discarded 4 years ago when America began to implement a common resolve to end our involvement in the Indochina conflict. "Whatever military action is necessary" were the words Secretary Rogers used on Monday. "Any area in North Vietnam, certainly as long as this invasion continues, is subject to attack," said Secretary Laird.

We have been told to expect that "Vietnamization" would lead the South Vietnamese to military self-reliance. But now, when Vietnamization is being put to its first real test since the 1968 Tet offensive, the program has failed and the United States has unleashed its air power in all its fury.

I cannot help but wonder whether the administration's motive for this accelerated warfare was to aid the South Vietnamese or to save face in light of clear indications that Vietnamization was less than a brilliant success.

Mr. Speaker, during the past several years I have cosponsored a number of measures proposing to set a date certain for total American withdrawal from Vietnam. I have been hesitant to support other proposals to force immediate withdrawal by cutting off funds. Now, however, it seems clear that administration decisionmakers are not about to end America's military involvement in Indochina—except on terms which are reminiscent of the misguided and tragically ineffective policies of the past.

Fifty thousand American lives have been sacrificed in the name of an American commitment in Southeast Asia. Some 325,000 Americans have been wounded. Several thousand are missing or held prisoner. Two hundred billion dollars in American resources have been expended for the defense of South Vietnam.

I cannot condone the administration's new escalation of the war. Withdrawal

must not only be continued—it must be accelerated.

I endorse the resolution proposed by the Democratic caucus:

To bring about the withdrawal of all U.S. forces, to provide for the cessation of bombing and to effect the release and repatriation of American Prisoners of War.

In addition, I support the thrust of that resolution to urge prompt legislative action on H.R. 14055 to cut off funds pending release of all American prisoners of war.

Our prime concern in carrying out this total withdrawal must, of course, be the release of American prisoners. This bill states in terms that cannot be misunderstood that total U.S. withdrawal is contingent only upon release of all prisoners. I consider this our best hope for gaining their release in the immediate future.

I am convinced that Congress must take the lead to force the Nixon administration to follow a course of total disengagement. It clearly does not otherwise intend to do so. I hope that this House will give strong support to the prompt passage of H.R. 14055, the 1972 end the war bill.

THE MENOMINEE INDIANS OF WISCONSIN SHOULD BE REINSTATED AS A FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, along with seven of my colleagues, a bill to reinstate the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin as a federally recognized tribe, and to make all Menominees eligible for the Federal services and benefits to which all such Indians are entitled. Companion legislation is being introduced in the Senate by Senators PROXMIRE and NELSON.

Some of my colleagues may remember the Menominees. The issue of their future was before the Congress in 1953. At that time many thought termination of tribal status for Indians was the final solution to the Indian problem in this country. Terminate the tribes it was thought, and Indian lands, culture, and identity would slowly fade away, and with it a national responsibility to a people who occupied our land before most of our ancestors ever arrived here.

Now I think the country knows better. We know that Indians want and deserve a measure of self-determination, a voice in their own affairs, and an opportunity to manage the natural and human resources of their people. But self-determination is a far cry from termination. Hopefully the fact that we now recognize the failure of termination as a policy will help all those tribes which did not terminate over the past 20 years. They will be able to avoid a great mistake.

But unfortunately this is not true of the Menominees. By an act of Congress in 1954, their tribal status was terminated and Federal protection of their lands ended. Today they need a different kind of help from the Federal Government, and I believe that help is contained

in the legislation which I am introducing in the House today.

THE MENOMINEE INDIANS

Mr. Speaker, at one time the Menominees occupied nearly 9½ million acres in northeastern Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula in Michigan. In 1854 the tribe agreed to move to a reservation on the Wolf River. In exchange for their land, the Federal Government promised to protect their land and to provide services available to Indians through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

By 1953, the Menominees as a tribe were relatively prosperous—certainly not rich—but better off than most other tribes. Their forest lands were valued at \$36 million. They had a hospital of their own on the reservation, run with the help of a Roman Catholic mission. They paid for most of the services which they received from the BIA. And, in 1951 they won a judgment for \$7.6 million as a result of a U.S. Court of Claims case against the BIA for mismanagement of their forest resources.

The tribe requested that approximately \$5 million of that judgment be divided among all members of the tribe, \$1,500 going to each member. An act of Congress was needed to release that money. A bill was introduced in the House to give the Menominees their money. That legislation passed the House, but unfortunately the Menominees soon learned they had to pay a price to get their money from the Government. That price was termination as a tribe, for when the House bill reached the Senate, it was amended to require the Menominees to terminate in order to get their per capita payments.

To be sure, consent is needed before a tribe can be terminated, and it is true the Menominees "consented" to such action. But serious questions remain as to whether the Menominees really knew what they were being asked to ratify.

When a vote of the people was taken, they favored the "principle of termination" by a vote of 169 to 5. That vote reflected the views of less than 10 percent of the Menominee people, and many Menominees thought they were voting only in favor of getting their \$1,500 cash payment. There was no ratification of a specific termination plan, and in fact, the policy of termination itself was later rejected by the Indians by a unanimous 197 to 0 vote.

When termination became final, it was clear that the termination act was not a measure for distributing aid to the Menominee people, but a vehicle for potential destruction of the tribe as a whole.

The Menominee Reservation became Menominee County, and its people, with a limited amount of experience, were expected, with little help, to govern it. A corporation, Menominee Enterprises, Inc.—MEI—was established to manage the tribal assets. But those assets had dwindled badly. Because the Menominees had to pay many of the costs of termination themselves, the tribal treasury was virtually empty.

Menominee children born after 1954 were no longer regarded as Indians. Health, education, and medical services

from the BIA ceased. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., was left with a deteriorating and obsolete sawmill which was in violation of many of Wisconsin's pollution abatement regulations. The hospital on the reservation was closed and there was not a doctor in the county. The Menominee land became subject to taxation and the only way the Menominees could meet that new tax burden was to begin to sell their land.

To the extent that the Menominees have kept their heads above water, they have done so only with the help of Federal and State governments which have provided them with \$19 million in aid since their experiment with termination began, and all this was needed, I might add, by a tribe which was relatively self-sufficient before termination.

If the Menominees as a people are to remain economically viable, it will probably be at the cost of selling off still more of their land. Both as a county and as individuals, Menominees are desperately poor. Average unemployment in Menominee County in 1970 was over 22 percent. Today, Menominee County has the highest percentage of families below the poverty level—34 percent—of any county in Wisconsin. Assets individual Menominees do possess, at least those Menominees on the tribal rolls at the end of 1954, include a \$3,000 bond which reaches maturity in the year 2000, and 100 shares of stock in MEI which were nonnegotiable until 1971. The State of Wisconsin extended the nonnegotiability of that stock to December 31, 1973. But obviously, unless action is taken soon, Menominees will be forced by their own poverty to sell away, in bits and pieces, the assets of the Menominee tribe.

The Congress has tried to help the Menominees with stop-gap measures in the past. So-called Nelson-Laird funds have been available to them for health, education and economic development purposes. But these funds are exhausted, and what the Menominees need are not more short term measures, but long term solutions to their problems.

That solution, I believe, is a reversal of the mistake which was made in 1954 when the Menominees were terminated as a tribe.

MEMOMINEE LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today would repeal the termination act of 1954 and once again make the Menominees a recognizable tribe. It would restore the Federal Government's status as trustee of Menominee lands and restore to the Menominee people the Federal services which were taken from them by termination.

Under the bill, a Menominee Restoration Committee would be elected to represent the tribe in bringing about restoration.

Menominees born since 1954 would be added to the tribal rolls so they could receive the benefits of Indian health, education, employment and other assistance programs funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

A governing body for the tribe is provided for, as well as a constitution, by-laws, and tribal corporation to conduct the economic activities of the tribes.

The assets of Menominee Enterprises, Inc. would be transferred to the Secretary of Interior to be held in trust for the tribe, and the land transferred would become a federally recognized Indian reservation.

The Menominee assets would henceforth be exempt from State, local, and Federal taxation. This provision, probably more than any other in the bill, would free the Menominees of an oppressively heavy property tax burden and allow them, over time, to become as self-sufficient as they were before termination.

The ownership of lands formerly part of the reservation but since purchased by non-Menominees would not be affected by this legislation. If persons who now own such land decided to sell their land to the tribe or the Secretary of Interior, to be held in trust for the tribe, they could do so.

The valuable Menominee forest lands would be operated on a sustained-yield basis.

The water, hunting, fishing, trapping, and treaty rights of the people, given to them in the treaty of 1854, and other treaties, would be protected.

I do want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation has the support of the vast majority of all the Menominee people. Admittedly, the Menominees have disagreed among themselves in the past over which programs and policies they ought to follow. But they were told by those of us in Washington, and by the Governor of Wisconsin in Madison, that if the Menominees wanted further help, they had to speak with one voice. I am convinced that as far as this legislation is concerned, they are doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, this truly is important legislation, not only for the Menominee people who want and need it, but for all Indians in this country. Its passage could show a recognition of the fact that termination has been a mistake as a policy and a disaster in practice. It deserves the attention of the Congress, and I am hopeful that Congress will give careful consideration to this measure, a copy of which appears below.

Cosponsors of this bill are Congressmen ASPIN, KASTENMEIER, MEEDS, O'KONSKI, REUSS, RUPPE, and THOMSON of Wisconsin.

H.R. 14556

A bill to repeal the Act terminating Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; to reinstitute the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin as a Federally recognized, sovereign Indian Tribe; and to restore to the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin those Federal services furnished to American Indians because of their status as American Indians

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Menominee Restoration Act".

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) "Tribe" means the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, as determined by the membership roll prepared pursuant to section 4 of this Act;

(2) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Interior;

(3) "Menominee Restoration Committee"

means that committee of nine Menominee Indians, who have been elected at a General Council meeting open to all living persons on the final roll of the Tribe published pursuant to the Act of June 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 250; 25 U.S.C. 893) (hereinafter referred to as the "final 1954 roll"), and their descendants. The Secretary shall approve the membership of the committee if he is satisfied that the above requirements of this section have been met. Immediately upon the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish the names of the membership of the Menominee Restoration Committee in the Federal Register. The Menominee Restoration Committee shall be the entity which shall represent the Menominee people in coordinating and negotiating the implementation of this Act prior to the restoration date, as described in section 8 of this Act. The Menominee Restoration Committee shall have no powers other than those given to it by this Act.

Sec. 3. Effective on the restoration date established pursuant to section 8 of this Act, the Act of June 17, 1954 (Public Law 399 of the Eighty-third Congress; 25 U.S.C. § 891-902) is repealed and shall be of no further force and effect.

Sec. 4. As soon as practicable, the Secretary shall establish a membership roll of the Tribe (hereinafter referred to as the "membership roll"). The roll shall contain the ages and quantum of Indian blood and, when approved by the Secretary, shall constitute the legal membership of the Tribe for all purposes. The membership roll shall include all persons listed on the final 1954 roll who are still living on the date of the enactment of this Act. The membership roll shall also include all descendants of persons listed on the final 1954 roll, if such descendants have at least one-quarter Menominee blood and if such descendants are living on the date of the enactment of this Act. Applications for inclusion in the membership roll may be filed with the Secretary for a period of four months after the enactment of this Act. Within 30 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall notify in writing all persons who were listed on the final 1954 roll for the purpose of ascertaining the names of all descendants of such persons. The Secretary shall also make all reasonable independent efforts to ascertain the identity of all persons entitled to be included on the membership roll. For a period of three months after the closing of the period for applications, the Secretary shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name on or from the roll. During such period of three months, the Secretary shall permit the examination of the applications by the Menominee Restoration Committee for the purpose of lodging protests in regard to the inclusion or omission of any name on or from the roll. The Secretary shall publish the membership roll in the Federal Register within 30 days after the last day on which protests may be filed pursuant to the above provisions of this section. After the restoration date, as described in section 8 of this Act, the Secretary shall make additions, deletions, and modifications to the membership roll, based upon written notice from the governing body of the Tribe, according to tribal rules and regulations which have been approved by the Secretary.

Sec. 5. All persons on the membership roll shall be eligible, as of the restoration date as described in section 8 of this Act, to receive all Federal services furnished American Indians because of their status as Indians. Such services shall include, but shall not be limited to, all health, education, employment, welfare, loan, financial, and other assistance and services which are provided to American Indians because of their status as American Indians.

Sec. 6. (a) Subject to the approval of the

Secretary, as set forth in section 7(a) of this Act, the Tribe shall organize a governing body for the Tribe's common welfare and shall adopt an appropriate constitution and by-laws, which shall become effective pursuant to the provisions of sections 7 and 8 of this Act. Such constitution and by-laws shall be recoverable by an election open to the same voters and conducted in the same manner as provided in section 7 of this Act. Amendments to the constitution and by-laws may be ratified and approved by the Secretary in the same manner as the original constitution and by-laws. In addition to any powers which were vested in the Tribe before the termination of Federal supervision and in addition to any powers which may be vested in any Indian Tribe or tribal governing body by existing law, the constitution adopted by the Tribe may vest in the Tribe or its governing body the following rights and powers: to employ legal counsel, including the choice of counsel and fixing of fees; to prevent the sale, disposition, lease, or encumbrance of tribal lands, interests in lands, or other tribal assets without the consent of the Tribe; to purchase property, real and personal; to create a tribal corporation or corporations to conduct all or some of the economic activities of the Tribe, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section; and to negotiate with the Federal, State, and local governments; except that no authority shall be granted to sell, or to mortgage or lease for a period exceeding 25 years, any of the land included within the limits of the Reservation. The Secretary shall advise, and consult with, the governing body of the Tribe concerning all appropriation estimates of Federal projects for the benefit of the Tribe prior to the submission of such estimates to the Office of Management and Budget or to the Congress.

(b) Subject to the approval of the Secretary, the Tribe may organize a tribal corporation or corporations to conduct all or some of the economic activities engaged in by the Tribe. The corporation or corporations may be organized pursuant to the laws of any State. In addition to all powers which may be vested in any corporation pursuant to the laws of the State in which the corporation is incorporated, the tribal corporation or corporations may be granted the following rights and powers: to purchase, take by gift or bequest, or otherwise own, hold, manage, and operate property of every description, real and personal; to purchase property, real and personal; to exchange interests in corporate property for any property, real or personal, acquired by the corporation; to dispose of personal property; to sue and be sued for matters involving such economic activities engaged in by the corporation or corporations, as may be incidental to the conduct of corporate business; and such further powers, not inconsistent with law; except that no authority shall be granted to sell, or to mortgage or lease for a period exceeding 25 years, any of the land included in the limits of the Reservation.

Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary shall conduct an election by secret ballot, pursuant to the provisions of this section, for the purpose of determining the Tribe's constitution and by-laws. Within 15 days after the publication of the membership roll, the Secretary shall announce the date of the election. The date of the election shall be within 60 days after the publication of the membership roll. All adult members on the membership roll shall be entitled to vote in election, either in person or by absentee ballot. The constitution and bylaws shall be adopted if they receive a vote of the majority of those actually voting and if they receive the approval of the Secretary, who shall give his approval or disapproval within 30 days after the date of the election. The Secretary shall approve any constitution and bylaws chosen by the Tribe if he finds that the constitution and by-

laws will treat with reasonable equity all persons on the membership roll and that they conform to applicable Federal and State law.

(b) The texts of the constitution and by-laws which shall be on the ballot at the election shall be determined by the Menominee Restoration Committee, after consultation with the Secretary. The Menominee Restoration Committee shall distribute to all persons entitled to vote in the special election, at least 30 days before the special election, a copy of the constitution and bylaws which will be presented at the election, along with a brief, impartial description of the constitution and bylaws. The Menominee Restoration Committee shall freely consult with persons entitled to vote in the special election concerning the texts and description of the constitution and bylaws.

(c) If the constitution and bylaws presented at the election are not adopted, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, a second election shall be held. The Secretary shall announce the date of the second election within 15 days after the proposed constitution and by-laws failed to receive the requisite number of votes or, if applicable, within 15 days after disapproval by the Secretary. The date of the second election shall be within 60 days after the proposed constitution and bylaws failed to receive the requisite number of votes or, if applicable, within 60 days after disapproval by the Secretary. Such election, and any subsequent election, shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this section in all other respects.

Sec. 8. Within 15 days after the Secretary approves the tribe's constitution and by-laws, as provided in section 7 of this Act, the Secretary shall announce a restoration date. The restoration date shall be within 90 days after the Secretary approves the constitution and bylaws. The Secretary shall promptly publish the restoration date in the Federal Register. On the restoration date, the following events shall occur:

(1) Subject to the approval of the shareholders as required by the laws of the State of Wisconsin, the Board of Directors of Menominee Enterprises Inc., or the appropriate officers at the direction of the Board of Directors, shall execute all necessary and appropriate documents to transfer to the Secretary all assets held by Menominee Enterprises, Inc. Such assets shall be held in trust by the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, for the tribe. Such assets shall include, but shall not be limited to, all cash, buildings, personal property, lands, waters, and interests therein owned by Menominee Enterprises, Inc., as of the restoration date. The transfer of assets shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation. All such assets, while held in trust by the Secretary, shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation.

(2) The land which is transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) of this section shall become a federally-recognized Indian reservation.

(3) All provisions of the constitution and by-laws selected by the Tribe and approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 7 of this Act shall become effective. The governing body selected by the Tribe at the election and approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 7 shall begin operation and shall be the official governing body of the Tribe in all respects.

(4) The Tribe shall be a Federally-recognized Indian Tribe.

(5) All persons on the membership roll shall be eligible to receive the Federal services set forth in section 5 of this Act.

Sec. 9. The Secretary is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to acquire for inclusion in the Menominee Reservation through purchase, relinquishment, gift, exchange, or assignment, any interest in lands, water rights,

or surface rights to lands, within or without the Menominee Indian Reservation as those boundaries were established by the treaties of 1854 and 1856, except that land within the present boundaries of the Stockbridge-Munsee Reservation shall not be acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this provision. The Secretary is further authorized to receive on behalf of the United States from the governing body of the Tribe, or from any person on the membership roll, voluntarily executed deeds to such lands as the Tribe or person may own in fee simple free from all encumbrances. Any property purchased, or received from the Tribe, pursuant to this section shall be held in trust by the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, for the benefit of the Tribe. Any property received from any person on the membership roll pursuant to this section shall be held in trust by the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, for the benefit of such person. Any land or rights transferred under this section shall be exempt from Federal State, and local taxation.

SEC. 10. The governing body of the Tribe, after full consultation with the Secretary, shall make rules and regulations for the operation and management of the tribal forestry units on the principle of sustained-yield management. The governing body of the Tribe, after full consultation with the Secretary, shall make such other rules and regulations as may be necessary to protect the lands of the Tribe from deterioration. The governing body of the Tribe, after full consultation with the Secretary, may regulate hunting, fishing, and trapping on the Reservation.

SEC. 11. This Act shall reinstitute all, and shall not abrogate any, water, hunting, fishing, and trapping rights or privileges, and any other rights and privileges of the Tribe and its members enjoyed under Federal Treaty or otherwise.

SEC. 12. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TIME MAGAZINE WEAKENS ITS RECORD OF JOURNALISTIC EXCELLENCE

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine greatly weakened its record of journalistic excellence this week by quoting a Rand Corp. analyst as saying:

It is inconceivable that the South can't hold out against the North Vietnamese. They are just too good and well-equipped an army for that—unless the North Vietnamese are all Prussians and the South Vietnamese all Italians.

This ethnic slur should never have been said, let alone appear in print. It defames the thousands of Americans of Italian descent who served in the U.S. Armed Forces honorably and well during the First and Second World Wars. It ridicules the armed forces of our good

friend and ally the Italian nation. As a member of NATO that country and its people have contributed greatly to the allied cause in the cold war and in post-war peace keeping.

Such continued use of prejudiced and pejorative ethnic slurs and innuendoes only perpetuates the social discrimination of Americans of Italian ancestry. It is up to responsible journalists to stop such activities, yet it is apparent that Time magazine has chosen to abdicate its responsibility in this regard.

The fact that a senior analyst of Rand Corp. made the statement in the first place, raises serious questions. I have asked the Defense Department to investigate the employment practices of the Rand Corp. to determine whether or not this attitude of one of their senior analysts is similarly reflected in their hiring practices. It may well be revealed that Rand Corp. not only thinks Italians are not courageous but believes it as well and excludes them from its employ.

I sincerely hope the other Members of this body who oppose such disparaging statements against an ethnic minority will join me in this protest against not only Rand Corp., and Time magazine, but all Americans who seek to divide this pluralistic society of ours by denigrating particular segments and peoples.

FEDERAL FUNDS HAVE DOUBLE BARRELED EFFECT ON 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government is a vast machine, and the various operations it carries out have a dynamic impact on the various States and their political subdivisions.

The 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the district I have the privilege of representing in this body, is no exception in this regard, for recent newspaper reports indicate that the Farmers Home Administration had extended housing loans equal to \$1,685,150 to citizens of York, Cumberland, and Adams Counties in this district.

Too, in response to an inquiry I had effected with the Library of Congress, I am advised that appropriations for Gettysburg National Park in Adams County for fiscal 1971 were \$624,900, with \$306,800 of this going for management and protection and \$317,100 for maintenance and rehabilitation. For fiscal 1972, appropriations are \$703,700, and \$361,700 of this is going for management and protection and \$342,000 for maintenance and rehabilitation.

This is only a token of the total amount of Federal funds that have been assigned

to Pennsylvania's 19th Congressional District, for the record shows that for fiscal 1971 Federal outlays for Adams County were \$29,889,468, for York County \$195,463,229, and for Cumberland County \$254,138,496. This makes for a total of \$479,491,193, the figures have been derived from "Federal Outlays in Pennsylvania," a report of the Federal Government's impact on States and political subdivisions for fiscal year 1971. This report was compiled for the Executive Office of the President by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It should be mentioned that these Federal funds come from various operations of the Federal Government, along with payments made to veterans and their dependents, social security beneficiaries, and so forth.

These Federal funds have a "double barreled" effect on the 19th Congressional District's economy. While these moneys unto themselves are a significant economic factor, they also generate other economic dynamics. The important thing is that taken together, the effect is that the wheels of private commerce in the 19th Congressional District are driven faster.

HONEST BEEF PRICES AND NUMBERS

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, beef producers and beef consumers share a common belief; they both want fair and honest prices. The farmers and ranchers of this country who raise, and feed, and fatten the cattle that become the beef in our grocery store meat counters have high production costs that are locked in and not likely to come down. And the price they are receiving for the live animal is no less than what is needed to keep them in business.

The housewife who does the family shopping and is faced with balancing the budget, despite the pressures of inflation, wants to be assured that she is getting the most for her meat purchase dollar in both quantity and quality, so she too wants a fair price.

I have previously drawn the attention of the House to the Bureau of Labor Statistics monthly report on beef prices listing much higher prices in eastern metropolitan centers than in Chicago. Beef prices are much higher in Baltimore, Washington, New York, Philadelphia, and Boston than in Chicago. I have prepared a table to list some of these differences.

Those retail figures, which were going up at a time when the wholesale price of beef was dropping, are compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Judge for yourself by this hodgepodge of prices:

RETAIL PRICES FOR JANUARY

	Chicago	Washington	Philadelphia	Baltimore	New York	Boston
Round steak	\$1.22	\$1.42	\$1.60	\$1.62	\$1.71	\$1.73
Rump roast	\$1.24	\$1.45	\$1.58	\$1.55	\$1.51	\$1.47
Hamburger	.71	.69	.74	.76	.94	.83

UPWARD TREND FOR FEBRUARY

	Chicago	Washington	Philadelphia	Baltimore	New York	Boston
Round steak	\$1.32	\$1.52	\$1.66	\$1.66	\$1.79	\$1.80
Rump roast	\$1.36	\$1.53	\$1.62	\$1.58	\$1.62	\$1.48
Hamburger	.76	.74	.74	.78	.97	.87

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that the further east the beef moves, as reported by the Bureau for January and February, the higher the prices became.

It cannot be explained on the basis of freight, which is less than 2 cents a pound from Chicago to these cities.

It cannot be explained away on the basis of higher distribution costs in a metropolitan area for Chicago, our Nation's second largest city, has the same distribution costs in its metropolitan area.

Nor can the difference be explained away on the basis of higher labor costs. A journeyman butcher in the New York area receives \$180 for a 40-hour week as compared to a journeyman butcher in the Chicago area receiving \$196 for a 40-hour week.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that there is much more to this pricing policy on beef in these various cities listed above than the once-over-lightly explanations that have been furnished so far to the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee and the Price Commission, both of which held hearings on this matter last week.

A grand jury investigation which is underway in Manhattan is trying to determine whether there is a possible conspiracy between organized crime and other groups that force up the price of meat in supermarkets throughout the New York metropolitan area. When I learned this, I contacted Alfred Scotti, chief assistant district attorney in New York, and discussed the situation with him.

Mr. Scotti told me last week that he fears underworld involvement in the pricing picture extends beyond the Manhattan grand jury inquiry and at that point, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Justice Department to begin a broader investigation. I had previously recommended a General Accounting Office investigation, and I wrote both the Justice Department and Mr. Staats, pressing for such review by their respective agencies. I also sent the pricing statistics to Mr. Scotti which dramatically paint the picture of higher retail beef costs in the East.

This picture concerns me greatly, and I feel that an extensive indepth study is needed of beef pricing and any gouging of consumers that may be taking place.

I am inserting copies of news articles by Lacey Fosburgh in the New York Times and William Proctor in the New York Daily News of April 11 that describe the grand jury investigation in Manhattan.

I am delighted that tomorrow our Livestock and Grains Subcommittee is hearing a witness from New York, a former assistant State's attorney, Nichol Scopetta, who we hope will be able to shed some light on the possibility of organized crime's involvement without prejudicing the Manhattan grand jury investigation.

Now another side of the beef picture is the supply of beef. This country has been lulled into the belief that we have an abundance of beef in prospect by reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that our cattle numbers are increasing 2, 3, and 3½ million head a year, and

that cattle on feed numbers are soaring to produce plenty of choice and prime beef.

Calf crop reports have indicated that there is an abundance of young feeder cattle to be placed in lots for feeding.

Two reports which came across my desk this week are quite disturbing in this respect.

One is a new cattle-on-feed report which says that only 2 percent more young animals were put on feed in the first quarter this year than were placed in the same period in 1971.

Feed prices are low. Finished cattle prices are good. This is a period when it was anticipated that all those hundreds of thousands of extra young steers and heifers would be packed into the feedlots but there was actually only a 2-percent increase—about 140,000 out of nearly 6 million head. Another indication that our cattlemen may be scraping the barrel for feeder animals is a tremendous increase in importation of young animals from Mexico; the number nearly doubled to 102,000 head in January, the latest report available to me.

The second item is a compilation of the total number of cattle enumerated during the 1969 Agricultural Census in 45 of our 48 States as it compares to the U.S. Department of Agriculture inventory figures for the next day, January 1, 1970.

The census data, compiled by the veteran livestock industry analyst Charles Burmeister, for Washington Farmletter, indicates that there were a total of 103,571,560 head of cattle in the 45 States or nearly 6 million less than indicated by the USDA inventory, on which our rosy picture of beef abundance is based. The USDA inventory showed 109,508,000 head in the same 45 States, or 5.73 percent more.

The missing States are Florida, South Carolina, and New Hampshire, which had about 2.5 million head in the USDA inventory on January 1, 1970. Census data has not been released on them yet.

It is clear that the census is going to show at least 6 million head less than USDA, and, when allowances are made for the mythical calves of mythical cows which have found their way into the USDA totals in the past 2 years since the counts were made, USDA may be over 7 million head high in comparison to census.

The differences between census and USDA figures are subject to an adjustment. After each census, certain quality tests are run. Several areas are intensively restudied to determine the percentage of people, farms, ranches, animals, and all other items have been missed by the census enumerators. Adjustments of 2 percent to 4 percent have been made in the past, although some experts contend that the farms missed are mostly small ones which seldom have cattle.

But it is still apparent that USDA is millions high on its cattle numbers figures, which they have boosted from 112.5 million head on January 1, 1970, to nearly 118 million head on January 1 this year, and that an adjustment is in order.

That adjustment should be made

promptly. In view of the meat price furor created by President Nixon's Price Commission Chairman and erroneous Giant Food store advertising, there is a threat of farm commodity price ceilings that could cause a contraction rather than a needed growth of cattle production. Chairman C. Jackson Grayson of the Price Commission was still talking about farm price ceilings on nationwide TV last Sunday. There is a real danger that price ceilings would discourage producers and bring about a decline in production, aggravating later price problems. Any control policy forced by Government could lead to beef shortages followed by black marketeering and/or illegal racketeering.

So this gets us back to the point which I was earlier discussing, Mr. Speaker, regarding beef prices in the New York area where the grand jury is investigating the possibility of organized crime extracting a tribute from meat wholesalers jacking up the price the consumers have to pay.

We need to know the facts that lead to the final cost figures of beef and in particular the high prices in eastern cities; and we need to know the facts about the supply of beef for the near future by knowing the true facts about cattle numbers and the production outlook. And again producers and consumers have a common cause in determining these true and accurate facts.

The before mentioned articles follow:

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 11, 1972]

PROBES WEIGHING THE MOB FOR FAT IN HIGH MEAT PRICES

(By William Proctor)

A Manhattan grand jury is investigating whether meat prices in the metropolitan area have been rising because of the "infiltration of organized crime" into the city's supermarket industry, according to statements made at a hearing yesterday in Manhattan Supreme Court.

Assistant District Attorney Franklyn Snitow appeared in court yesterday to ask Justice Joseph Martinis to order a grand jury witness, Herbert Newman, 70, of 185 E. 85th St. and Miami Beach, to testify. Snitow said he has been conducting the investigation into the supermarket industry with the help of Chief Assistant District Attorney Alfred Scotti and the DA's squad since early last year.

ORDERED TO TESTIFY

But he said that the grand jury probe, which focuses on extortion, conspiracy, grand larceny, bribery of labor officials and illegal kickbacks, began only last month.

Newman, who is a retired president of Trans-World Fabricators, a meat company formerly called Trans-World Brokerage Inc., at 14 Gansevoort St., wanted to postpone his testimony until his attorney, Paul Rooney, has finished trying the Hulan Jack labor conspiracy case in Federal Court. Martinis, however, ordered Newman, who has been given immunity, to testify.

Snitow said in court that the specific question under investigation is whether meat brokers, who act as middlemen between supermarket chains and wholesalers, are using the threat of labor problems to force wholesalers to raise meat prices and to strong-arm retailers into buying at those prices.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The inflated prices would then be passed on to the consumer, who would in fact be "paying tribute to organized crime."

The grand jury is also considering whether "the additional money which is obtained as a result of the inflated prices is then paid to certain representatives of organized crime and certain corrupt officials of unions," Snitow explained. These unions represent supermarket employees throughout the city, Snitow said, and the money could be used "to purchase labor peace or labor influence for these supermarkets" from the underworld.

Another facet to the investigation, Snitow said, is whether the supermarket chains are being forced to deal with certain meat brokers and whether wholesalers are also being forced to go through these brokers to market their meat products.

Snitow said the investigation involves supermarket chains throughout the metropolitan area—New York City, Long Island, Westchester, northern New Jersey, and southern Connecticut.

Neither Snitow nor Scotti would name the specific labor unions involved or say whether any indictments were imminent. But the probe may involve "several conspiracies," Snitow said in court.

Sources close to the investigation said that the probe is likely to continue for "a very long time."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1972]

CRIME LINK WITH MEAT IS HINTED

(By Lacey Fosburgh)

A Manhattan grand jury is investigating a possible conspiracy between organized crime and corrupt labor leaders to force up the price of meat in supermarkets throughout the metropolitan area, the District Attorney's Office disclosed yesterday.

Assistant District Attorney Franklin Snitow asserted that consumers were being made to "pay tribute" to the forces of organized crime when they bought meat.

The price of meat has risen here during the last year almost three times as much as the Consumer Price Index as a whole, according to the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics.

MEAT BROKERS INVESTIGATED

Mr. Snitow said that the investigation, which has been conducted by the rackets bureau for more than a year, had focused on the operations of certain meat brokers, the middlemen in the meat industry between the retailers and the wholesalers.

The grand jury, he said, is specifically seeking to determine these things:

Whether certain meat wholesalers have been forced to offer their products at these specific wholesalers at the special, inflated prices. The extra money, which is shared by the crime figures and the corrupt labor leaders, Mr. Snitow said, is allegedly the price they must pay to maintain peace with some labor unions.

Whether certain meat wholesalers have been forced to offer their products at these increased prices as the cost of their right to stay in operation and to sell to supermarkets, generally among the most lucrative outlets.

The investigation was disclosed yesterday when Mr. Snitow went before State Supreme Court Justice Joseph A. Martinis to ask him to order a witness to testify before the grand jury.

The witness, Herbert Newman, 72 years old, the retired president of Trans World Fabricators, a meat brokerage at 14 Gansvoort Street, wanted to delay his appearance before the grand jury until his regular lawyer, now busy on another case, could accompany him.

Justice Martinis refused, however, and ordered him to testify immediately.

SNITOW GAVE REASONS

In his effort to persuade the judge to have the witness testify, Mr. Snitow said the grand jury was seeking to determine "whether there exists in New York County a conspiracy or several conspiracies to commit the crimes of grand larceny by extortion, coercion, bribery

receiving by a labor official, bribery of labor officials and commercial bribery."

Under the Nixon Administration's Economic Stabilization Program, the wholesale cost of meat is exempt from price control and retailers are allowed to raise their prices as long as their profit margin remains the same.

During the last year, however, the price of meat has risen here more than that of any other food commodity.

Samuel Ehrenhalt, the deputy director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, pointed out that from February, 1971, to February, 1972, the over-all price index had increased 4.9 per cent, food and groceries 6 per cent, fruits and vegetables 9.5 per cent and meat, poultry and fish 10.1 per cent.

Neither Mr. Snitow nor Chief Assistant District Attorney Alfred J. Scotti, who is in charge of the rackets bureau, would say, however, whether this substantial price increase had been influenced in any way by the possible infiltration of organized crime.

Neither of the officials would comment any further on the investigation or identify either the supermarkets or the labor unions possibly involved.

The president of one of the largest wholesalers in the downtown meat market here, who asked not to be identified, said that the presence of organized crime was generally known throughout the industry.

From time to time, he said, these criminal elements would control certain companies, or aspects of the business, such as trucking, for example.

ON THE REESCALATION OF THE WAR BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today, I have joined with Congressmen DERWINSKI and WAGGONER, as well as many other Members, in support of a proposed House resolution condemning the North Vietnamese Communists for their invasion of South Vietnam. It is my hope that the U.S. House of Representatives will go on record as soon as possible supporting this resolution, indicating that it believes recent pronouncements blaming the United States for the increased war activity are without foundation, and are in fact completely irresponsible.

I presume the President will continue to follow through with his Vietnam policy which is, in part, based on the proposition that the United States will not allow the Communists to overrun South Vietnam. While he continues to seek a political solution, notwithstanding the unwillingness of the Communists to negotiate anything that might bring a cessation of hostilities, the President is faced with a military challenge, mounted by a Communist clique which seems to have estimated that the United States, in the midst of a policy of de-Americanization of the war and an election, would not respond.

Obviously they have guessed wrong, notwithstanding the screams and outcries from numerous presidential candidates who are appalled at the renewed bombing, but who have said nothing in condemnation of the Communists' invasion of the South. One must wonder just how these one-sided critics will view the recent attacks on American shipping as it patrols the Gulf of Tonkin. No

doubt they will determine that our effective response which sunk two vessels and downed one plane is yet another example of American escalation.

On April 18, 1972, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird indicated that under consideration was the possible mining of the harbor of Haiphong. Given this most recent and brutal reescalation of the war by the Communists, I think the allied forces are perfectly justified in taking this military move and others. All Americans should appreciate that if the harbor had been closed, no Soviet tanks would have been available for the North Vietnamese to use for their World War II-style attack; no Soviet SAM's would have been available for installation in and just north of the DMZ to use against American aircraft. Without injury to any civilians, the United States could have done, and still could accomplish, much to end the war by cutting off what the North Vietnamese Communists need most: Armaments, supplies, and continuing support, which, need it be pointed out, come primarily through the ships unloaded at Haiphong.

As the administration reviews the situation, it is my hope they will review all options, especially the possibility of closing the harbor at Haiphong. Gradual escalation, as Gen. Maxwell Taylor has pointed out in his recent book, was ineffective. Apparently, gradual deescalation does not work either because the Communists fully intend to fight on until they have conquered the South. This the United States must keep in mind as it proceeds.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY SAYS HE SEES NO TAX LOOPHOLES

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed to learn today that the Secretary of the Treasury indicated that he sees no loopholes in present tax laws. It is a gross insult to the intelligence of the average taxpayers of America to assume that no tax loopholes exist in the tax laws of our Nation.

Under present tax laws corporate taxation is on its way out. In 1971, over 40 percent of American corporations paid no taxes. My office is currently undertaking studies to determine how many of the 500 largest corporations of America are freeloaders and pay no taxes, because of depletion, depreciation, the asset depreciation range, investment credit, the foreign tax credit, and what have you.

The high-income citizen has a comparable selection of tax escapes including tax-free bonds, investment credits, depletion, depreciation, capital gains, dividend exclusions, and stock options, among others. These gimmicks are especially designed for those of large income.

The average taxpayer has no way out, but to pay, and he does.

The Secretary of the Treasury is following a dangerous course if he overlooks the action of the House Democratic Caucus which adopted the following resolution on March 15, 1972:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS, PRESENTED BY CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK

Whereas, the estimated Federal Funds budget deficit of the Federal government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, exceeds \$44.7 billion, and the estimated deficit for fiscal year 1973 is now estimated at \$36.2 billion, which means in four years an increase in the Public Debt of \$123 or \$124 billion; and

Whereas, the National debt ceiling has been raised to \$450 billion, with a higher debt ceiling request scheduled for June, 1972; and

Whereas, additional revenues and reduced deficits may be achieved through effective tax reform; and

Whereas, the House is reluctant to undertake weeks of work on tax reform proposals if after passage they are to be subjected to a Presidential veto; and

Whereas, full Presidential support is needed to assure passage of meaningful, revenue-raising tax reform;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives of the 92nd Congress

That it is the sense of the Caucus that passage of legislation further increasing the federal debt ceiling will be jeopardized unless the President either publicly supports a meaningful, revenue-raising tax reform proposal, or, at least, sets forth the tax preferences or loopholes which in his judgment Congress may attempt to rectify without confronting a Presidential veto.

The Democratic Caucus in this action reflects a determination of the American people to bring about fair play in taxation. The day of reckoning will occur when the Secretary requests a higher debt ceiling and must explain who will be paying the new and added tax burdens which must be faced next year.

DECRIMINALIZING PERSONAL POSSESSION AND USE OF MARIHUANA

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill, H.R. 14549, today to provide for the decriminalization of marihuana. H.R. 14549 is identical to the bill introduced in the Senate today by Senators JACOB JAVITS and HAROLD HUGHES. It would remove all penalties for the possession of marihuana for personal use in a private home; it would also allow not-for-profit transfer of marihuana and the possession of reasonable amounts of marihuana in public when such possession is incident to private use. Marihuana smoking in public would continue to be a criminal offense.

We are introducing this legislation in response to the recommendations made in the March 22d report issued by the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse. Senators JAVITS and HUGHES are members of the Commission. I had the privilege of introducing the original bill in 1969 providing for the Commission's creation.

For the past year the 13-member Commission has conducted a comprehensive study of marihuana smoking in this country, examining the social, medical, and legal effects of its use. The Commission considered this issue from as many vantage points as possible, includ-

ing the historical and social context of today's use of marihuana.

The Commission found that approximately 24 million Americans have tried marihuana at least once and that there are at least 8.3 million current users. The Commission did not find any evidence that experimental or intermittent use of marihuana causes physical or psychological harm. The immediate effects of marihuana on a user are similar to alcohol; according to the Commission it causes a "loss of some psychomotor control and a temporary impairment of time and space perceptions."

While proposing a "social policy seeking to discourage marihuana use," the Commission recommended that all criminal penalties for the simple possession of marihuana and the casual, not-for-profit transfer of marihuana in private be removed. This is what our bill would do. In addition, however, it would remove the penalties for possession and not-for-profit transfer of marihuana in public when incident to private use. The Commission recommended that marihuana possessed in public remain contraband subject to summary seizure and forfeiture—and that such possession of more than an ounce remain a criminal violation. We have departed from the Commission's majority recommendation on this point because of the inconsistencies and difficulty of making it legal for a person to have marihuana at home for his personal use and yet retaining the criminal sanctions against its not-for-profit transfer in public and transportation home even when incident to its decriminalized private use.

In addition to its decriminalization provision, our bill implements the Commission's recommendations for a new provision in the Federal law: One providing that a plea of marihuana intoxication shall not be a defense to any criminal act under its influence.

Mr. Speaker, there are persons sitting in jail today serving sentences for convictions of simple possession of marihuana. The Federal penalty for a first offense was revised in 1970 so that it is now a misdemeanor punishable by up to 1 year in jail and a \$1,000 fine; a second offense is punishable by up to 2 years in jail and a \$2,000 fine. Unfortunately, the penalties are even higher in many States; indeed, there is a man serving a 30-year sentence in Texas today for the simple possession of marihuana. The National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse has aptly demonstrated that the Federal law again needs revision; furthermore, it has recommended the adoption by the States of a uniform statutory scheme for marihuana similar to that recommended for the Federal law. I recognize that the bill we are introducing today would not affect the largest number of marihuana users since most arrests and convictions are carried out under State laws. But, this legislation can set an example leading to changes in the States' laws. It is imperative that the Congress act quickly to correct its own laws and provide a model for the States.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to commend the two Commis-

sion members from the Senate, Senators JAVITS and HUGHES, for their leadership in this field. Similarly, we in the House are indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) for their service and representation of this body on the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. 14549

A bill to amend certain provisions of the Controlled Substances Act relating to marihuana

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Controlled Substances Act is amended by inserting immediately after section 404 thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 404A. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 308, 401(a)(1), 404, or any other provision of this title or any other Federal law, it shall not be unlawful for any person—

"(1) (A) to possess, within a private dwelling or other residence, marihuana for his own use, or for the use of others, within any such residence or dwelling, if such marihuana is not possessed with the intent to distribute, or sell such marihuana in violation of this title or any other Federal law; or

"(B) to possess, in a public area, marihuana in a reasonable amount, if the possession of such marihuana is incident to a private use within the purview of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, and is not with the intent to distribute, transfer or sell such marihuana in violation of this title or any other Federal law; or

"(2) to distribute, transfer or sell, in public or private, any marihuana, lawfully possessed, to any person for a private use within the purview of subparagraph (A) of the first paragraph of this subsection, if such distribution, transfer, or sale is not made for profit.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 or any other provision of this title or any other Federal law, marihuana in the lawful possession of any person shall not be considered contraband and shall not be subject to seizure or forfeiture by the United States.

"(c) In the prosecution of any person charged with an offense in violation of any Federal law, the fact that such person was suffering from marihuana intoxication at the time of the commission of that offense shall not be a defense to that charge or any element thereof.

"(d) For purposes of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, the possession of marihuana in an amount not to exceed three ounces shall be deemed to be a reasonable amount, if such possession is incident to a private use within the purview of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, and is not with the intent to distribute, transfer or sell such marihuana in violation of this title or any other Federal law."

THE PLIGHT OF OUR LIVESTOCK FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, if there has ever been a clear illustration of the true plight of our beef cattle producers, it is some statistics that were published in the *Hastings, Nebr.*, Tribune recently.

During the Easter recess, I met one eve-

ning with the representatives of the Lafayette County Farm Bureau in Higginsville, Mo. This has been an annual event for many years on the Monday evening following Easter Sunday. The purpose of these meetings is to give the members of the farm bureau an opportunity to discuss legislation on the Federal, as well as on the State, level of importance to farmers.

It was my privilege this year to have with me as a panel of two, the Honorable Melvin Vogelsmeier of Concordia, Mo., who represents Lafayette County in the Missouri House of Representatives. I mention this only because I am indebted to Mr. Vogelsmeier for providing me with some statistics published in the *Hastings, Nebr., Tribune*.

The point is that the livestock producers in America, and principally our beef cattle producers, are already the "underdog" in the meat market situation, and can hardly afford to take any additional losses.

For the benefit of the Members of the House as well as the other body of the Congress, and also those others who may read the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, I submit herewith some prices per hundred-weight of cattle as follows:

In January 1952:	
Prime cattle.....	\$38
Most choice of prime.....	34-38
February 16, 1972	
Prime cattle.....	39
Most choice of prime.....	35.50-38

Please note that these prices are substantially the same, or very nearly identical. But just take a look at what has happened after 20 years to retail prices. The Nebraska paper contends that the retail price for different cuts of meat were taken from the very same supermarket for, both the year 1952 and the years 1972, which is exactly 20 years later. The figures are as follows:

January 9, 1952:		Per pound
Swiss steak.....		\$0.85
Hamburger.....		.49
Rib steak.....		.79
Beef stew.....		.79
Sirloin steak.....		.85
Round steak.....		.98
Beef roast.....		.65
Prime rib.....		.69
February 16, 1972:		
Swiss steak.....	1.69	
Hamburger.....	0.98-1.19	
Rib steak.....	1.59	
Beef stew.....	.98	
Sirloin steak.....	1.63	
Round steak.....	1.63	
Beef roast.....	1.19	
Prime rib.....	1.29	

With these kinds of statistics staring us in the face I suppose the immediate reaction would be to ask, "What goes on here?" It should be very clear from even a casual glance at these figures that hamburger prices are more than double what they were 20 years ago. Sirloin steak is almost double. Round steak is nearly double in price. Just about every item has been substantially doubled in price in the last 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, this brings us down to the question as to whether or not the American farmer has received his fair share in the prosperity of our economy. I become so very weary of the efforts of

those who seek through the media, both electronic and published, to say that somehow, somewhere, if Congress does something that could or might be in the interest of the American farmer they must be hurting the American consumer. Recently Secretary Butz has come under criticism for his efforts to try to help our farmers. There are those within and without the administration who seek to thwart his efforts and to muzzle his statements when he speaks out for the American farmer.

I shall not take long tonight except for a moment to repeat, or I should say once again express, what an unusual or perhaps a better word is what an exceptional job the American farmer is doing for the American consumer in relation to what is happening elsewhere in the world. Because of the efforts of the American farmer, the American family gets a better bargain today for his food dollar than anywhere else on earth. I wish there was some way better to dramatize or emphasize this point. Instead I shall have to rely on the economic report of the Department of Agriculture which, appears on page 10 of the August 1971 issue, which sets out the expenditures for food as a proportion of the total of private consumption expenditures for various countries during the years 1955 through 1969. I suppose the most meaningful figures would be the most recent figures which are available, or, in other words, the figures for 1968.

The best answer to those continuously harping critics who go about trying to arouse a confrontation between the consumer and the farmer would be to take a close look at the figures which are listed below. In the United States only 18.3 percent of the family budget is expended for food. In our neighboring country to the north, Canada, the percentage of the family budget expended for food is 19.3.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith and read into the *RECORD* the cost or expenditure for food as a proportion of total private consumption expenditures for the following countries for the year 1968, which as far as I can determine are the latest figures available from our own Department of Agriculture:

LATIN AMERICA	
Jamaica.....	32.7
Panama.....	45.9
Puerto Rico.....	22.8
Venezuela.....	27.6
WESTERN EUROPE	
Austria.....	28.3
Belgium.....	24.3
Denmark.....	22.3
Finland.....	29.3
France.....	27.5
Germany, Federal Republic.....	31.9
Greece.....	37.5
Ireland.....	29.6
Italy.....	36.9
Malt.....	37.9
Netherlands.....	25.2
Norway.....	27.8
Sweden.....	25.0
Switzerland.....	23.6
United Kingdom.....	23.7
EASTERN EUROPE	
Bulgaria.....	54.4
Poland.....	47.6
U.S.S.R.....	50.1
Yugoslavia.....	40.9

AFRICA	
Ghana.....	60.0
South Africa.....	26.8
Sierra Leone.....	45.6
ASIA	
Ceylon.....	50.9
China (Taiwan).....	41.6
Israel.....	26.1
Japan.....	35.4
Korea, Republic of.....	47.1
OCEANIA	
Australia.....	20.8

In conclusion let me suggest that if there should be those who still have reason to challenge any of the above figures, then I hope they will come forward and advise me of my errors or else the errors of the Department of Agriculture.

I have listened to debate on the floor of the House in years past which indicated that in some parts of Southeast Asia and portions of the dark continent of Africa where food costs take even a higher percentage of total family income than those that have been previously published. In former years the food costs for some countries on this earth has run as high as 70 or 80 percent of the total private expenditures. On the other hand I can prove that since 1955 the American farmer has been responsible for lowering the percentage of expenditures for the American housewife from a figure of 22.6 percent in 1955 down to a point of 18.3 percent in 1968 of the total family's overall expenditures for food.

Mr. Speaker, what more arguments are needed than the above figures to show that our American farmer needs and deserves to enjoy a greater share in the economic prosperity of our country.

TOWARD A STRONG BALANCED AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The *SPEAKER* pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I for one want the record to show that I support a strong air transportation system, grounded on the proved ability of scheduled service. This is the backbone of the air industry and the basis of our national leadership in the air. I believe that the supplemental carriers should perform those duties for which they were originally created, namely, to greet the needs of the public not served by the basic scheduled air transport system. They were created to supplement, not to supplant or destroy scheduled service.

Although there have been many requests by the Air Transport Association representing all the scheduled carriers, interested cities, chambers of commerce, Members of Congress, to mention a few, urging the CAB to hold full scale hearings on the issue of group charters, all that is forthcoming is oral arguments to the Board. In view of the fact that the proposed rulemaking could alter entirely the shape of our scheduled airline service as we know it today, this CAB policy strikes me as being wholly unsatisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals contained in this rulemaking may be fine if you live in a major city such as New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles, but most of the

rest of the country's air travel would be greatly curtailed. What is self evident here is that if this proposed rule is put into effect, the scheduled airline system, out of pure economic necessity, would have to change their "modus operandi" to conform to the new regulations. Make no mistake about this, with far more stringent charter restrictions the supplemental carriers have made extraordinary inroads into transatlantic travel.

In 1964 the supplemental carriers flew less than 5 percent of the U.S.-flag share but by 1969 they carried nearly a quarter of all U.S.-flag transatlantic passengers. By their ability to concentrate their activities in prime markets, the supplementals carried more than half of all passengers between California and Europe in 1969. The latest IATA figures indicate that scheduled traffic across the North Atlantic increased by only 4.6 percent in 1971 while charter passengers gained 29.7 percent. If this trend continues, it may well be that by 1975 supplemental traffic across the Atlantic could exceed U.S. scheduled carrier traffic. This charter proposal, while compounding the transatlantic problems, will open new doors to the domestic market which so far have been relatively free from such intrusion.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the real issue here is whether the public wants low fares within a framework that allows for all the advantages of a network of dependable scheduled air service, or whether it wants low fares alone with only limited, irregular and infrequent service. The CAB, in my opinion, has decided it will change the law by administrative rulings without the benefit of public evidentiary hearings. Unwittingly then, they will force the scheduled airlines to reevaluate their present policies and cause them to adopt the same scheduling techniques used by the supplemental carriers, namely, full plane loads from major hubs. It is easy to say we want the cheapest available way to fly but let us look at the facts and see if this is what we really mean.

Scheduled service is merely another way of saying "full service" whereas supplemental service suggests "limited service." The "full service" carriers handle the public's needs for every type of air transportation from the individual vacation traveler to the transportation of mail. The public's needs are served on thin routes as well as strong, on off season as well as peak, on the lightly traveled mid-week day as well as the heavily traveled weekend. In contrast the "limited service" charter carrier meets very few of the public's needs. It operates only at its convenience and with full plane loads, hence only on certain traveled routes and heavily traveled seasons.

In stark contrast to the rounded service of the scheduled carriers, the charter carriers, in order to provide the public with even a modest fare reduction from the bargains available on scheduled carriers, must necessarily depend on plane load economics. Therefore, as I pointed out earlier, they must concentrate their services where such loads are available. They must also operate at their con-

venience rather than when the public convenience and necessity dictates.

Mr. Speaker, if the public should decide that the way of the future lies in the direction of limited service, full plane load, charter operations, you can be sure the scheduled airlines will adjust to the new ground rules. However, if this comes to pass, it will be the public itself that will be the greatest loser.

The seemingly subbargain pricing which limited service dangles before it is not the solution. Moreover, it will be our constituents who will complain the loudest when they are unable to get from Lansing to Albany or Richmond to Albuquerque.

As I have suggested, the full service carriers have been successful in meeting the public's overall service needs because up to now they have been able to maintain a healthy route balance. However, the whole balancing concept of route structure falls apart if another group of carriers are free to concentrate on those operations which permit full plane loads and to do so without regard to bona fide groups, but rather by selling to the general public at large as the CAB regulations propose.

Mr. Speaker, I do not for 1 minute suggest that the charter carriers should be put out of business. They do a commendable job for certain types of group transportation. I am urging that a proper balance be struck between the two types of carriers. The present charter rules, bottomed on affinity requirements, were not arrived at haphazardly and accordingly should be maintained for the interest of all concerned.

It is time we stop and take stock of our air transportation system. Do we want regularly scheduled services serving small cities as well as large in and out of season or do we want bulk transportation by means of charter aircraft only at major hub airports? It is clear to me that we cannot have both.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the United States has pursued steadfastly a policy of responsible withdrawal of ground troops from Vietnam and has undertaken since 1969 a general deescalation of the war. In response, the North Vietnamese have intransigently refused to move toward a peaceful settlement.

The recently launched massive invasion of South Vietnam probably has many goals, but certainly not the least of these goals is to arouse public disharmony in our Nation.

The U.S. House of Representatives should emphatically condemn the brutal, desperate use of military force by the North Vietnamese in their current offensive. We should also support the efforts on the part of South Vietnamese forces to repel this latest testimony to the North Vietnamese lack of desire for peace.

We must disregard the counsel of those

who would have us abandon the people of South Vietnam. The statistics of our disengagement speak for themselves: In early 1969 we had 550,000 ground troops there. Today we have fewer than 90,000, none of whom are engaged in ground combat. But this disengagement has been and should continue to be a responsible, honorable one, one which will give the South Vietnamese a chance for self-determination. At the same time we must continue to provide protection for our own remaining ground troops.

I join in support of the resolution to express the sentiment of the House of Representatives in condemnation of the North Vietnamese Communist invasion of South Vietnam and in support of actions taken by the United States to assist in repelling the invasion.

VLADIMIR MACHLIS

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, I have been asked to deliver a message to my distinguished colleagues and other Americans.

It was sent by telephone from Moscow by a 27-year-old Jewish man, Vladimir Machlis, who, in the past 6 months, has applied six times to emigrate to Israel and has been turned down six times by Soviet officials.

The message was relayed to me yesterday by Vladimir's twin brother, Leonid, who, along with his mother and sister, Ella, were given permission to emigrate to Israel 6 months ago.

Vladimir's message is:

I have only one hope left now, that good people of America and everywhere will cry out for me.

Leonid borrowed money to come to the United States and my office to deliver his brother's plea.

He and the other two members of his family were granted exit permits only after much harassment and frustration.

On the day Leonid received his emigration permit, a neighbor threw boiling water on his sister's head and face, causing second-degree burns and leaving permanent scars. Leonid told me that, as a result of Government propaganda against those seeking to leave the Soviet Union, neighbors considered his family "traitors."

Vladimir was constantly harassed by the KGB, even though he was a civil pilot for Aeroflot, the Russian airline, for 6 years.

His troubles began while he was in pilot training. At that time, an old man gave him a Hebrew Bible at a synagogue. With the aid of a flashlight, Vladimir read it secretly at night under his blanket. He became increasingly involved in Jewish activities, began training as an historian with the goal of studying Hebrew and the Bible more openly and narrowly missed being brought to trial for his activities in 1966.

Now, as a result of his requests to emigrate, Vladimir has been dismissed from his job. He is without relatives or money.

Like thousands of Jewish citizens in the Soviet Union, he is a victim of an official system which discourages emigration, even though the Soviet Constitution proclaims it as a right. One of the ways the government discourages emigration is to allow some members of Jewish families to emigrate to Israel while refusing the same right to other members of the same family. In Vladimir's case, it has been his fate to be detained in the Soviet Union while his family has been freed.

Leonid reports his brother has written letters, seeking assistance, to United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim and to President Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced, and I was reminded yesterday by Leonid, that the focusing of attention on the oppressed Jews and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union by public and official opinion in the United States and other countries is one of the most effective ways to alleviate the continuing oppression and, in some cases, to secure the survival of some of the oppressed.

Today, I am privileged to bring the attention of this legislative body to a bipartisan list of 125 colleagues who are publicly showing their concern for the cause of Soviet Jewry and human rights by signing a petition to President Nixon before his departure for Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will insert this petition which asks our President to convey to Soviet leaders the concern of millions of Americans over the treatment of the Jewish minority and the names of my colleagues who have joined me in signing the petition.

I also will include the names of 45 Soviet Jews, who, like Vladimir Machlis, have been denied requests to emigrate to Israel, are deprived of work and who are the victims of other forms of discrimination.

This list represents only a very small part of the thousands in similar circumstances. But it is important that we, in the Congress, identify and bring attention to as many of these victims of oppression as we can with the hope that our small effort will ease their plight and eventually secure their freedom to emigrate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert a copy of a letter Vladimir Machlis wrote to Secretary-General Waldheim. This letter describes the terrible frustration and the hope for outside assistance for Soviet Jewry.

We, in the Congress, and the people of the United States will be watching with interest the reaction of Soviet Russia to the plight of these Jews. We will be interested to see if Soviet Russia treats these people as human beings with God-given rights or as serfs. I plan to make sure their plight receives world attention.

The material follows:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY
President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In the interest of peace and the easing of world tensions we, the undersigned, welcome your forthcoming trip to Moscow. We also urge you to take advantage of this unique opportunity and to help

redeem Soviet Jews, thus fulfilling the hopes of millions of Americans who have labored on their behalf.

Mr. President: We respectfully petition you on behalf of three million Soviet Jews. We urge you to be their advocate and to convey to Soviet leaders the concern of millions of Americans, and people of good will everywhere, over an oppressed minority which faces discrimination, and is prevented from perpetuating its history, its culture and its ancient religious heritage. Nearly forty of its finest young people are in Soviet prison camps because they sought to live as Jews, while others seeking to emigrate are harassed. If some succeed in departing it is only after months of struggle and of deprivation.

Mr. President: We urge you to exert your influence to help free Jewish prisoners of conscience and to help Soviet Jews achieve the fundamental right to live as Jews and to leave for Israel and elsewhere.

Bella Abzug, Joseph Addabbo, John Anderson, William Anderson, Frank Annunzio, Bill Archer, Les Aspin, Herman Badillo, William Barrett, Alphonzo Bell.

Charles Bennett, Tom Bevill, Mario Biaggi, Johnathan Bingham, Edward Boland, Frank Brasco, Jack Brinkley, Joel Brodyhill, John Buchanan, John Byrnes.

Goodloe Byron, Hugh Carey, Elford Cederberg, Donald Clancy, Del Clawson, James Cleveland, James Collins, Barber Conable, Silvio Conte, Lawrence Coughlin.

Philip Crane, Dominick Daniels, George Danielson, James Delaney, Frank Denholm, Samuel Devine, John Dingell, Harold Donohue, John Dow, Thomas Downing.

Robert Drinan, Thaddeus Dulski, John Duncan, Florence Dwyer, Don Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, Dante Fascell, Hamilton Fish, Daniel Flood, Edwin Forsythe.

Donald Fraser, Bill Frenzel, Edward Garmatz, Sam Gibbons, Barry Goldwater, Jr., Ella Grasso, Charles Griffin.

Gilbert Gude, Seymour Halpern, James Hanley, Michael Harrington, James Hastings, Ken Hechler, John Heinz, Henry Helstoski, Louise Day Hicks, Lawrence Hogan.

Chet Holifield, Frank Horton, James Howard, John Hunt, William Keating, Carleton King, Edward Koch, Norman Lent, Arthur Link, Clarence Long.

Manuel Lujan, Mike McCormack, Robert McEwen, William Mailliard, Richard Mallary, Dawson Mathis, Spark Matsunaga, Abner Mikva, Parren Mitchell, Jan Myers.

Lucien Nedzi, James O'Hara, Edward Paten, Thomas Pelly, Claude Pepper, Peter Peyser, Bertram Podell, Richard Poff, Walter Powell, Richardson Preyer.

Charles Rangel, Thomas Rees, John Rhodes, Robert Roe, Paul Rogers, Benjamin Rosenthal, Edward Roybal, William Ryan, Paul Sarbanes, James Scheuer.

Garner Shriver, B. F. Sisk, Henry Smith, Gene Snyder, Robert Steele, Sam Steiger, William Steiger, Samuel Stratton, Fletcher Thompson.

Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert Tiernan, Lionel Van Deerlin, Victor Veysey, Jerome Waldie, William Widnall, Lawrence Williams, Bob Wilson, Wendell Wyatt, John Wylder, Sidney Yates.

LIST OF DETAINEES

MOSCOW

Slepak Vladimir, K-9, 15 Gorkovo str., apt. 77.

Polsky Victor, 23 Krasnokazarmennaya str., apt. 62.

Abramovich Pavel, 39 Parkovaya str., apt. 65.

Kiliachkin Mikhail, 25 Dmitrovskaye shosse, apt. 6.

Prestin Vladimir, 6 Uralskaya str., cor. 4, apt. 11.

Gershovich Ada Grigorievna, 13 Lesnaya str., apt. 3.

Orlov Boris, 12 Cherkizovskaya str., cor. 1, apt. 253.

Gurvich Sergel, 3/1 Cherkizovskaya str., apt. 71.

Tsitilznok Boris, 5-ya Parkovaya str. 54, apt. 23.

Libov Lev Davidovich, 25 Trubnaya st., apt. 37.

Smelianski Emmanuel, 17 Tashkentskaya st., apt. 42.

Begun Iosif, 14 Melnikova st., apt. 14.

Kogan Boris Victorovich, 22 Buzheninovskaya st., apt. 78.

Lerner Aleksander Yakovlevich, 4 Dmitriia Uljanova st., cor. 2, apt. 322.

Korenfeld Ilya, 14 Pervomajskaya st., apt. 65.

Tsylin Leonid, 6 Koltsevaya st., apt. 32.

Shapiro Gavriel, 10 Chkalova st., apt. 11.

Svechinsky Grigori Lazarevich, 19 Strelbishchensky per., apt. 31.

Ratner Marina, 7 Khersonskaya st., apt. 418.

Faingold Natan, 2 Stoletova st., apt. 65.

RIGA

Segal Mikhail, 24 Gospitaliu st., apt. 1.

Shvalbe Mira Markovna, 99 Lenina st., apt. 24.

Gerchikov Mikhail, 37 Kr. Barona st., apt. 8.

Zitserman Boris, 18 Engelsa st., apt. 21.

Kit Lazar Girshevich, 61 Lachplesha st., apt. 8.

Oshero Boris Veniaminovich, 3 Gauyas st., apt. 2.

Ulman Mikhail, 105 Karl Marx st., apt. 10.

LENINGRAD

Varnavitski Izrail, 102 Prospect Tareza corp. 2, apt. 19.

Lerner Lev Davidovich, 28 prospect Engelsa, apt. 23.

Fridman Vladimir, 7 Pobedy st., apt. 190.

KIEV

Melamed Zinovi Usherovich, 7a Raisy Okipnoj st., apt. 28.

Pipko Grigori Veniaminovich, 9 Kolomyshesky per., apt. 66.

Soroko Yuri Lazarevich, 15/14 Vasilkovskaya st., apt. 20.

Khusid Grigori Khunovich, 5 Ivana Shetsova st., apt. 2.

Remennik Simkha Kiselevich, 4 Podvojskovo st., apt. 13, Kiev-60.

SVERDLOVSK

Kosharovskiy Yuli Mikhailovich, 76 Michurina st., apt. 5.

Markman Vladimir Ilyich, 69 Lenina st., apt. 429.

MINSK

Levin Ernst Markovich, 13 k. Marksa st., apt. 1.

Alshansky Naum Mordukhovich, 2/35 Tashkentsky per., apt. 9.

KISHINEV

Gittelman Vladimir Iosifovich, 64b Kotovskaya shosse, apt. 1.

KHARKOV

Grinberg Solomon Isaakovich, 20 Ivanova st., apt. 10.

Siganovich Eduard, 8 Chicherina st., apt. 10.

VILNIUS

Shames Leib Gdalevich, 75 Zhirmunu st., apt. 110.

Klein Khaim Yakovlevich, 8 Kretingos st., apt. 11.

Skutelski Mikhail Davidovich, 103 Dzerzhinskovo st., apt. 9.

TRANSLATED FROM RUSSIAN

To the UN Secretary General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim.

To the Prime Minister of the State of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir.

To the President of the United States of America, Mr. Richard Nixon.

I, the undersigned, a Jew, an inhabitant of Moscow, am forced to appeal to you and in your person to the entire progressive mankind with the request to render me all pos-

sible aid in helping me to realize my desire to emigrate to the State of Israel, where my relatives, mother, sister and brother live. The opposition with which I meet on the part of the Soviet organs is unexplainable, inhumane and unjustifiable both morally and legally.

Emotionally and spiritually I have been tied with Israel for many years and I consider it as my only Homeland. And as a son of the Jewish people, which had gone through the most cruel oppression, hounding and physical annihilation, I am prepared to go to the end for the sake of this aim, because I cannot imagine the possibility of further existing in the diaspora.

I appeal to you not to remain indifferent to the tears of my mother; I beg you to do everything that is possible and necessary for the reunification of my family.

Being one out of the thousands of Soviet Jews whose rights to free emigration are unlawfully violated by the Soviet Authorities, I apply to you with a personal letter, because I consider that the fate of every individual is the reflection of the fate of his people.

I know that Statesmen and International organizations meet with difficulties in formalities when they attempt to help individuals whose rights are violated by the administrative apparatus of one or another country. However, placing great value on your prestige and influence, I believe that you will be able to help me and my family.

May God help you.

MAKHLIS VLADIMIR SEMENOVICH.

U.N. CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on June 13 of this year the nations of this globe will meet in what will surely be one of the profound historic gatherings of our century. On that date, the United States will meet with some 130 other countries to begin the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, Sweden.

I hope and expect, along with scientists and politicians all over the world, that this meeting will be a significant turning point for every nation in bringing about coordinated action to meet one of the greatest challenges mankind has ever faced—the challenge of preserving our global environment. I am sure I need not cite here the now-familiar statistics which demonstrate that threats to the environment are already at critical points.

However, even before the conference itself begins, it has produced significant accomplishments. Four preparatory sessions have been held, which were in effect "miniconferences." During these sessions the agenda was settled upon, key problems identified, and questions for debate formulated. I had the privilege to serve as a U.S. delegate to the second preparatory conference, and I can report that the work done at these sessions was thorough and painstaking. There is no question of the value of the preparation process for world environmental concerns.

Each participating nation has been forced to ask itself new questions concerning the six agenda item subject areas:

Planning and management of human settlements;

Natural resource management;

Identification and control of pollutants;

Educational and informational aspects;

Development and environment; and

Organizational implications of action proposals.

As part of the preparations for the conference, each nation has been asked to prepare reports on the state of its environmental problems, organization, and actions. Some 70 nations have now submitted their reports, and these already constitute a valuable inventory of such problems and capabilities within individual countries.

In addition, international organizations and national governments have cooperated in assessing the scope of the various issues mentioned in the agenda, and the capabilities that already exist to monitor and deal with the problems that have been identified. This total overview approach has not been done before, and will prove invaluable.

As this information becomes available, nations are already in better positions to compare their standing with others in dealing with these problems. And the need to create an international organizational capability to carry on data collection and dissemination of this sort in the future has already become obvious.

Furthermore, as the more obvious environmental problems were discussed and the necessary approaches developed, new and crucial aspects of these issues emerged.

Partly as a result of all these developments during the conference preparations, there has been a distinct change in emphasis in expected results after Stockholm. In 1968 the conference was established for the purpose of alerting the world to the global nature and critical extent of the environmental crisis. By 1972 the rapid spread of environmental consciousness everywhere has produced changes in attitudes, and the emphasis is now on actions needed, and the possible programs and organizational developments that will be necessary.

However, although much has been accomplished in the preparations, the critical decisions and commitments have yet to be made at the Stockholm meeting. I urgently hope that the U.S. Government can demonstrate its commitment to the environment by exercising real leadership in forging a lasting and meaningful commitment at Stockholm.

The critical areas in which actions are needed and expected by the world's scientists and international leaders are: Agreement on methods of controlling major identified pollutants; designation of effective research and monitoring capabilities by existing facilities and the creation of new facilities for these purposes; the setting up of an institutional framework to coordinate these efforts.

The increased activity of national governments in attacking environmental problems has also resulted in some newly perceived problems on the international horizon. It has become clear that trade

patterns among countries may be substantially affected by pollution control requirements through higher prices on affected items. The interconnection between methods of meeting pollution control costs and effects on international trade relations must be defined. This is a problem in which I have taken strong interest, and, as Members may recall, I have introduced a bill in this Congress to create a National Commission on International Trade and Environment which would examine these matters with a view to assisting both formulation of U.S. policy and discussion on the international level.

As has happened in the United States, I expect that discussions on the international level will center more and more on the economic ramifications of environmental management, as consideration moves from the abstract into the realm of active pollution control methods and resource management.

In consideration of these economic realities, I am sure that the international framework which seems certain to emerge from Stockholm will play an essential role.

In this and in the other crucial environmental concerns that face the world as representatives from around the world meet at Stockholm, I have every confidence that the beginnings of global cooperation will be set effectively in motion.

I have this confidence, because I think we have discovered that no nation can hope to obtain a healthy environment through its own efforts alone. There are no boundaries for air and water pollutants. The need is established for international cooperation in measuring and assessing the present state of pollution and in discovering ways to deal with present and future environmental problems.

The preparations for the Stockholm Conference have shown already what can be accomplished by an international effort; and now I hope the United States will send the most determined and committed leadership to Stockholm to contribute to a meaningful continuation of this effort—not only during the 2-weeks of the conference, but in the period following, so that this can be counted a real turning point in world commitment to survival.

AMERICAN RADIO OVERSEAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current interest in the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as well as continuing discussion over the status of the U.S. Information Agency, I submit for inclusion into the RECORD the text of remarks by Frank Shakespeare, Director of the U.S. Information Agency:

In recent months the international radio voices of the American people have come under attack as being outmoded relics of a supposedly evaporated cold war.

What are these voices?

What purpose do they serve?

Do people listen to them?
Are they outmoded?

These are legitimate questions. What is involved are four radio stations broadcasting into certain foreign countries and operated and paid for with minor exceptions by the United States. They are:

Radio Free Europe, which broadcasts into Eastern Europe: Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria.

Radio Liberty, which broadcasts into the Soviet Union.

RIAS, those initials stand for Radio in the American Sector, which broadcasts from West Berlin into East Germany.

And the Voice of America, which broadcasts worldwide and thus reaches Mainland China and Cuba as well as Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union among the closed societies.

The purpose of these radios is to inform people about events and policies in their country, which oftentimes are kept from them.

Do people listen?

In the Communist societies one does not take surveys. There are no Gallup Polls, there are no man-on-the-street interviews.

In seeking to determine whether people listen to foreign radio, one must search for telling bits and pieces of evidence.

Here are some . . .

A sensitive writer and poet defects from the Soviet Union. His name is Anatoli Kuznetsov.

During a television discussion on his decision to flee, he is asked how in a sealed society he formed a judgment of life's value in the West.

In effect, they asked him how did he conclude that he would not be going from the frying pan to the fire.

And he answered, "There are the foreign radios—BBC, Radio Liberty, the Voice of America."

This week, in an extraordinary interview, the very symbol of the struggle against repression of ideas in the Soviet Union, the courageous novelist Alexander Solzhenitsyn, said, referring directly to Radio Liberty:

"If we learn anything about events in our country, it's from there."

James Scheuer, Congressman from New York City, recently returned from a visit to the Soviet Union and told how Jews in that country had come up to him with tears in their eyes to express appreciation for the broadcasts of the Voice of America. To them it keeps hope alive. He said whatever doubts he may have had about the value of the radios were gone.

When Senator William Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, indicated during recent Senate hearings that he had reservations about the continued usefulness of the American radio (RIAS) in beleaguered Berlin, spokesmen for all three political parties in Berlin spoke out in the strongest terms about the value of the station. They said that in East Germany it was a symbol to an oppressed people and in West Berlin it was a symbol of the American commitment to freedom.

American reporters traveling through Eastern Europe are close to unanimous in their appraisal that Radio Free Europe is widely listened to and believed . . . particularly when crisis threatens such as during the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the riots in Poland in December 1970.

Some say the cold war is over. If by the cold war is meant:

The clash of ideas;

Differing views on the nature and interrelationship of God, man and the state; Efforts by some to force their views on others;

The pressures of nationalism; and

The maneuvering of nations seeking to achieve their ends, which in some cases is the domination of their neighbors . . . then the cold war is self-evidently not over,

and our international information programs should be structured accordingly.

President Nixon has called for an era of "negotiation not confrontation" in a determined effort to seek fairer arrangements in a troubled world. Those who support his efforts must deal with the world as it is.

For us who live in this country, it is difficult to conceive of the hunger for truth among people who have no access to truth—

Whose television, radio, newspapers, magazines and theater are total instruments of the state;

Whose educational institutions are not places in which to search for truth but in which to indoctrinate the young;

Who cannot travel abroad;

Who fear to be seen talking with foreign visitors lest they arouse the suspicions of the security police; and

Whose very thoughts of God must be in private to avoid the frowns of their authorities.

For such people to be able to hear through the miracle of radio free voices talking to them from afar is a ray of light.

To argue that the existence of such radios is a cold war anachronism is to tragically misunderstand the needs of the human spirit.

For us, as a people, to extinguish or to dim the light would not only be political folly but would be an act of shame.

MILITARY RETIRED PAY RECOMPUTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, today I have been afforded the privilege of introducing legislation recommended by President Nixon which addresses itself to the long standing controversy of military retirement and the right of retirees to recompute their retired pay as a percentage of current active duty pay.

This bill is the result of an extensive study by a distinguished commission appointed by the President to study retired pay. Though it does not represent all that retirees had hoped to achieve and, in my opinion, does not award them what they are morally and legally entitled to, it is without doubt the most practical solution to the perplexing problem of recomputation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing will allow those retired prior to January 1, 1971, the right to recompute their retired pay at age 60 if they have had less than 25 years of service and at age 55 with more than 25 years of service. In light of the fantastic anticipated costs of future retired military pay I feel that this bill is the best possible compromise with fiscal reality.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 100 years military men were recruited and continued their military service with the clear-cut understanding that their retired pay would be based upon a percentage of current active-duty pay.

In 1963 the Defense Department admitted that this right to recompute had been both a moral and legal obligation for more than 100 years. Defense Department officials stated that though the military retirement system is not a contributory system, military men, by accepting a lower active-duty pay, do achieve the effect of contributing to their retirement. However, unlike civil serv-

ice retirement, nothing is credited to their accounts and if they leave before retirement they have no equity to collect. Nor do their survivors have any right to this equity or a continued annuity. The retired military man is still subject to orders by his Commander in Chief and his retirement pay is, in effect, deferred earned pay. Let me emphasize this point—retired pay is earned pay.

In 1958 Congress, without any warning to those who had served in good faith and entered retirement status in reliance upon the moral and legal obligation of this Nation, decided to abolish recomputation and to substitute cost-of-living increases. But the Congress did not bother to repeal title X, section 6149, of the United States Code which guaranteed recomputation as a legal right. Finally, in 1963, this section was repealed and those who retired after passage of the 1958 act and before passage of the 1963 act were given the benefits of recomputing on the basis of the 1958 act. After 1963, however, they were denied this right. So today we have a situation where a man who retires prior to a pay raise will receive one level of retired pay, while another man with exactly the same length of service and exactly the same grade, will receive a greater sum simply because he retired at a later date.

If retired pay is in fact earned pay, as the Defense Department has admitted, then why should it be bestowed upon military retirees under a multiplicity of standards? This is an inequity and one which should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963 I was responsible for a House-passed amendment which would have restored full recomputation. On still another occasion the House has voted in favor of the same principle. However, the matter died in the Senate. Since that time, retirement costs have skyrocketed and as a purely practical matter we must all admit that full recomputation though justified on moral and legal grounds, is a practical impossibility.

This bill when enacted will put this problem which has been with us since 1958 to permanent rest and will establish a permanent policy for the future. I sincerely hope that the Armed Services Committee will schedule hearings in the near future. My bill will finally solve a problem which has involved the good faith of the U.S. Government, has seriously jeopardized the morale of active duty forces, and has created a discriminatory retired pay structure as between those who gave equally dedicated service to their country but retired on differing dates.

INTRODUCTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation, H.R. 14369, to modify the Economic Development Act of 1965. My aim was to expand the powers of the successful agency created by the act, the Economic Development Administration. In so doing, I endeavored to provide EDA with tools it can use to

aid economic development in urban areas without hindering or limiting highly successful operation in the Nation's rural communities.

My bill would set up a new designation category of areas impacted by rural migration and suffering substantial unemployment. It would also widen the options available to the EDA in aiding an applicant to finance a project, and would create a number of financial and procedural tools that EDA could use to great advantage in the cities.

For too long EDA has been exclusively a rural-oriented agency. I am not suggesting that it should reduce its role in rural areas, but only that it should expand its overall view to include the inner city areas that desperately need economic development and the kind of coordination that so far only EDA has been able to provide.

I testified on behalf of this amendment before my own Economic Development Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, and I insert the text of the bill and my remarks before the subcommittee at this point in the Record:

H.R. 14369

A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965

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

Sec. 101. This bill may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972".

Sec. 102. Section 101(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of a grant for a project in a redevelopment area designated as such under section 401(a)(6) of this Act in which the Secretary determines that the applicant is unable to immediately contribute the full amount of the required non-Federal share because of financial inability, he may:

"A. waive the non-Federal share;

"B. reduce the non-Federal share below such per centum; or

"C. authorize payment of the full cost of such project if he receives a binding commitment upon such terms and conditions excluding the payment of any additional charge as he deems necessary from the applicant to pay the 20 per centum non-Federal share of the project cost over the useful life of the project."

Sec. 103. Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 105. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title not to exceed \$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the final year ending June 30, 1971, and not to exceed \$800,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977. Any amounts authorized but not appropriated for a fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, may be appropriated for the succeeding fiscal year. Not less than 25 per centum nor more than 35 per centum of all appropriations made for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973, under authority of the preceding sentences shall be expended in redevelopment areas designated as such under section 401(a)(6) of this Act.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, not to exceed \$100,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June

30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, in addition to all other amounts authorized under this section, for grants for the acquisition or development of land and improvements for mass transportation facility usage in connection with projects in redevelopment areas designated under section 401(f) of this Act.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$50,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, in addition to all other amounts authorized under this section, for grants to redevelopment areas designated under section 401(f) of this Act.

"(d) Authorizations contained in subsections (b) and (c) of section 105 shall not be construed as a limitation on the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for grants to redevelopment areas designated under section 401(f)."

Sec. 104. Section 201(c) is amended by striking out everything after "Provided," and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "That annual appropriations for the purpose of purchasing evidences of indebtedness, making and participating in loans, guaranteeing leases, and providing mortgage insurance shall not exceed \$350,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977."

Sec. 105. Section 202(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 202. (a) The Secretary is authorized (1) to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to guarantee and make loans (which for purposes of this section shall include participations in loans) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, and rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings; (2) to guarantee loans for working capital made to private borrowers by private lending institutions in connection with industrial or commercial facilities in redevelopment areas upon application of such institution and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe; (3) to guarantee rentals under leases of single or multi-tenanted commercial and industrial property in redevelopment areas upon application of lessor or lessee; and (4) to insure and to make commitments to insure prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon mortgages (including leasehold mortgages) in connection with any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, and rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion or enlargement of existing buildings upon application by the mortgagee: *Provided, however,* That no guarantee or insurance obligation under this section shall at any time exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan, rental, or mortgage."

Sec. 106. Section 202(b)(7) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "twenty-five" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty".

Sec. 107. Section 202(b)(8) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof of the following: "The Secretary is authorized to contract to pay and to pay annually on such terms and conditions as he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the financial capacity of the business and the size of the loan, to or on behalf of private business entities, amounts which are sufficient to reduce by up to 2 percentage points the interest to be paid by such en-

titles on loans (including mortgages) both Federal and non-Federal, obtained in connection with projects in redevelopment areas".

Sec. 108. Section 202(b)(9) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"(9) (A) Loan assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project, and shall, among others, be on the condition that—

"(i) other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

"(ii) not less than 15 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied as equity capital or as a loan repayable in no shorter period of time and at no faster an amortization rate than the Federal financial assistance extended under this section is being repaid, and if such a loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing such Federal financial assistance: *Provided, however,* That, except in projects involving financial participation by Indian tribes, not less than 5 per centum of such aggregate cost shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization which is non-governmental in character, unless the Secretary shall determine in accordance with objective standards promulgated by regulation that all or part of such funds are not reasonably available to the project because of the economic distress of the area, or for other good cause, in which case he may waive the requirement of this provision to the extent of such unavailability, and allow the funds required by this subsection to be supplied by the applicant or by such other non-Federal source as may reasonably be available to the project;

"(iii) to the extent the Secretary finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in a particular project by other lenders and investors, and except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (ii), any Federal financial assistance extended under this section may be repayable only after other loans made in connection with such project have been repaid in full, and the security, if any, for such Federal financial assistance may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project.

"(B) In determining the loan assistance required for the rehabilitation, alteration, or enlargement of an existing building, the loan assistance needed by the individual lessees of such building may be aggregated."

Sec. 109. Section 203 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

Sec. 110. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by inserting "and" before "June 30, 1972" and by striking out "and June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and \$100,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977."

Sec. 111. Section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding a new subsection (f) as follows:

"(f) The Secretary shall designate as 'redevelopment areas impacted by rural migration' those redevelopment areas designated pursuant to section 401(a)(6) of this Act located in municipalities with a population of over two hundred and fifty thousand if he determines that the areas:

"(1) have experienced a substantial influx of persons from rural areas, and
 "(2) have experienced substantial unemployment in the total population."

Sec. 112. Section 701(4) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "made" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or guarantees made or mortgages insured".

Sec. 113. Section 701(5) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "made" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or guarantees made or mortgages insured".

Sec. 114. Section 701(6) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "made" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or guarantees made or mortgages insured".

Sec. 115. Section 701(7) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "made" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or guarantees made or mortgages insured".

Sec. 116. Section 701(9) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "made" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or guarantees made or mortgages insured".

H.R. 14369

(Remarks of BELLA S. ABZUG)

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to report to you today that I have introduced legislation, H.R. 14369, which I feel will speak to many of the problems that have been so well discussed during these hearings.

First let me tell you what my bill is NOT. The bill is not an attempt to change the focus of EDA. It is not an effort to increase funding for urban areas at the expense of rural neighborhoods. It is not a sweeping overhaul of the system, nor is it a revolutionary new proposal. Neither is my legislation the kind that will make the cities wholesome and beautiful overnight, nor will it make any big headlines tomorrow.

But it is important legislation and it is useful. What my bill will do is provide new tools to the Economic Development Administration, tools EDA can use to become effective in the cities as it is in our rural areas. The bill is a series of amendments, more or less technical, which will expand EDA powers so that its organizational talent and proven effectiveness can be applied to the cities too.

As you have heard repeatedly during these six weeks of hearings, EDA has already demonstrated its capability in rural development. It is structured to get at the root causes of rural stagnation and, with nothing more than increased funding, would be able to increase its effort there. And this is important.

As Mr. Podesta indicated was needed, my bill would increase funding for EDA Title I to \$1 billion per year up to and including fiscal 1977. Only with such guaranteed funding on a fairly long range basis can EDA make the kind of long-range planning and long-range commitment that means coordinated and well-targeted programs.

Only with enough money to do the job in enough places will EDA reach the full potential of its powers. And this year, let us not only authorize such funding, let us see that it is appropriated too; and once it is appropriated let us demand that it be spent for its intended purposes. For only then can we truly say we have made any real progress.

It has often been said, here as well as elsewhere, that the federal government already spends too much money on the cities compared to the amount it spends on rural areas. (Mr. Mizell of North Carolina, I believe, cited figures to that effect during these very hearings.) And it is true there are many programs aimed at city problems.

The difficulty is that none of these programs—from HUD, from HEW, from the Small Business Administration and the OEO—none are coordinated with any other (with the possible exception of Model Cities). Not one of these plans takes an overall view, not one is capable of drawing together the various elements of a development problem and providing aid at more than one point.

One program builds sewers, another provides health care, a third offers manpower training, another changes tax provisions. Often they work at cross-purposes. And it is further the case that the largest cities (such as my own New York) are often deliberately excluded from these programs because of the intensity of the problems and the small funding available. Yet these so-called "high risk" areas are among the places that need help the most.

That is why I have avoided setting up radically new programs, new approaches or new bureaucratic structures. As Mr. Podesta asked, EDA will not have to balloon into any superagency with vast new responsibilities. Instead, my bill provides only some tools for the existing EDA framework to exercise; new muscles, if you will, for this agency to flex in the cities.

Let me now tell you what my bill does do.

To allow more flexible targeting, H.R. 14369 would permit a new designation: one of urban areas impacted by rural migrants and therefore suffering from substantial unemployment. (This is described under Section 111 of the bill.) We have agreed here during these hearings that rural residents who leave home for lack of a job or prospects weaken their small towns by leaving. At the same time they create problems in the cities because their lack of skills often makes it hard for them to find a job in urban areas. The new designation would simply make the central city areas where these people concentrate eligible for EDA attention.

We have heard here from many able spokesmen for urban areas that a major problem for people in these impacted areas is transportation—transportation to and from possible places of employment. My bill would set aside \$150 million for grants to such areas for transportation development and other purposes. It is my position that such an investment would be more than repaid by the increased productivity of the people involved.

Further, my bill would increase the options available to EDA in another direction. At present, when the Secretary determines an applicant for aid is unable to raise the money for its share of a project fund—usually a 20 per cent share—then EDA can do one of two things. It can either reduce the amount the applicant must pay or eliminate the non-federal share altogether. In practice these things rarely happen and some worthwhile projects are stalled for very long periods while the applicants work to come up with ready cash to pay their 20 per cent of the cost.

My bill would provide a third alternative. It would allow EDA in effect to loan the applicant this 20 per cent of the funding costs, the non-federal share, at no interest, providing EDA gets in return a binding commitment that the share will be paid at a future date. This way the much-needed project can receive its initial funding and get started while the applicant is raising his share of the bill. I might point out that this provision will make it easier for rural and urban areas alike to get their projects off the ground.

Other changes I am proposing are the more technical ones. They include provision of increased interest subsidies, mortgage insurance for commercial and industrial use; and, for the first time, lease guarantees so that businesses could rent space backed by the federal government rather than having to buy it.

That latter provision would involve shopping center uses too—lease guarantees for multi-tenant facilities are included.

In determining aid needed, EDA for the first time would be able to aggregate the business loan need of all tenants of a building rather than have to deal with each one separately as is now the case. And my bill would extend the term of loan guarantees from 25 to 30 years, because that would make the effective term 40 years—with the normal 10-year extension—and 40 years is the standard property depreciation term used in most other business calculations.

So you see I have proposed nothing that is really revolutionary. These are changes in the EDA act of the kind that make progress but rarely make news. They would provide some of the weapons EDA could use for an attack on city problems, an attack as necessary as the one EDA has already mounted in the area of rural development.

And the increased funding I have included in my bill will make it possible for EDA to address itself to development problems in rural areas as it has been doing, with increased funding there . . . and for the first time also to the development of city areas.

Nothing is lost, much is gained by this legislation, and for that reason, I ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

Thank you.

THE FUTURE IS NOW FOR AMERICA'S AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, after a lifetime of work, the retired American soon learns his "golden years" are anything but golden. His income drops while prices keep climbing in the other direction. These soon become the years of despair and disappointment.

Inflation eats away at savings and pensions with a voracious appetite. Food prices and rents soar, property and sales taxes climb and medical costs zoom out of sight. About 80 cents out of every dollar the elderly have must go for day-to-day survival, such as food, housing, transportation, and medical care.

In the wealthiest nation on earth, there is no justifiable reason why millions of elderly citizens must live in or near poverty. Yet, that is just what is happening. It has been reported that 70 percent of all single women and 32 percent of all single men over age 65 have incomes less than \$2,670 a year. Couples are only slightly better off, with nearly one in four having annual incomes below \$3,000. Some 5 million or more older Americans are subsisting below the poverty level.

It has been pointed out that poverty among the aged could be wiped out for what it costs to conduct the war in Indochina for only 3 months. Medicare coverage could be expanded to include out-of-hospital prescription drugs for the price of a single aircraft carrier. A comprehensive manpower program for older workers could be established for the cost of a single submarine.

Surely a nation that has so much money to spend on the instruments of death and destruction can set aside a fraction of that sum for life and opportunity for its elderly citizens.

Low income is the No. 1 problem of today's aged population. Regrettably, the social security system has failed to keep

up with the rising income needs of the aged. Poverty is not a transitional problem for the elderly, that given present trends, will solve itself.

Because so many are on fixed incomes, they are among the first and hardest hit by inflation. If we do not enact a bold, comprehensive, and truly meaningful social security bill, many of our aged citizens may have no alternative but to go on welfare. Our piecemeal trial and error steps in this field are continually going to fail to meet the needs of the aged, 15 percent of whom are chronically ill. The ineffectiveness of our present social security coverage further regresses among minorities, where the likelihood of being poor is nearly twice as great for the white aged population and four times as great as for our total population.

I am today introducing what I feel is a much-needed social security bill which can help relieve the unconscionable state of deprivation that so many of our elderly citizens have been forced to endure for so long.

My bill provides for a 50 percent increase in benefits for the elderly, survivors, and disabled with a \$150 monthly minimum for an individual, and \$300 for a couple. A recent survey of my constituents revealed overwhelming support for this move.

This bill will lower the minimum age of eligibility for health insurance benefits to 60, a provision which is the result of good commonsense since extreme illness strikes when it can least be afforded. Millions of older Americans today postpone treatment until the crisis stage simply because they expect old age to bring infirmity and misery. Gaps in medicare and medicaid coverage also make it difficult for them to receive high-quality health services and supplies except during and immediately after hospitalization.

About half of the elderly population pay a monthly premium of \$5.60 to supplement medical care costs under part B of medicare, and this rate will go up to \$5.80 in July to an annual cost of \$69.60. Inflation, which hits hardest at those on fixed incomes like the poor and the elderly, is sure to send this fee higher and higher in the years to come. Such increases probably will force many to give up their medicare coverage, and the result can easily be catastrophic out-of-pocket medical costs. Under my bill, those earning under \$4,800 would be exempted from this payment.

Medicare protection has already eroded to the point that the elderly, as a group, are paying almost as much in out-of-pocket payments for health care now as the year before this law went into effect. Forty-one percent of their medical costs remain as a personal responsibility to be met out of social security benefits, other income, personal assets, by relatives and friends, and by their private insurance.

On the average, an elderly person pays \$791 a year for medical bills. Hospital and doctor costs are rising rapidly, well ahead of the overall cost of living. Health bills for the elderly are averaging almost \$800 million a year; nearly six times that for youngsters and triple that for individuals in the 19-to-64 age bracket. How are these people expected

to cope with this unavoidable horror? A physician's care cannot be compared with a new dress or a movie. Illness demands treatment and care now, and our sense of morality and decency cannot allow us to think of the consequences of only half-treating this problem. We must supply this Nation with workable, tangible means of quality health care for the elderly.

In this bill, unlimited post-hospital extended care services are offered with an emphasis on prescription drugs. The elderly spend about three times more per capita on prescription drugs as the rest of the population. A study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare showed that the 1970 per capita expenditure on drugs by the elderly was \$50.94, compared to \$16.29 for persons 65 and under.

My bill would extend medicare coverage to include out-of-hospital prescription drugs. This is something I have long advocated and a program endorsed by the White House Conference on Aging, the President's own Task Force on Aging, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's Task Force on Prescription Drugs, and the 1971 Social Security Advisory Council. A large portion of health care costs stem from the purchase of drugs. This is especially true of our elderly, who must spend 20 cents of their health care dollar on medicine. While the elderly represent only 10 percent of our population, they account for 25 percent of the Nation's prescription drug expenditures, or about \$1 billion a year. It is essential that we make the purchase of these drugs less of a hardship.

Aside from financial difficulties, the elderly face additional obstacles. They frequently have transportation problems and find it difficult to shop around for the lower drug prices they might be better able to afford. Oftentimes, their very illnesses present impediments to their exercising full consumer power.

This measure will not only eliminate this unfortunate use of much-needed hospital space, but will avoid the potentially tragic psychological impact that a hospital stay can have on older people.

This program would also help avoid much worry and bother for medicare patients. They would simply pay the pharmacist \$1 for each prescription and not have to worry about keeping any records, paying monthly premiums, filing claims or getting tangled up in red-tape. A person would pay for this coverage during his working years, rather than after he retires and his income is sharply reduced.

Any program has potential administrative problems, and this bill is no different. Yet, the \$1 copayment, the reimbursement directly to pharmacies, and the formulary committee proposal strikes me as offering a balance between safeguards against waste, on the one hand, and protection and convenience for pharmacists, the Government, and, of course, the elderly, on the other.

The human costs of not enacting this bill, and thus perpetuating this hardship for our elderly, are far greater than the financial costs involved. In an age when

we talk of spending over \$10 billion on space shuttles and one-tenth that amount on elaborate university campuses and Government office complexes, surely we must find the necessary funds to provide drugs for our elderly citizens.

I think my bill takes a giant step toward alleviating the inequities between what should be done and what has not been done by us.

Among the features of my bill are:

The age of entitlement is lowered to 60 for both men and women. Age 60 would be the cutoff for both men and women in computing insured status and average monthly wage.

Early retirement is a developing trend that could seriously impede attempts to improve the income position of future aged populations. However, the eligibility age would be an inducement for earlier retirement and make more jobs available to others. In recent years, more than half of the men retiring have done so before age 65.

Payment of increased benefits is permitted to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit. Persons should not be penalized for being married.

A widow's benefits are increased from 82.5 percent of her husband's payment to a full 100 percent. At a time when the insurance benefits are needed most, they should not be reduced. Present law says that if a couple receives \$150 a month and the wife dies, the husband would continue to collect \$100, the full benefits for a single person. But if he died, his widow would only receive \$82.50 a month. Under my bill, both would receive the \$100.

The earnings base is raised to \$15,000.

Cost-of-living increases in social security benefits are provided. There are two aspects to this provision: one is national across-the-board, cost-of-living adjustments. Inflation has made this imperative. The second aspect provides for cost-of-living differentials in major metropolitan areas where living costs are markedly above those elsewhere.

Dependent and surviving parents can begin receiving benefits at age 60 instead of 62. They are facing all the same problems of all the aged, too.

Age requirement for entitlement to widow's and widower's insurance benefits are lowered from age 60 and 62, respectively to 50. More of the aged in the future will be women and most of these women will be widows, many living alone. Widowers face problems in comparable sums of money.

Sisters or brothers of insured individuals are entitled to receive insurance benefits if they have reached the age of 60 and were receiving at least half of their support from the insured person at the time of his death.

The blind can refuse to accept State rehabilitation services without suffering deduction in their social security payments; they are also entitled to disability benefits after age 65. The blind should not be forced to submit to a rehabilitation program in order to receive benefits because of a physical disability.

Federal employees are permitted to elect social security coverage instead of

the present Government pension program, if they wish.

The reduction in disability insurance benefits presently required if a beneficiary is receiving workman's compensation is repealed.

Late applications for disability insurance benefits, where failure to file in time was due to good cause, will be accepted and validated.

The ceiling on outside income is removed. Because social security is insurance which the worker paid for, he should not be denied the benefits because he has provided for other income in retirement or because he continues working. If he paid for it, he should receive the benefits.

Medicare coverage is extended to the disabled under the age of 60.

Federal, State, and local employees are eligible for medicare.

The 100-day limit on posthospital extended care services under the hospital insurance program is eliminated.

Individuals with less than \$4,800 gross annual income will be exempt from paying for their supplemental medicare coverage.

Free annual physical examinations for the elderly are provided. This will encourage preventive care rather than crisis treatment, contribute to a healthier population, and could help prevent more costly illnesses later one.

Every part of my bill affords effective, tangible, and solvent ways of correcting the questions it deals with. We all face a common aging problem. We must provide and plan for a retirement period of indeterminate length and uncertain needs. In 50 years 15 percent of all Americans will be over 65; a third of these, 15 million, will be over 75. My bill will help eliminate many of the spiraling problems that have plagued our country's aged. It must be kept in mind that social security is not charity, but insurance bought and paid for by American workers.

Because the bill is so voluminous, I am inserting in the Record at this point the table of contents:

H.R. 14558

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent benefit increase with a \$150 minimum and subsequent cost-of-living increases, to improve the computation of benefits and eligibility therefor, to increase widow's benefits and provide for payment of such benefits in full at age 50 without regard to disability, to raise the earnings base, to eliminate the actuarial reduction and lower the age of entitlement, to provide optional coverage for Federal employees, and to eliminate the retirement test; to amend title XVII of such Act to reduce to 60 the age of entitlement to Medicare benefits and make such benefits available to the disabled without regard to age, to provide coverage for certain governmental employees, to include qualified prescription drugs and free annual physical examinations under the supplementary medical benefits program, and to eliminate monthly premiums under such program for those whose gross annual income is below \$4,800; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Social Security Amendments of 1972".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE I—OLD-AGE SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

- Sec. 101. 50-percent increase in benefits with \$150 minimum.
- Sec. 102. Cost-of-living increases in benefits.
- Sec. 103. Elimination of actuarial reduction in benefits.
- Sec. 104. Payment of benefits to married couples on combined earnings record.
- Sec. 105. Increase in earnings counted for benefits and tax purposes.
- Sec. 106. Age-60 cut-off for both men and women in computing insured status and average monthly wage.
- Sec. 107. Age requirements for entitlement to old-age insurance benefits.
- Sec. 108. Age requirements for entitlement to widow's and widower's insurance benefits.
- Sec. 109. Benefits for remarried widows, widowers, and parents.
- Sec. 110. Benefits at age 60 for dependent and surviving parents.
- Sec. 111. Sister's and brother's insurance benefits.
- Sec. 112. Increased widow's and widower's insurance benefits.
- Sec. 113. Definition of disability.
- Sec. 114. Eligibility of blind persons for disability insurance benefits.
- Sec. 115. Repeal of reduction in disability insurance benefits presently required if beneficiary is receiving workmen's compensation.
- Sec. 116. Validation of certain applications for disability insurance benefits filed after prescribed period.
- Sec. 117. Voluntary Social Security coverage for Federal officers and employees.
- Sec. 118. Transfer of Federal credits earned by individuals not entitled to benefits under other Federal systems.
- Sec. 119. Repeal of Earnings test.

TITLE II—HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS

- Sec. 201. Eligibility for benefits at age 60.
- Sec. 202. Health insurance benefits for disabled individuals without regard to age.
- Sec. 203. Health insurance benefits for retired Federal employees.
- Sec. 204. Retired Federal employees with duplicate health benefits coverage.
- Sec. 205. Hospital insurance coverage for certain State and local employees.
- Sec. 206. Unlimited posthospital extended care services under hospital insurance program.
- Sec. 207. Coverage of prescription drugs under hospital insurance program.
- Sec. 208. Exemption from premium payment requirement under supplementary medical insurance program in case of individuals with gross annual income of less than \$4,800.
- Sec. 209. Free annual physical examinations for the elderly.
- Sec. 210. Home maintenance workers.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 302. Recomputations to reflect new and additional benefits.

FUNDING NEEDED FOR MILK PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to extend and fund section 6 under Public Law 92-32 for fiscal 1973.

Section 6 money, originally made available in Public Law 92-32, and not publicized by the Department of Agriculture makes it possible to provide iron-

enriched milk to infants. We are particularly concerned that these programs be funded for we see reason to hope that iron-fortified infant feeding programs may prove the breakthrough to eradicating hunger among infants that school lunches have been for school age children.

Over the past 14 months the Maryland Food Committee has funded with \$35,000 two pilot programs for iron-fortified milk: One in Cherry Hill and O'Donnell Heights in Baltimore City, and the others in Anne Arundel County and the nine counties of the Eastern Shore. The programs were set up to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs in redressing infant anemia and malnutrition and to study various distribution methods coupled with nutrition education for the mothers.

The programs were administered by the Maternal and Infant Care Divisions of the Baltimore City Health Department and the Maryland State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

In Cherry Hill where the program has been in operation longest, the results have been truly remarkable. At the start of the program 40.8 percent of the infants were markedly anemic. A high percentage of the babies were smaller and lighter in weight than normal, 90 percent had some identifiable medical problem. After 4 months on the iron-enriched formula, the anemia was largely corrected and the height-weight curves were significantly improved.

The Maryland State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene is prepared to extend this program to all needy infants in the State through its well baby clinics. If "needy" is determined by State Medicaid standards about 5,000 infants would be involved; if by food stamp or school lunch eligibility standards, which would seem more logical, 13,000 infants should be reached. Family nutrition education using community volunteers and extension aides is built into the program outline.

The Congress of the United States has demonstrated in the last year, through its passage of Public Law 92-32 and House Joint Resolution 923 its very real concern for the hungry children of this country and its determination to do something to relieve the condition. It is logical and essential to carry this concern one step further and extend section 6 to provide iron-fortified milk to hungry infants.

THE TOUGH HIDE SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the Members of this House to a most serious situation, in the past few weeks Member after Member, including myself has risen to point out some of the more obvious shortcomings and failures of phase II. The implementation and administration of the guidelines has not been what anyone could mistake for a modern American success story. The irony is that in one of the few cases where controls have produced results the

results were neither intended nor desirable. I am referring to the serious crisis which has developed in our domestic footwear and tanning industry directly as a result of the imposition of price controls on hides.

I found it necessary to come to the House to discuss the seriousness of the situation because, quite frankly, I seriously doubt whether the powers that be in this administration have been too impressed with just how serious this situation is—this in spite of repeated warnings and communications from Members of Congress, including practically the entire New England delegation. I first became involved in this crisis—and I do not think “crisis” is too strong a word to use describing the situation facing the footwear industry—I first became involved in this crisis as long ago as the beginning of the year. All I have succeeded in accomplishing to date, however, is to initiate another vicious circle of buck-passing from one agency in the administration to another. The Price Commission and the Cost of Living Council have refused to budge on the matter and modify their controls in this particular instance on the grounds that an administrative remedy is available from the Commerce Department which is able to recommend to the President the imposition of controls over exports of hides. At the present, I am caught in the incredible situation where the Commerce Department refers me to Mr. Flanigan of current fame at the White House, with Mr. Flanigan very obligingly referring me back to the Commerce Department and so on and so forth.

What are the issues in brief? What has happened as a result of the controls imposed upon prices of domestic hides is that the sales of hides in this country have practically dried up because hide producers have been able to receive much better prices for their product on the world market. The reason for this, from what I have been able to determine, is that world demand for hides has never been greater and supply has never been more limited. Under the circumstances the American tanneries and ultimately the shoe manufacturers that are still manufacturing in this country are unable to compete in any way, shape, or form with the foreign purchaser. In point of fact, a number of firms have not been able to purchase hides for the past several weeks now and in at least several instances tanneries are on the verge of closing down in a matter of days. Speaking for myself and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the last thing we need in Massachusetts right now is more unemployment. What particularly upsets me and galls me in the present situation is that it is at root a manufactured crisis, an artificially created crisis for which there is an administrative remedy available—if not several administrative remedies available. Yet all I have met with in my attempts to break through the barrier of disinterestedness in the executive department here is more and more frustration and bureaucratic gobbledegook. All I have been promised for my efforts are more and more studies. To date, I have been careful about being too quick to criticize the obvious lack of progress in resolving this crisis in hopes that some-

thing could be worked out. Following Monday's meeting, however, in the form of a briefing on the Hill with officials of the Department of Commerce, I am convinced that the administration has no other intent except to study this problem to death. Meanwhile time is running out and I am fearful that what is left of the shoe industry in this country is in serious danger of total disruption. Instead of responding to a serious crisis after the fact, my hope was that the administration would anticipate the crisis.

I am sorry if I cannot place greater reliance on the promise of further surveys by the Department of Commerce before a decision is made. I can appreciate their reluctance to recommend the President placing export controls over hides. But however, understandable, reluctance can be overcome and should be overcome in emergency situations. As far as I am concerned, this preoccupation with studying the problem fits in all too well with the pattern this administration has consistently displayed where the shoe industry of this country is concerned. They are studying the industry to death. For instance, the President has had before him now for more than a year a proposal to grant the industry a measure of industry-wide relief because of the impact of foreign imports. All we have been promised is more and more consideration. Meanwhile firms and workers are still waiting for adjustment assistance. It is not surprising that I am wary of being promised that the problem will be considered and that surveys are currently underway before action is taken. Therefore, anything you, my colleagues, can do to impress upon the White House through your contacts with administration officials the seriousness of the present situation facing the tanning and shoe industry in this country would be deeply appreciated by myself and thousands of workers around the country.

COTTER APPLAUDS DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS ACTION TO END THE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely gratified by the action of the Democratic caucus today which overwhelmingly adopted the O'Neill resolution which places the House Democrats on record for the first time as desiring an end to the war dictated by congressional legislation.

The caucus further instructed the House Foreign Affairs Committee to report appropriate legislation to the full House within 30 days.

I have little doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this vote was a direct result of the renewed bombing of North Vietnam. The new rash of bombings over North Vietnam in retaliation for the attack by North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam, has made the war reemerge as a major national issue.

I, along with many of my colleagues, have been working and voting to end U.S. military participation in this war. I have supported President Nixon's troop withdrawals, although I have frequently

been critical with the pace of withdrawal and the content of the withdrawal program. The crux of the Vietnam war is that it continues to divide the American people because the United States continues to assume a major combat role in the defense of South Vietnam.

We are all constantly harassed with new plans and strategies to end the war, but in my own mind, the only condition to complete U.S. military withdrawal is the return of our POW's. I have fought and voted for this position before and I will again.

In January of this year, when intensified bombing began in Cambodia and Laos, I wrote to the President urging him to clarify his withdrawal program. I was concerned then, and subsequent events have reinforced my concern, that the retention of massive U.S. airpower and naval power signifies a continuing large-scale direct U.S. military presence for the indefinite future.

Today I reiterate my call to the President. At a time when our Nation has been torn apart by the conflict and Southeast Asia has been decimated by the war, I ask the President to address the American people about his future intentions. Our Nation cannot stand more unclear statements about “troop withdrawals” when what is meant is only ground combat troops while a vast U.S. air and naval armada is massed to save the South Vietnamese Army.

There is another matter that the President should address. His Vietnamization program allowed the South Vietnamese to build a 2-million-man army with a 500,000-man militia. This 2-million-troop South Vietnamese Army—ARVN—is not being supplied by the United States to be Thieu's palace guard; they are there to protect South Vietnam from attack. I do not condone the attack of the North Vietnamese across the DMZ, but I am terribly concerned that the South Vietnamese Army appears to have been saved only by massive U.S. air power. The President must explain how, after 10 years, the South Vietnamese cannot withstand such an attack when they have superior manpower and equipment.

I believe that the President owes the American people a complete and candid explanation of these two central issues. The American people must be told if the President plans an indefinite U.S. air and naval commitment to protect South Vietnam and a realistic report on the progress of Vietnamization.

Absent any clearly defined statement by the President on these matters, I will continue to vote, as I have today and in the past, to end the war by congressional action.

I believe that the House Democrats have today acted courageously and responsibly. By adopting this resolution, the Democrats assured that the House of Representatives will be given the opportunity to vote openly on specific legislation to end this tragic and divisive war.

On the other hand, this action by the House Democrats has reinforced the obligation of the President to clearly and precisely inform the American people about his plans for ending the war, and I am hopeful that he will take the opportunity next week to “square” with the

American people, and that, through a candid address, he can repair the divisiveness that again threatens our country.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the shock and horror which followed the announcement that President Nixon had ordered massive bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong and other areas of North Vietnam, I was reminded of several tantalizing lines from the folk song, "Blowing in the Wind."

How many years must one man have, before
he can hear people cry;
How many deaths will it take to be known
that too many people have died.

President Nixon, who was elected to office on the basis of his "secret plan to end the war," has now had more than 3 years to hear the American people cry out that they are sick of the war in Southeast Asia, which has now become the longest war in our Nation's history.

How many more deaths, how much more slaughter and destruction, will it take to convince him that too many people have already died in this senseless war?

A keen analysis of the American bombing, and the illogic of continued use of B-52's over North Vietnam, was given in this morning's Washington Post. The editorial reads as follows:

The debate on the renewed heavy bombing of the Hanoi-Haiphong area seems to us to have missed a crucial point about B-52s. These huge heavy airplanes, which carry 30 tons of bombs apiece, cannot dodge missiles the way lighter aircraft can, and they must fly at great altitudes—six miles or so—in order to avoid being shot down. For just this reason, B-52s had not previously been used in the more urban and heavily defended parts of North Vietnam.

The mysterious way in which the military finds ripe new targets sprouting after every raid, like mushrooms after a rain, should not be underestimated. But it is surely fair to insist that the administration accept the implications either of its claimed success or of an actual failure, whichever obtains. It cannot have it both ways.

Either the bombs dropped by B-52s on Hanoi and Haiphong last weekend hit their intended military targets, as the Pentagon claimed, in which case there is no further military reason to send the B-52s back; or those bombs did not hit their intended military targets, in which case there also is no further reason to send the big planes back, since the oil depots surely will have been emptied and supplies dispersed and since the accuracy of high-flying B-52s surely will not have been improved in the intervening days.

If Mr. Nixon nonetheless does decide to make further B-52 raids on North Vietnam's most heavily populated and—because of the dikes—most vulnerable areas, then he will be wide open to the charge that he is indifferent to the danger of killing civilians and destroying civilian centers and works for the sake of making a diplomatic or political impact on Moscow. This is very nearly the moral equivalent of shooting hostages. Lyndon Johnson never deliberately and consciously adopted a bombing policy which endangered civilians to this degree. He did not use B-52s as far north as Hanoi and Haiphong, as has Mr. Nixon, who is supposedly "winding down" the war.

President Nixon's resumption of wholesale bombing represents not only a renewal, but an expansion, of the discredited bombing policy of 1965-68, which proved so futile. The President's action shows a reckless disregard for the avowed wishes of the American people, and for the potentially tragic consequences which could result.

U.S. bombers rained a hail of destruction upon both North and South Vietnam from early 1965 until late 1968, with virtually no effect on the ability or the determination of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to continue the war. The Tet offensive of January 1968 bore dramatic testimony to this fact. The slaughter of innocent civilians and the destruction of homes, school, and hospitals only bolstered their will to fight.

The amount of bombs that we have dropped in Vietnam since 1965 is truly appalling. More than 6 million tons of bombs have fallen on that hapless nation, three times the total tonnage dropped by American planes in all of World War II.

More than half of this tonnage has been dropped in the 3 years since President Nixon took office.

What has it accomplished? The current North Vietnamese offensive, like the 1968 Tet offensive, does not represent the efforts of a nation bombed into submission.

Mr. Speaker, our intervention in Southeast Asia was based on a "commitment" to the Government of South Vietnam nearly 10 years ago. Have we not more than fulfilled whatever commitment or obligations we may have had?

South Vietnam, the nation for which we have expended nearly 60,000 American lives and over \$100 billion American dollars, is today pockmarked with American bomb craters. Over 150,000 South Vietnamese soldiers have been killed, another 350,000 wounded. More than 4 million persons, nearly a quarter of the population, have been driven from their homes. We have destroyed nearly 6 million acres of forests and croplands with herbicides. More than 1 million civilians have become casualties, including 325,000 killed—100,000 of them children under 13. The economy has been demolished, with a \$50 billion loss in production and damage to capital assets estimated at \$304 million. More than half of the South Vietnamese national budget today is derived, directly or indirectly, from the U.S. assistance.

Inflation has become a way of life; retail prices in Saigon have increased by over 700 percent since 1965. Black marketeering, governmental corruption, increased narcotics addiction, and prostitution are among the other "benefits" to the Vietnamese of our intervention.

Do the South Vietnamese really need or want any more of our "help"? Is any American national interest served by our continued intervention? Is the perpetuation of the Thieu government really worth more American lives and dollars?

If President Nixon really wants to "wind down the war" and secure the release of our captured servicemen, why have we boycotted the Paris peace talks?

If the Vietnamization program is working, why does the South Vietnamese

Government need our planes and ships to repel the current invasion?

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to bring this tragic episode in America's history to a close, and it is not through escalation and retaliation. Our expanded bombing can only add to the toll of innocent victims, and add to the toll of American prisoners in Communist hands.

We must act now to completely terminate our military activity in Southeast Asia and to resume negotiations at Paris for release of our prisoners.

This morning, in the Democratic Caucus, I supported the resolution offered by the majority whip (Mr. O'NEILL) and his Massachusetts colleague (Mr. DRINAN).

I have also joined with another member from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) and several other colleagues in sponsoring a Concurrent Resolution to stop the bombing of North Vietnam, to order our representatives at the Paris Peace Talks to resume negotiations, and to continue withdrawal of American forces.

The negotiators in Paris would be instructed to seek the return of all our prisoners now held captive, and an accounting of all our missing men, in return for total withdrawal of all American forces from Indo-China and a cessation of all our military activity there.

These simple steps, Mr. Speaker, offer us a clearcut way out of the morass into which we have been led, as opposed to President Nixon's policy of escalated bombing which can serve only to lead us deeper into the quagmire and invite the possibility of world war.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the text of the resolution I am cosponsoring to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and end this terrible war:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO STOP THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that, (1) All American military activity, whether land, sea or air, against the territory of North Vietnam be terminated at once;

(2) The President now order our representatives at the Paris peace talks to resume negotiations, in order to achieve the return of our personnel held captive in Indo-China and an accounting of all those missing there, in return for the total withdrawal of American military forces from Indo-China and the cessation of all American military activity in that region; and

(3) Meanwhile there be no interruption in the withdrawal of American military forces from Indo-China.

The text of the resolution adopted by the Democratic Caucus this morning reads as follows:

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS INDOCHINA RESOLUTION (ADOPTED APRIL 20, 1972)

That it is the sense of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives that in the 92d Congress the House of Representatives:

Should condemn the current military invasion of South Vietnam by the forces of North Vietnam;

Resolved, that the recent bombings of North Vietnam represent a dangerous escalation of our role in the Indochina war and a direct contradiction of the Administration's stated policy of "winding down" the war;

Resolved further, that the national interest in obtaining a permanent peace with security would best be served by promptly

setting a date to terminate all U.S. military involvement in and over Indochina, subject only to obtaining the release of our prisoners of war and all available information on the missing in action;

Resolved further, that the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives hereby directs the Democratic members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to prepare and report within 30 days legislation designed to accomplish these specific objectives.

DELAYING A POSTAL BOOST

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following editorial that appeared in the April 3 Belleville, Ill., News-Democrat. As the editorial suggests, wonderers never cease.

DELAYING A POSTAL BOOST

The thesis that wonders will never cease derives a lot of support from Postmaster General E. T. Klassen's cancellation of 450-million-dollar postal rate increase scheduled to take effect next January. As anyone who has ever mailed a letter must realize, this sort of thing is just not done in the best postal circles.

Klassen went further than simply announcing cancellation of the hike in mailing rates. Said he at a meeting of management personnel of the U.S. Postal Service, "We must learn to live within our income."

This revolutionary concept has had some lip service in the past, but Klassen put it rather more bluntly than is customary. Moreover, he proposed a course of action to follow through on the idea, notably a 90-day moratorium on hiring in the Postal Service.

Actually, the postmaster general left himself a loophole. That is, he said, learning to live within postal income "means that without impairing service, costs must be substantially reduced in order to enable us to eliminate the need for a 450-million-dollar increase next January."

The operative words are "to enable us." If it doesn't work, presumably, mail rates may still have to be jacked up in accordance with the initial plan.

Whatever happens, it is good to have a postmaster general urging the Postal Service to live within its means instead of routinely turning to another postal rate increase. The latter may be necessary in time, but economies of operation certainly will be welcome.

AEC'S 15TH ANNUAL REPORT ON PRICE-ANDERSON ACT

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act, the AEC recently submitted its 15th annual report to the Joint Committee on indemnity activities under section 170 of the act, commonly referred to as the Price-Anderson Act. A copy of the report is available at the Joint Committee offices. I should like to submit for inclusion in the RECORD a summary of highlights of the report.

SUMMARY OF AEC'S 15TH ANNUAL REPORT ON INDEMNITY ACTIVITIES UNDER THE PRICE-ANDERSON ACT

1. Effective January 1, 1972, the two nuclear energy liability insurance pools, Nuclear Energy Liability Insurance Association

(NELIA) and Mutual Atomic Energy Liability Underwriters (MAELU), increased the combined maximum amount of nuclear energy liability insurance available from the pools from \$82 million to \$95 million. Since the total of liability insurance and government indemnity fixed by statute is \$560 million, the indemnity portion is reduced proportionately from \$478 million to \$465 million. The history of the growth of the capacity of the insurance pools is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Liability insurance (pools)	Indemnity (Government)
Original.....	60	500
Jan. 1, 1966.....	74 (+14)	486
Jan. 1, 1969.....	82 (+ 8)	478
Jan. 1, 1972.....	95 (+13)	465

Effective March 1, 1972, the Commission amended the regulations and its indemnity agreements to reflect the increased private insurance. The time lag was to afford licensees a reasonable opportunity to make the necessary arrangements.

2. The Commission adopted an amendment to its regulations, an amendment to its form of indemnity agreements, and approved an endorsement to liability insurance forms to clarify the waiver of defenses provision under the Price-Anderson Act. Those provisions relate to waiver of defenses available to a party liable in the event of "an extraordinary nuclear occurrence." The changes make it clear that a licensee employee working at an indemnity site exclusively in connection with construction of a reactor for which no operating license has been issued and not involved in the possession, storage, use or transfer of nuclear materials, maintains his rights under the waiver of defenses provisions. Those provisions will also be available to workers engaged in construction of a follow-on reactor (i.e., a second reactor at an existing site) for which no operating license has been issued and to maintenance employees (even though only part-time) at an essentially completed facility pending issuance of the operating license.

3. Consistent with the Industry Credit Rating Plan the two insurance pools paid the fifth annual refund of premium reserves to 1961 policyholders (247 policies). This retrospective rating plan provides for a portion of annual premiums to be set aside as a reserve for either payment of claims or return to policyholders after 10 years. The amount of the reserve available for refund is determined on the basis of loss experience over the 10-year period. The 1971 refund was \$1,017,609 representing 68 percent of the premiums paid in 1961 and 97 percent of the reserve established from those premiums. Comparative figures for the first four refunds were:

Year	Refund	Percent of premiums	Percent of reserve
1970.....	\$784,612	67.2	96.4
1969.....	477,870	66.8	97.1
1968.....	241,209	67.5	99.2
1967.....	46,436	66.0	97.0

4. Under the Price-Anderson Act, every licensee protected by an indemnity agreement must pay an annual indemnity fee to the AEC at the rate of \$30 per megawatt of thermal capacity authorized by the license. During the year ending March 21, 1972, \$794,377 was paid to the Commission for such fees making a cumulative total paid since the inception of the program of \$2,664,553. No claims have been filed nor payments made under licensee indemnity agreements since the inception of the program.

5. The Commission established interim amounts of financial protection and interim indemnity fees for the Midwest Fuel Recovery Plant (General Electric Co.) near Morris,

Illinois. These were set at the same level as those required for the Nuclear Fuel Services plant in New York. Financial protection requirements were set at \$5 million for preoperational storage and \$20 million for plant operation. The indemnity fee was set at \$500 for preoperational storage and \$4,000 for plant operation.

VEGETABLE GARDENS AND EARTH WEEK

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during Earth Week 1972 it is especially fitting and proper to encourage the American people to plant flower and vegetable gardens. There is today a new awareness about the environment and about ecology. We have a few prophets of doom who preach gloom and disaster, but most Americans believe in the positive approach to environmental improvement.

Earth Week is a splendid tribute to those millions of concerned citizens who are doing something positive to improve the environment. There is so much that each individual can do in his own way. Some contribute by growing flowers. Our own State is especially beautiful in the spring and summer with the color and scent of billions of flowers. The fabulous gardens of the Charleston area are world famous, and in our own city of Greenwood we are especially proud of the annual South Carolina Festival of Flowers, to be held this summer on July 28 to 30.

Another splendid activity of environmental improvement is gardening. Even a small garden the size of a living room can greatly improve a diet and provide recreation which is good for the mind and physical body. Gardening is good therapy for all of us, particularly the elderly. I am especially pleased during this Earth Week 1972 to introduce a resolution to encourage each American family to grow a vegetable garden. In addition to being of great value as recreation and environmental improvement, vegetable gardening by millions of Americans will fight inflation by increasing the supply of vegetables.

We introduce this legislation during Earth Week 1972 in recognition and commendation of the millions of Americans who make positive contributions to the beauty and the environmental improvement of the United States. For example there are the millions of garden club members who are so dedicated and devoted to the beautification of our Nation.

In introducing this bill, Mr. Speaker, we encourage all Americans to follow the spirit of Earth Week 1972 and make a positive contribution to environmental enhancement.

The text follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas inflation, nutrition, physical fitness, and recreation are national concerns; Whereas a family can save on food costs, fight inflation, improve nutrition, get healthful exercise, and have fun together by planting a vegetable garden;

Whereas many citizens of the nation have already realized the many advantages of planting a vegetable garden; and

Whereas the pleasure, profit and fulfillment of growing your own vegetables has

been recognized by publications with worldwide circulation;

Whereas patriotic citizens planted victory gardens during World War II at the urging of the President of the United States for the purpose of conserving national resources and combating inflation;

Whereas our nation is currently engaged in battle against the ravages of inflation and malnutrition, and vegetable gardens are a potent weapon against both;

Whereas the American way of fighting a problem is not boycotts and is not mere passing of laws, but is self-help and unity in pulling and working together; and

Whereas the planting of vegetable gardens will provide more food for the family's budget and will increase the vegetable supply and bring food prices down for apartment dwellers without space for gardens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That each American family is urged, where practicable, to plant a vegetable garden for the purpose of fighting inflation, saving money, getting exercise, and having the fun and pleasure of family vegetable growing.

LEAA: SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, charges have recently been made in connection with the proposed but unpublished report of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations concerning the administration of the block grant programs of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—since its creation in June 1968.

The extended statement made in the other body on Thursday, April 13, by the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) contains inaccuracies of fact and unwarranted conclusions and requires a reply.

To begin with, I deprecate the political atmosphere which has been cast about the whole question of reviewing the activities of LEAA. With the public history of scandal, ineptitude, and criminality which has been revealed in many States, conspicuously Alabama, Florida, and Indiana, it was not only desirable but essential that a committee of the House charged with reviewing the economy of operation and effective functioning of Government agencies should look into the affairs of this unit of the Justice Department which had never been thus reviewed since its creation.

In addition, the escalating volume of appropriations which reached \$699 million in fiscal year 1972, a 1,100 percent increase in 4 years, demanded appropriate examination, especially in these days when the taxpayer complains increasingly about the burden and distribution of the payments exacted from him by the Government and about too frequent waste of public funds.

Unfortunately, the opportunity to discuss the problems of LEAA on their merits has been disrupted by events of the last week involving the publicity given to the report which Senator HRUSKA describes.

In this connection it is essential that certain facts be understood. First, the

draft of the report was never released outside the membership of the House Committee on Government Operations. Second, after a preliminary draft of the report had been distributed to 39 members of the full committee, someone leaked a copy to a reporter for the Chicago Tribune and stories concerning the report appeared in the Tribune on Friday, April 7, and the next 2 days. It is my understanding that the reporter who wrote the stories covers the Justice Department and the Supreme Court and not the Congress. Upon hearing of this action I immediately wired the following telegram to the publisher of the Chicago Tribune:

Publication of report of Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee on Law Enforcement Assistance Administration program is premature and unauthorized. Report is subject to approval by House Committee on Government Operations and should not have been released for publication prior to Committee approval. Release was not authorized by me.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of House Committee on Government Operations.

On Friday, April 14, 1972, I received a response from the executive editor of the Chicago Tribune which, in part, stated:

(Re:) your telegram of the 9th concerning our stories on the law enforcement assistance administration program . . . I am assured that the information reflected in these stories did not come from you.

The interviews for the CBS documentary concerning LEAA on "60 Minutes" were filmed on February 24, 1972. They were related to the hearings of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee on LEAA which were held July 20–22, 27–29, and October 5–7, 1971. The discussions were dependent upon the hearings, rather than the report for their basic facts.

LEAA knew about the preparation of the program and in fact the Administrator of LEAA consented to be interviewed for the program and played a prominent role in the telecast.

It is unfortunate that the leak of the subcommittee's report to the Chicago Tribune occurred. Such a premature leak could have the effect of minimizing the coverage which the report otherwise would have received upon official release. I believe that the leak to a reporter for the Chicago Tribune, who covers the Justice Department and not the Congress, was a calculated attempt to lessen the impact of the report and prevent it from getting serious consideration on its merits.

I regret the leak to the Tribune, but I am more concerned about the waste and ineffectiveness that has characterized too much of LEAA programs; the lax and dishonest procurement procedures at State and local levels and the exorbitant fees and shoddy work of outside consultants. I am more concerned about LEAA funds paying for an airplane used to transport a Governor, his family, and State LEAA officials around the country.

I am equally concerned about the attack by the LEAA Administrator on the integrity of a committee of Congress and its staff.

I merely call the attention of the Members of this body to Mr. Leonard's state-

ments which Mr. HRUSKA inserted in the RECORD of April 13, 1972, at pages 12659–60. His attack on the right of Congress to review the operations of executive agencies and on the motives of Members of Congress flies in the face of legal authority and shows a total misunderstanding of the role of an oversight committee of the Congress.

The Senator from Nebraska has done a public service by inserting in the RECORD the entire transcript of the interview of Mr. Leonard by Mike Wallace, which I understand took place in March 1972. It affords an opportunity, over and above what Mr. Leonard said on the air, to evaluate the accuracy of the administrator's responses. It is useful to highlight some of the responses:

First, Mr. Leonard says at pages 12653–54 of the RECORD that a prospective discretionary grant to the city of San Diego in the amount of \$920,000 for security at the Republican Convention was not published by LEAA and that the agency did not receive the grant application "until very recently."

The facts are that San Diego did submit a grant application to LEAA on December 8, 1971, in the amount of \$920,287. On November 9, 1971, Mr. Leonard had announced a grant in the amount of \$395,424 to Miami Beach for security at the Democratic Convention. In a letter to me dated December 30, 1971, responding to a series of questions I raised about the convention grants, Mr. Leonard stated:

The Discretionary Grant application of the City of San Diego was received by LEAA on December 8, 1971. That Grant Application is currently being reviewed and evaluated by LEAA staff, and no date or dollar amount of the award has yet been determined.

Second, Mr. Leonard responded to another of Mr. Wallace's questions that "handcuffs, tear gas, surveillance equipment, mugging cameras—and—all that kind of thing" purchased under the Miami Beach grant "can all be moved" to San Diego for use at the Republican Convention.

LEAA's own grant conditions on discretionary grants state that title to property purchased under such grants "vests in the grantee subject to divestment at the option of LEAA—exercisable only upon notice of 120 days after the end of the grant period—"

The time period of the Miami Beach grant is from November 1, 1971 through March 1, 1973, so it is clear that none of the equipment purchased by Miami Beach can legally be transferred to San Diego in time for use at the Republican Convention.

Third, at another point in his interview Mr. Leonard stated that "the governors have unanimously agreed to accept the responsibility for the audit function—"

In fact, responses by the Governors to a request by Mr. Leonard on June 7, 1971, for audits of the State programs, on the whole, have been negative and have resisted the Administrator's request for such audits.

The record of the subcommittee's investigation reprints 39 letters of Governors responding to Mr. Leonard's request. They are far from unanimous. In fact, many of them requested additional

payments in order to perform the auditing duties requested by Mr. Leonard. Included in that group were the responses from the States of Hawaii, Louisiana, Nebraska, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Mississippi.

Fourth, Mr. Leonard also told Mr. Wallace that possibly "a couple thousand" projects "didn't work out as well as the people who put them up thought they would."

I believe this admission, considering the amounts of money that some of these projects entail, is quite serious and underscores the suspicion that as extensive as the subcommittee's investigation was, it may only have touched the tip of the iceberg.

Fifth, Mr. Leonard characterizes Washington, D.C. as a "fine, safe town today."

While everyone is pleased when any city is able to curb the rise in crime, I believe all will agree that Mr. Leonard's characterization of the personal security in the Nation's Capital is somewhat charitable.

There is no reason why the Nation's Capital should not be the safest city in the world. Recognizing the crime problems of the District of Columbia I have consistently supported court reform, stronger criminal laws, and drug control legislation that would assist Federal and local authorities in their effort to halt the rise in crime. I congratulate Chief Wilson and his department and others in the District of Columbia criminal justice system for their efforts but any local success does not explain or justify the deficiencies which are highlighted in the report.

Sixth, Mr. Leonard told Mr. Wallace that he knew about alleged closed specifications written by Motorola Communications and Electronics, Inc. "shortly after (he) became Administrator" and that he "began to take steps to get uniform specifications."

In his appearance before the subcommittee on October 7, 1971, 5 months after he became Administrator, Mr. Leonard testified:

We have this Committee and its staff to thank for bringing this problem—closed specifications—to our attention. This is one, at least, that until these hearings got underway, that had not come to my attention. (page 689)

Mr. Speaker, other inconsistencies and inaccuracies could be pointed out. It is obvious that the Administrator is embarked on an attempt to obscure the real issue and to prevent it from being considered in a dispassionate way. He resorts to guttersnipe tactics and political obscurantism by equating the review of his agency's programs with softness on crime. This is arrogance indeed in view of the developing record. By use of such smokescreen he is attempting to defuse a thorough and fully documented report which seeks to channel more effectively the common effort to control crime. May we not get back to the real issue: the effective operation of LEAA?

OPPOSITION TO WAR IN VIETNAM CONTINUES

(Mr. KEMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, during the past week we have heard the Democratic Presidential candidates and other Democratic leaders making such rash and irresponsible remarks as: The response of the President to the North Vietnam invasion is "a moral outrage and a dangerous gamble" and "if I were President, I would end the bombing on a moment's notice," or "the only way to end the war is to recognize we made a mistake and to set a date now to terminate operations in Southeast Asia." Listen to this: "My fervent hope is that in their own decisions on the war, the leaders in Hanoi, Moscow, and Peking will not be as irresponsible as President Nixon has been." Resolutions are being introduced to force our President to abandon assistance to South Vietnam all at a time when the outcome is in doubt, and we have seen headlines entitled, "Pullout Voted by Democrats."

Suppose we do as they propose; tell the enemy we are leaving, lay down our weapons and withdraw our assistance. What then? Can they assure us our men will be unmolested—that our prisoners and missing in action will be returned? What if they are wrong? What if the enemy descends on our retreating forces as they have on South Vietnam these last 2 weeks. What if there is a Dunkirk with thousands of our young men killed and captured. Do our advocates of peace at any price have guarantees that there would not be slaughter?

Does any one doubt that the detente in the Middle East—the first such stability in more than two decades—is the result of the fact that Egypt and Soviet Russia believe that the United States will stand behind Israel in any future aggression. If peace in the Middle East is predicated on the credibility of our continuing commitment to helping Israel defend themselves, how is it that we can be less than credible in our commitment to South Vietnam to help them defend themselves.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the parallel between South Vietnam and Israel is not perfect, parallels seldom are. I recognize that Saigon has not achieved Jeffersonian democracy nor is it as responsive to the will of its people as is the Israeli Government, but nonetheless there are 18 million people who are attempting to defend themselves.

Admittedly, we have put too much money and too many troops into Vietnam in the past and that to the contrary Israel is not asking for American manpower but seeks only to purchase American firepower. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not the President who poured that money and those troops into South Vietnam; it was the party of those who, when they last held executive power in this country, gave us 550,000 troops with no plan to win the war and no plan to extricate us from the war. Their only plan was further escalation.

Mr. Speaker, I confess grave doubts about the outcome of this battle, not so much because of an unwillingness on the part of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves or the President to lend air support but because of the moral medi-

ocrity of those who cry for "peace at any price."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot declare peace from the floor of the Congress. There is no division in this country over the desire for peace, but winning the actual peace is something more difficult. It has been said that in the field of foreign policy you can choose who you want to be your leader, but you cannot choose not to have a leader. That is to say that it is the President who is our leader, and he is attempting to win the peace, not at any price, not just "in our times," as was so tragically attempted in 1939, but his aim is for peace in the years to come. These critics imprisoned by the present crisis, mesmerized by the latest headline only the "now," cannot even suspend their judgment until the battle is over.

As Secretary Rogers has said so eloquently, there is plenty of time for criticism. The President is not trying to dodge his accountability but at least we can await the outcome of this military and diplomatic challenge with some unity in this country.

Mr. Speaker, what I really find ironic is that Monday we unanimously passed a resolution on this very floor condemning Soviet Russia for its treatment of Soviet Jews. We asked that our President speak up on behalf of this oppressed minority and stand up to the Soviets to help the Soviet Jews. In the last few days, in a 180-degree moral flip-flop, many of those who helped pass that resolution are now willing to suggest that our President not stand up to the Kremlin nor to the North Vietnam invaders, and further suggest we withdraw American support for 18 million oppressed people attempting to defend themselves. If they think that this will bring peace to the world or if this will help contribute to the continuance of a detente in the Middle East, I would like them to consider the warning of the very able correspondent of the New York Times, Hanson Baldwin, who said:

If the Americans are forced, whether for military or for political reasons, to pull out of Vietnam, their defeat, however, disguised, will be hailed by revolutionaries everywhere as the final vindication of the theory of People's Revolutionary War—a demonstration that even a super-power can be defeated by a peasant army. In that event, the efforts now being made to launch such insurrections, or sustain them, in Africa and Latin-America, would be redoubled.

Mr. Speaker, I want peace as do I am sure all Americans. The American people want a peace that, as Smith Hempstone in the Washington Evening Star points out, is not a euphemism for surrender to Communist aggression. I do not doubt the sincerity of those who disagree with American policy, but I seriously question their judgment. I ask that all pay attention to the following article by Mr. Hempstone:

HEADING TOWARD A MOMENT OF TRUTH IN VIETNAM

(By Smith Hempstone)

In a number of ways, it may be just as well that the North Vietnamese launched their massive, multi-pronged invasion, now about to enter its fourth week, of South Vietnam.

With some 12 of its 13 mainforce divisions locked in combat on South Vietnamese soil, it becomes a trifle difficult for Hanoi to cling

to the hoary fiction that the conflict is essentially a civil war between freedom-loving, anti-imperialist South Vietnamese and a puppet, neo-fascist regime in Saigon.

The war is revealed finally and conclusively for what it in fact has been since the early 1960s: A war of naked, coldly calculated aggression waged by North Vietnam, with the support of the Soviet Union and Communist China, against South Vietnam, supported by the United States.

Not that this will deter Sen. George McGovern. Nor will it change the attitude of the Doomsday Gang, whose bag is denigration of their country and exaltation of its enemies. They have, after all, demonstrated an infinite capacity to believe whatever they wish against any and all evidence to the contrary: To hear them tell it, the murder of thousands of South Vietnamese civilians in Hue during the Tet offensive of 1968 was no more than a true expression of the popular will in which a few (no doubt unpleasant) people happened to lose their lives. Nothing to compare to My Lai; Oh, my no!

In the end, of course, the war will be neither won nor lost on the American presidential campaign trail, in Ivy League faculty clubs or in the newspaper columns of the mea culpa pamphleteers. It will be won or lost in the paddies of the Mekong Delta, in the mistwreathed mountains of the Central Highlands and in the twisting streets of Hue and Saigon and of a hundred nameless villages. And it will be won or lost by the only people who can win or lose it, the people of South Vietnam. American air power and (where it can be brought into play) sea power can have an effect on the outcome, but they cannot determine it.

The track record of the ARVN (South Vietnamese troops) admittedly is mixed. They have not done well in Cambodia, and rather less than that in Laos. But on their own soil, in defense of hearth and home and family (as was the case during the 1968 Tet and is so now), they have, when well led, given a good account of themselves.

And so perhaps it is just as well that the decisive campaign of the war—and who can doubt that this is it?—should come, not in Cambodia or Laos, but literally in their own backyards. And in this respect it is perhaps worth noting that the pitiful flow of refugees is not toward those areas "liberated" by the North Vietnamese but toward government-controlled sanctuaries—and no Asian peasant lightly abandons his land. That is known as voting with your feet.

Thirdly, the invasion is to be welcomed because it casts the cold light of reality upon the euphoria engendered by President Nixon's visit to Peking and his forthcoming trip to Moscow. The exchange of musk oxen and pandas is well and good but it does not alter the fact that the men in charge in Peking, Moscow, Hanoi and most other Communist capitals are a bloody bunch of cutthroats dedicated to the ultimate destruction of democracy everywhere and of the United States in particular.

And finally, that the North Vietnamese should be willing to sacrifice so much blood and treasure with the obvious intent of resurrecting the war as an issue in American politics and procuring the defeat of Richard Nixon in November can be taken as a measure of the effectiveness of the President's policy. Hanoi apparently is convinced that it has no hope of winning the war if Nixon is re-elected and that, at least to this observer, is a rather good reason why he should be.

Nobody in his right mind wants this (or any other) war to continue. But there are worse things than war, things like enslavement and betrayal and self-deception and cowardice. So the lines are drawn and the battle is joined. The distinction between aggressors and defenders is clear.

Peace is very much to be desired, but not at any price. Not the false peace of the Neville Chamberlains and the George Mc-

Governors which contains within it the seeds of later and greater conflicts. Not the peace which is a euphemism for surrender.

Indeed, one could do worse than to recall the words of Lord John Russell, uttered 119 years ago: "If peace cannot be maintained with honor, it is no longer peace." That still holds true today. Which is one reason Mr. Nixon launched the B52s against Hanoi and Haiphong.

Now that House Democrats have voted to push the end of the war issue to a full House vote within 30 days, let them consider the probable fate of the people of South Vietnam in the event of a Communist takeover. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an article written by Mr. P. J. Honey, a British authority on Vietnamese affairs:

VIETNAMESE COMMUNISM—THE FORMATIVE YEARS

(By P. J. Honey)

In the monograph that follows, P. J. Honey presents a chilling analysis of the historical record of how the Vietnamese Communist Party, the Hanoi government, and their principal leaders have dealt with the political opposition in circumstances where the Communists have gained the upper hand over the latter. His account begins with the earliest political activities of Ho Chi Minh in China, including his betrayal of the respected Vietnamese nationalist leader Phan Boi Chau to the French authorities; and carries through the grisly massacres perpetrated by the Communists in the city of Hue during the infamous Tet offensive of 1968. . . .

Mr. Honey is the first British scholar to have specialized exclusively on Vietnamese affairs. He has lived in both North and South Vietnam, and is fluent in the Vietnamese language. Formerly a Lecturer in Vietnamese at the London School of Oriental and African Studies at London University. His two books, *Communism in North Vietnam* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press 1963), and *Genesis of a Tragedy, The Historical Background to the Vietnam War* (London: Benn, 1968), are standard references.

Communism in Vietnam was the achievement of a single individual, Nguyen Tat Thanh, better known to the world by the alias he later adopted, Ho Chi Minh. He learned his trade of professional revolutionary at the University of the Toilers of the East in the Soviet Union during the early days of the Stalin era, and first applied his newly acquired skills in Canton, where he worked on the staff of the Russian Consul Mikhail Borodin. There, under cover of his consular appointment, Ho created the Vietnamese Revolutionary Youth Association, the forerunner of the Vietnamese Communist Party, and selected and trained the lieutenants who would later serve him in the titanic struggles he undertook. To understand Ho's political philosophy and methodology, one must begin by examining his thinking at that time and the techniques he employed, for he inculcated both into his disciples by word and example.

From the start, it was apparent that Ho had acquired in the Soviet Union an unshakable belief, which he retained to the end of his days, in the two basic principles of Stalinist orthodoxy:

(1) The dictatorship of the proletariat must be achieved in two stages: the bourgeois democratic revolution; and, later, the Communist revolution.

(2) Only workers can provide good revolutionary leadership, while peasants and others can never be more than "long term allies."

It was the first of these principles that determined the whole course of Ho's political activities from the 1920s to the 1950s. Unlike so many other Communist revolutionaries, he resisted the temptation to move directly towards the establishment of com-

munist. He evidently believed implicitly the warnings he received from his Russian teachers concerning the dangers of too great haste, and carried with him the lesson he learned from the Soviet experience that revolution can be successfully accomplished only if it is undertaken in two stages. All his efforts were, therefore, directed to the achievement of a bourgeois democratic revolution in Vietnam in the first instance. . . .

NO SERIOUS RIVAL TOLERATED

The bourgeois classes were never regarded as anything more than temporary allies of communism, necessary for the accomplishment of the first, or bourgeois democratic, phase of the revolution. Their role was to serve under a Communist leadership and preferably remain unaware that they were doing so, which is why communism was carefully concealed from the revolution's supporters in the opening years of the Vietnamese revolution. Bourgeois classes were never, under any circumstances, to be allowed to assume political power. Such members of the bourgeoisie as already held positions of leadership, or were even believed to possess the qualities which might make them leaders at some future time, had to be eliminated as early as possible. No serious rival to Vietnamese communism could be tolerated. Ho Chi Minh's conduct as the founder and head of the Revolutionary Youth Association exemplifies this latter principle.

HO ELIMINATES NATIONALIST LEADER

At the time of Ho's arrival in Canton during 1925, a Vietnamese independence movement already existed in southern China, organized and led by the greatly respected nationalist leader Phan Boi Chau. This organization would have proved a formidable rival to Ho's intended Vietnamese Revolutionary Youth Association, not least because Chau's face and prestige far overshadowed that of Ho. The latter therefore resolved to liquidate the movement together with its illustrious leader, and did so in the following way. Having arranged with the French Security Service to deliver Phan Boi Chau for a reward of one hundred thousand piastres—a very large sum indeed at that time, Ho invited Chau to a meeting in Shanghai. The unsuspecting nationalist leader, who had failed to remark that the meeting place was just inside the boundary of the French Concession (an area within Shanghai formerly administered by the French authorities under the old "unequal treaty" system) went to the house and was immediately arrested by French police. Ho's ally in this plot was Phan Boi Chau's own representative in Hong Kong, Nguyen Cong Vlen, who was at that time using the name Lam Duc Thu, and the two divided the reward equally. Chau was brought back to Vietnam, tried and sentenced to death for his revolutionary activities. . . .

At a later stage of his revolutionary progress, in August 1945, Ho Chi Minh was present inside North Vietnam as the leader of the Viet Minh movement he had himself created. At his disposal he had a small military force, weapons supplied by the World War II Allies, and a network of Communist Party cells throughout the country. The Japanese occupation forces had imprisoned all French troops on March 9th; and, when Japan capitulated to the Allies on August 15th, her soldiers adopted an attitude of neutrality while they awaited the arrival of Allied troops who would disarm and repatriate them. Thus the Viet Minh movement was virtually unopposed after August 15th, and moved swiftly throughout all parts of Vietnam to make itself master of the country. Within ten days it had, to all intents, accomplished this objective; and on August 29th, Ho Chi Minh proclaimed the Provisional Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

COMMUNIST PARTY BEHAVIOR HASN'T CHANGED

The very great majority of Vietnamese knew little or nothing about communism or the Viet Minh. But all were perfectly well

aware that the French were in prison, that colonial rule had, for the moment at least, ended, and that a Vietnamese government was once more in control in Vietnam. Popular rejoicing was nationwide. Ho and his Communist comrades, who were unquestionably masters of both the Viet Minh and the Provisional Government, were everywhere regarded as liberators and patriots. It is instructive, therefore, to observe Ho's action on assuming power because, although the Communist Party was then smaller, less experienced, and less organized than it now is, little change has taken place in the top leadership and there is no reason to suppose what the Party's behavior pattern at that time was markedly different from what it would be today.

The following is a description of what took place, published in the book *Histoire du Viet-Nam de 1940 a 1952* by Philippe Devillers, French writer well-known for his sympathetic attitude towards the Vietnamese Communists:

"In the villages and towns, (Vietnamese) notabilities and officials in their hundreds were singled out, molested, arrested, and even massacred by unrestrained groups led by agitators who were frequently unknown (locally), without provoking any reaction from the populace, itself generally terrorized but, on occasion, consenting. All the prisons, all the jails, thrown open at the same time, poured out on the country political and common law prisoners drunk with the thought of freedom and revenge. . . .

"People soon gave up counting the numbers of beatings, seizures, extortions of money, and 'confiscations of goods belonging to bourgeois fascists and counterrevolutionaries,' arbitrary arrests, and assassinations after (or even without) a farcical trial by hastily assembled 'peoples courts'. . . ."

The above extracts, it should be pointed out again, were written by a man widely known over many years for his sympathetic attitude towards the Vietnamese Communists and who still supports their cause with the spoken and written word today. . . .

GENERAL GIAP MAKES HIS MOVE

A year later, in mid-1946, the Communists had disposed of all the organized resistance to their regime in North Vietnam with the sole exception of the Viet Nam Quoc Dan Dang (VNQDD, the Vietnamese Nationalist Party). In July, General Giap moved his forces against these remaining opponents, and the following extract from the same book of Philippe Devillers describes the action:

"After bloody clashes, its (that is, the government's) forces retook control over the towns of Vinh-yen, Viet-tri, and Phu-tho, completely clearing the Phu-tho-Tuyen-quang-Ha-giang axis. In the Cao-bang-Land-son region they consolidated their positions. Their successes were less clear-cut in the Red River Valley; Lao-kay, on the frontier, was nevertheless occupied.

"But it was in Hanoi that the great blow was struck. A succession of police raids on VNQDD centers during July 11th, 12th, and 13th led to the arrest of about 120 people, and to the seizure of arms, documents, and materials for forging money. The offices of the newspaper *Viet Nam*, principal organ of that party, at 80 Grand Bouddha Street, were taken; far from being suspended, the newspaper reappeared six days later, but under new management and under the control of the censors. . . .

"At the end of July, therefore, the Viet Minh Government had consolidated its strength. It had practically eliminated its rivals. It no longer faced adversaries capable, without external help, of overthrowing it."

Thereafter, the ascendancy of the Communist-controlled United National Front was unchallenged, and Ho Chi Minh was able to lead the movement into a war against the now returned French on December 19, 1946, with the approval and support of the great majority of the Vietnamese people.

From then until the end of 1950, the resistance movement conducted its "anti-imperialist" struggle relatively harmoniously and with only minimal internal dissension. At the beginning of 1951, however, the Communist leadership decided the moment was opportune to shift to the "antifeudal" phase of the struggle, that is to say, to change the objective of the revolution from simple overthrow of colonial rule to the twin objectives of defeating colonialism and establishing communism. The Indochinese Communist Party, ostensibly dissolved in November, 1945, lest non-Communists be dissuaded from supporting the resistance, reappeared under the changed name of Dang Lao Dong Viet Nam, or Vietnamese Workers Party. A new slogan was adopted, "The anti-imperialist and antifeudal fights are of equal importance"; and communism became the overt controller of the revolutionary movement. . . .

THE COMMUNIST REVOLUTION

During the years 1951 and 1952, Communist Party control over every area of activity in the resistance zone was strengthened and consolidated in preparation for a campaign that might strain the Party to the utmost but which would eliminate, once and for all, the possibility of further internal challenge to the Communist regime thereafter. That was the agrarian reform campaign, an operation of some complexity for which minute and careful preparations had to be made. In February, 1953, when both peasants and traders had been reduced to a state of penury and debt by the impossibly high taxes imposed on them, a campaign of terror was unleashed by order of the Communist Party Central Committee. It lasted for fifteen days, two terrible weeks in which no single person was safe from denunciation, torture, arrest, or assassination, when indiscriminate violence raged unchecked and the Party authorities made no move to intervene. After the campaign had ended, as abruptly as it had begun, by personal order of Ho Chi Minh, every citizen was aware of, and overawed by, the might of the Party. But the two weeks of terror proved to be no more than a demonstration of what the Party could do. It imbued all with the desired dread of the Party and ensured instant compliance with Party wishes, but much worse was to follow. . . .

NORTHERNERS LINKED TO REGIME

The campaign instilled into all North Vietnamese a boundless fear of the Communist regime; but at the same time, it linked them inescapably to that regime. Were it ever overthrown or replaced by another, the people could scarcely expect to escape blame for the terrible crimes committed, since the whole populace had approved the sentences and witnessed their execution. Immediate compliance with the regime's future demands would thus be assured, and the people would feel impelled to do all in their power to ensure that this regime was not replaced by any other liable to exact punishment for the crimes. Some idea of the scale on which the murders were carried out is apparent from the disclosure by Nguyen Manh Tuong, in his address to the National Congress of the Fatherland Front (a front organization established by the North Vietnamese Communists in 1955 and designed especially to appeal to South Vietnamese dissatisfied with the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem) in October 1956, that the slogan used by the Communists throughout the campaign was, "It is better to kill ten innocent people than to let one enemy escape." No official figure has ever been divulged by the Communist authorities of the total number killed during this orgy of butchery, and none is ever likely to be; but Gerard Tongas, a French history teacher who continued to work in Hanoi until 1959, claims to have acquired accurate information on this point. He states that the campaign resulted in a hundred thousand deaths—more than double the total

American deaths in the entire Vietnam War to date.

THE GENEVA ACCORDS

Whatever Ho Chi Minh's reasons may have been, more than a quarter of a century of experience convinced very large numbers of Vietnamese of the extreme dangers that threatened non-Communists—in particular, those non-Communists belonging to institutions or organizations regarded with suspicion by the Communists, such as the Roman Catholic Church, the nationalist parties, and the like—in circumstances of unchallenged Communist domination. The 1954 Geneva Accords legitimized such domination by the Communists in North Vietnam, which is why a million North Vietnamese availed themselves of the opportunity to flee to South Vietnam. Such evidence as is available suggests that the numbers of those leaving North Vietnam at that time would have been very much greater if the Communists had honored the terms they accepted at Geneva and permitted all who wished to do so to leave the country unimpeded. In the event, however, they prevented large numbers from going, which forced some of those whose intentions were frustrated to resort to such desperate measures as putting out to sea on flimsy, hastily constructed bamboo rafts. A few were picked up by passing ships, but the numbers of those who drowned or starved can never be known.

The mass exodus from North Vietnam following the Geneva Accords was a very important propaganda setback for the Vietnamese Communists, because it proved to the watching world the falsity of their claims to the support and approval of the Vietnamese people as a whole. These people have learned from bitter experience how a numerically tiny Communist Party can, by dint of its disciplined organization and total ruthlessness in pursuit of its objectives, impose itself on a whole people.

SOUTH VIETNAM

South Vietnam remained a secondary theater throughout the First Indochina War, the main action taking place in the North. No great victories were won in South Vietnam and no Communist fief was created in any populous area there. Consequently, in 1954, the South Vietnamese people had very little direct knowledge of the Vietnamese Communist regime. For the vast majority of them, the First Indochina War was, from start to finish, an anticolonial struggle for national independence. French promises of independence were not believed by them, and the "nationalist" governments formed from Vietnamese prepared to work with the French failed to win their respect or support.

Consequently, when the Communists resumed the war in the southern half of the new divided but independent Vietnam, the insurgents were at first regarded with some tolerance by the majority of the South Vietnamese people. Certainly the guerrillas exploited their favorable image in South Vietnam, and the myth of Communist invincibility that derived from the defeat of the French Expeditionary Corps. Only the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and the North Vietnamese refugees recognized the new threat for what it was; but the latter were still occupied in establishing themselves in South Vietnam, while the government lacked the resources to counter the insurrection effectively. . . .

INSURGENTS RESORT TO VIOLENCE

But the insurgents in South Vietnam failed to find an emotive cause which would persuade the local people to support their movement wholeheartedly as they had earlier done in the war against the French. . . . Few, apart from Communist sympathizers, were moved by Hanoi's claims. While people were willing to tolerate the insurgents, they did not go out of their way to help them with food, money, or men. The insurgents, for their part, were largely dependent on South

Vietnamese assistance. Since this was not offered voluntarily, they were obliged to take what they needed by means of armed force or terrorism. At first they employed selective terrorism, killing or abducting officials, educated persons such as teachers, and men of influence. When they wished to assassinate someone publicly, as an exemplary punishment designed to cow others into submission, they tried to select victims whom they knew to be unpopular or corrupt. As the fighting spread, however, and their needs became greater, the insurgents resorted more and more to indiscriminate violence. . . .

But the overthrow of the [Diem] government had created political instability, which was worsened by the inexperience of the new rulers and by the ambitions of rival claimants to power. During 1964, coup d'etat followed coup d'etat and government succeeded government. While South Vietnam's leaders quarrelled among themselves, the Viet Cong used the opportunity to spread their control throughout large areas of the countryside. Not until early 1965 was political stability restored in Saigon. But by that time, the military situation had so deteriorated that only outside help could restore it. It was then that President Lyndon B. Johnson took the momentous decision to commit American troops to the fighting in the South and to commence a systematic bombing of North Vietnam. During the remainder of 1965 and throughout 1966, American assistance enabled the military deterioration to be halted and the situation to be stabilized. In 1967, the Communist forces were committed again and again to large, set-piece battles in which they suffered very heavy casualties because the Allies were able to bring to bear their superiority in manpower and firepower, and their monopoly of air power.

THE TET OFFENSIVE

By the end of 1967, it had become clear to the Communist leaders in Hanoi that their military strategy was disastrously wrong. If persisted in, it would lead to the early destruction of their forces fighting in South Vietnam. A change had to be made, and this took the form of massive surprise attacks on all the cities and towns of South Vietnam simultaneously. . . . To assemble sufficient troop strength for the execution of such a grand offensive, known now in the West as the Tet Offensive, the Communists were obliged to denude the countryside of cadres. In the event, total surprise was achieved, but the rest of the plan went hopelessly awry. The Communists had completely misunderstood the mood of the South Vietnamese people, failed to bring about any popular uprising against the government, and were eventually driven out of all the places they had entered, suffering huge losses in the process. Had it not been for the wildly inaccurate and alarmist reporting by the foreign press crops in South Vietnam, Tet Offensive would have been an unrelieved failure for its authors. As it was, the panic of the press correspondents was communicated to the American public, which brought irresistible pressure to bear on the President to change his policy in Vietnam. In response, President Johnson first restricted, and then ended, American bombing in North Vietnam in return for Communist agreement to participate in talks to be held in Paris. Thus the only advantage to accrue to the Communist side from the Tet Offensive came, not from their own efforts, but from the hysteria their attacks induced in the American and other foreign correspondents. Rarely in the history of modern warfare has any nation been so ill-served by its own press.

The one exception to the general military pattern was the Central Vietnamese city of Hue, which was occupied by the Communists for more than three weeks. Because the Communists controlled Hue and its population for this period, their conduct during these weeks must be examined closely.

THE TRAGEDY OF HUE

The importance of what took place in Hue cannot be exaggerated, because it provides a scale model of what would follow a decisive Communist victory in South Vietnam. The conduct of the Communist soldiers occupying that hapless city, it is true, diverged in no important respect from earlier Communist behavior patterns. But in Hue, it was subsequently possible to investigate their actions immediately after they had taken place and in the fullest detail, as well as to question eyewitnesses who watched them from beginning to end. This writer was present in Hue during September, 1970, and was able both to inspect the locations where the events unfolded and to question witnesses of them. This is what happened.

COMMUNISTS OCCUPY HUE

A Communist force of twelve thousand soldiers, most of them North Vietnamese regulars, attacked and occupied the city of Hue on the night of January 30, 1968. The Communists remained there for 26 days before finally being driven out. Numbers of South Vietnamese, soldiers and civilians, were killed in the course of the fighting, their bodies being readily identifiable as battle casualties by the wounds or the circumstances of death. Others were deliberately assassinated by the order of 150 civilian cadres who concerned themselves with the civil population of Hue while the soldiers were occupied with their military duties. Because no Communist official would dare to execute such a methodical preplanned campaign without authority, it may safely be assumed that these 150 men carried out an action program expressly ordered by their Communist Party superiors. Not all of them entered Hue with the soldiers, for some were already living in the city as part of the Communist infrastructure there. The majority of the 150 were locally born men, natives of Thuathien Province, and well acquainted with the city and its inhabitants.

HOLD KANGAROO COURTS

During the first days of the occupation, the cadres rounded up numbers of residents, whose names and addresses were contained in lists prepared before the Communist attack, and brought them before "kangaroo" courts. The "trials" lasted about ten minutes each, and all the accused were found guilty of being "enemies of the revolution." Sentence—always execution—was carried out at once, and the bodies were either buried or returned to their families. The victims were civil servants, military officers and NCOs, teachers, doctors, and religious figures; in fact, the leading members of Hue's citizenry. Once these individually named individuals had been eliminated, the cadres commenced a second roundup, this time working from a list of professions, occupations, organizations, groupings, and social classes, not of individual names. The second purge was patently designed to eliminate those whose social class, occupation, or association rendered them, in Communist eyes, a potential opposition to communism in the future, which is why so many non-political persons—even children and students—were killed. Because of its nature, the second purge eliminated some who, though they belonged to suspect groups, had been active supporters of the Communist cause in Hue. Some two thousand people were eliminated in this campaign.

MANY PEOPLE "DISAPPEAR"

Throughout the final week of the Communist occupation of Hue—they were driven out on February 24th—the cadres arrested and marched away many hundreds of citizens after first informing them that they were being taken for political indoctrination. Sometimes those arrested were known to the cadres and were addressed by name, but at other times the arrests appeared to be haphazard, as when the four hundred persons sheltering in a Roman Catholic church in

Phu-cam district were marched away *en bloc*. There has since been speculation that those arrested during the closing days of the occupation were taken because they were in a position subsequently to identify the cadres of the local Communist infrastructure, and therefore had to be eliminated. But this is no more than speculation, and several other possible explanations would equally well fit the circumstances. At any rate, the people were arrested and were not seen afterwards. Relatives and friends continued to hope that they were prisoners of the Communists and still alive.

Two days after the expulsion of the Communists, seventy bodies were discovered in the grounds of Gia Hoi school. In the ensuing months, eighteen further burial sites yielded another 1,030 bodies. A year later, more mass graves were discovered accidentally at Phu-thu, some miles from the city, and were found to contain 809 bodies. Not until late September 1969, was another mass grave found, this time in the inaccessible Da-mai Valley, as a result of information supplied by Communist defectors. By then the bodies had decomposed so much as to be unrecognizable, but 250 skulls were discovered. Although the city of Hue lost 4,800 citizens dead or missing in the successive purges, by no means all of these have yet been found, and more graves may still come to light. Hope that the missing who are still unaccounted for may yet be alive has now been abandoned.

NO WORD OF REGRET

These happenings took place within the space of 26 days in a city from which the Communists had always known they would be expelled. The arrests and killings were carried out on orders from the Communist leadership, coldly and deliberately, in accordance with prearranged plans. Any possibility that some terrible mistake had been made, that the local cadres had erred or exceeded their orders, was dispelled by subsequent references to the events made by the Vietnamese Communist press and radio. Typical of such comment was a broadcast on Communist Liberation Radio on April 26, 1968, while the mass graves were still being uncovered. It stated that those killed were "hooligan lackeys who owed blood debts to their compatriots, and who were annihilated by the Southern armed forces and people in the early spring." There was no word of regret.

COMMUNISM DOES NOT LIBERATE

The prevalence of famine, disease, and flood in many parts of Asia has made premature, violent death all too common a phenomenon, and engendered in the people a stoical acceptance of what cannot be avoided. The fatalism of Asians in the face of frightful disasters never fails to amaze Westerners. But despite this inbred tolerance to adversity, the systematic and unfeeling massacre of so many ordinary residents of Hue struck horror and revulsion into the people of South Vietnam. Those Hue citizens questioned by this writer professed, in addition, incomprehension; they simply did not understand how Vietnamese people could behave in so brutal a fashion to their compatriots. For them, the massacre provided incontrovertible proof that the Communist insurrection had abandoned all pretense of seeking to liberate the people of South Vietnam, and was undisguisedly attempting to establish an oppressive and intolerant Communist dictatorship. . . .

The tightly controlled information media of North Vietnam have been saying it [that a decisive Communist victory would result in a bloodbath] for several years. Hanoi Radio, to cite one typical example, in a broadcast on September 18, 1969, cited the following words of Politburo member Truong Chinh: "It is absolutely necessary for the people's democratic dictatorships to use violence against counterrevolutionaries and exploiters who refuse to submit to reform.

Therefore, we must pay continuous attention to consolidating the repressive apparatus of the people's democratic state, the people's army, the people's police, the people's control institute, the people's tribunal, and so forth." The same radio station, broadcasting on March 21, 1968, said: "All citizens are bound to take an active part in denouncing counterrevolutionary elements, in providing dictatorial organs with evidence and documents, in supervising punishment . . . of counterrevolutionary elements." North Vietnamese press and radio have referred to all in South Vietnam who have opposed the Communist insurrection as "hooligans," "lackeys," "exploiters," "counterrevolutionaries," and the like, and have repeatedly mentioned the "blood debts" such persons have incurred. Solemn promises are constantly made that full payment of those debts will be exacted. Historical precedent and recent example make it impossible to doubt that the Communist leaders intend to keep their word.

CONCLUSION

Should the Vietnamese Communists win undisputed control of South Vietnam, either by military victory or through a "coalition government" in the fashion of some countries of eastern Europe, they will act exactly as they have done in the past. They will seize control of all South Vietnamese information media and use them for their own purposes. They will expel the foreign press corps and all other foreigners, and will then close the frontiers of the state. Once all non-Vietnamese witnesses have been removed, they will proceed to exact payment of the "blood debts." In a deliberately created atmosphere of terror, they will establish thousands of *ad hoc* "people's courts," before which will be arraigned all those individuals and groups the Party has decided to eliminate. Those unfortunates will be accused of "crimes" which have no existence in civilized societies. They will face charges of being "counterrevolutionaries," "enemies of the people," "exploiters of the people" and a host of similar meaningless things, and they will be found guilty by jurors too terrified to do anything but obey the orders of Party cadres. All believed to pose a threat, real or potential, to the Communist regime will be killed at once, and some of the remainder may be permitted to postpone execution as long as they continue to work as unpaid slave laborers. Calculated on the basis of past Communist deeds, and given the size of South Vietnam's population, the minimum number of those to be butchered will exceed one million and could rise to several times that figure. While the massacre is in progress, the outside world will know nothing of it, for foreigners will have been expelled and no mention will be made by the Communist information media. Because the battles will be over and the big guns will have ceased to fire, peace will be said to have returned once more to Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will include an editorial appearing in the April 18, 1972, Buffalo Evening News. I am very proud to call attention to this editorial because it is from my home town paper and shows a keen analysis of the sensitive and critical issues involved in the bombing response.

The article discusses the risks of total South Vietnamese collapse; the risks to the end of the American involvement; and the political risks to the President. The column points up the fact that the President, fully aware of these risks has made his decision, and is deserving of "all the homefront trust and support he can get."

NIXON NEEDS CRISIS BACKING

The intensity of the administration's responses, both verbal and military, makes it clear how deeply President Nixon is con-

vinced that the massive Soviet-supported North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam has confronted both his summit diplomacy and his effort to settle the Vietnam war with a new kind of acid test. It is a test on which he plainly feels that an American under-reaction would, at this moment, incur graver long-run risks than would an over-reaction.

The risks in the latter course, both to his over-all foreign policy and to his domestic re-election prospects, are certainly as obvious to Mr. Nixon as they are to his Senate and other critics, who have wasted no time in denouncing his bombing response as "reckless" and in decrying what they fear may be a new start down the old Johnson road of endless war.

It is the opposite risks, however, which the President is in a better position to weigh than we are, and which he evidently deems the more dangerous. These presumably include the risk of a South Vietnamese collapse if our air power does not sufficiently blunt the Hanoi invasion, and the risks to our remaining forces in event of such a collapse, or even a major, demoralizing setback. And they may include a series of wider and subtler risks to the Nixon negotiating position at Moscow on such sensitive and vital issues at the Middle East and strategic arms limitations.

Under the circumstances, the American public, as much as it wants the U.S. involvement in this tragic conflict to end, has little choice but to stand behind the President and trust him to do his best to steer us safely through it.

Even the War Powers Act just passed by the Senate, in a proper effort to revitalize the participatory role of Congress in underwriting long-term war-type commitments, recognizes clearly that the President must be free to make the initial responses to any grave foreign threat to our security as he perceives it.

President Nixon on his record of steadily diminishing the American troop commitment to Vietnam, moreover, is entitled to be believed now when his leading foreign policy spokesman declared that an administration which has withdrawn a net total of 450,000 ground troops from Vietnam has no intention of reversing that process.

As was the case in the 1970 incursion into Cambodia, so this latest seeming re-escalation of enemy provocation and U.S. response can be better judged in its immediate aftermath. Suffice it to say that the President knows well the political risks of any course that would reverse his long-term commitment to wind down the war. As recently as last January, he had declared flatly that "Vietnam will not be an issue in the (1972) campaign because we will have brought the American involvement to an end." Hopefully, this can still be the case.

Faced with Hanoi's Moscow-armed and Peking-prodded all-out invasion of the South, the President had to weigh the grave risks of over-reacting against those of under-reacting. He has set his course fully aware, we must assume, of the varied dangers thereby incurred. While the outcome hangs in the balance, the President needs—and on his record, deserves—all the home-front trust and support he can get.

URGING THAT THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT CEASE PERSECUTION OF SOVIET JEWS

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

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, illness prevented my presence on the House floor on Monday, April 17, 1972. I deeply regret that I was, therefore, unable to cast my vote in

favor of House Concurrent Resolution 471, calling on the President to urge that the Soviet Government cease the persecution of Soviet Jews.

My record, however, is clearly in support of these efforts. Shocked by the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union and realizing that many of these people are seeking a haven from persecution, last May I introduced the Soviet Jews Relief Act of 1971, H.R. 8488. This measure would authorize 30,000 special immigrant visas for Soviet Jews who are heads of households. Their spouses and children would be issued visas to emigrate to the United States without numerical limitation.

Before then Commerce Secretary Stans visited the Soviet Union in November, I signed a telegram to him urging that he impress upon Soviet officials the deep concern of the American people for the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. The telegram also called on Secretary Stans to urge that the U.S.S.R. guarantee to Soviet citizens the right to practice their religion and preserve their traditions without fear of reprisal or threat of harm, and to emigrate to other lands if they desire to do so.

In February of this year, I cosponsored the Soviet Refugee Assistance Act of 1972, H.R. 13022, which would authorize \$85 million for assistance to Soviet Jewish refugees resettling in Israel. It is estimated that Israel will receive 40,000 to 60,000 new refugees this year from the U.S.S.R. alone, placing a severe burden on the already strained Israeli economy.

President Nixon will have a significant opportunity to urge Soviet leaders to reverse their repressive policies during his forthcoming visit in Moscow. For this reason, I joined in petitioning the President this month:

To help free Jewish prisoners of conscience and to help Soviet Jews achieve the fundamental right to live as Jews and to leave for Israel and elsewhere.

The complete text of this communication follows:

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: In the interest of peace and the easing of world tensions we, the undersigned, welcome your forthcoming trip to Moscow. We also urge you to take advantage of this unique opportunity and to help redeem Soviet Jews, thus fulfilling the hopes of millions of Americans who have labored on their behalf.

Mr. President, we respectfully petition you on behalf of three million Soviet Jews. We urge you to be their advocate and to convey to Soviet leaders the concern of millions of Americans, and people of good will everywhere, over an oppressed minority which faces discrimination, and is prevented from perpetuating its history, its culture and its ancient religious heritage. Nearly forty of its finest young people are in Soviet prison camps because they sought to live as Jews, while other seeking to emigrate are harassed. If some succeed in departing it is only after months of struggle and of deprivation.

Mr. President, we urge you to exert your influence to help free Jewish prisoners of conscience and to help Soviet Jews achieve the fundamental right to live as Jews and to leave for Israel and elsewhere.

HENRY HELSTOSKI,
Member of Congress.

LEAD POISONING

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to protect game and wildlife resources by prohibiting the use of lead shot for hunting on public lands. The problem simply is that 2 to 3 percent of the waterfowl population dies annually due to lead poisoning. This represents more than a million birds when waterfowl populations are high. Lead pellets have also been found in the gizzards of rails, although significant poisoning has not been demonstrated. It is, however, reasonable to assume that mortality occurs.

Lead shot are ingested—either as food or grit—and eroded due to chemical and physical abrasion in the gizzard. Subsequent assimilation of lead into the blood stream causes poisoning. Poisoning affects the blood, the liver, the kidneys, the brain, and the vascular system. Acute toxicity results in rapid death. Chronic toxicity is prolonged and may or may not result in death directly attributable to lead—in other words, sick ducks may be subject to increased predation by natural predators or man. Chronic toxicity is evidenced by apparent starvation, and ducks may not die for 60 days. Ducks lose 30 to 60 percent of original body weight, and finally die if the lead pellets are not voided from the gizzard. Obviously, the greater the number of lead shot in the gizzard, the greater the likelihood that a duck will die of acute effects of lead.

Lead pellets are deposited in the environment by hunters, and current estimates are that about 6,000 tons of shot are deposited annually. Certainly, most of this is deposited in marshes and other aquatic or semiaquatic areas where it may remain available to waterfowl and other marsh birds such as rails. Depending on the bottom type, shot may sink out of reach of waterfowl or may remain on the surface and become concentrated, thereby serving as a death trap.

A substitute for lead shot is available: soft-iron shot. Soft-iron shot has been proven to be nontoxic to waterfowl and is suitable ballistically, that is, the killing power of size No. 4—that size often used for ducks and geese—is comparable to that of lead shot up to about 50 yards and crippling losses are not increased.

Use of iron shot should be required in marshes and other aquatic areas. Size No. 4 shot is certainly suitable for most, if not all waterfowl hunting. The target date for the switchover should be the 1973 hunting season, with regulations prohibiting all but iron shot in connection with hunting primarily in and around aquatic areas.

I am hopeful Congress can act on this legislation, for it is needed if we are to maintain our present numbers of waterfowl.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, 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:

Mr. RANDALL, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNGATE, for 60 minutes, May 1, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. ESCH, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUBSER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 15 minutes, April 24.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MITCHELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for 5 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. RAILSBACK in four instances.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mr. MALLARY.

Mr. THONE.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
Mr. BEGICH in five instances.
Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

stances.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in three instances.

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. REUSS in six instances.

Mr. LENNON.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. BURTON in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. COTTER in three instances.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. RONCALIO.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution to urge each American family to plant a vegetable garden; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution relating to the furnishing of Secret Service protection to major presidential and vice presidential candidates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8817. An act to further cooperative forestry programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1989. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the renewal of certain start route contracts; and

S. 3153. An act to amend the Act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91-660; 84 Stat. 1967). An Act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 19, 1972, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10344. An act to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the Interstate Compact on Mental Health.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 24, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES DURING 1971 AS REQUIRED BY THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 86-472 AND BY PUBLIC LAW 86-628

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of

1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds.

The required reports for travel during 1971 are submitted herewith:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 22, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Joseph P. Vigorito:												
Italy	Lira	11/7	11/15	9	30,600	\$50.00	275,400	\$450.00	8,700	\$13.96	284,100	\$463.96
Plane transportation	D. mark								3,515.55	1,019.00	3,515.55	1,019.00
Hon. Robert B. Mathias:												
Italy	Lira	11/12	11/20	9	30,600	50.00	275,400	450.00	3,515.55	1,019.00	275,400	450.00
Plane transportation	D. mark										3,515.55	1,019.00
Allan Watson:												
Italy	Lira	11/7	11/12	6	30,600	50.00	183,600	300.00	3,038	4.88	186,638	304.88
Plane transportation	D. mark								3,515.55	1,019.00	3,515.55	1,019.00
Total						50.00		1,200.00		3,075.84		4,275.84

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
Mar. 8, 1972.

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

RECAPITULATION

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Full committee	Dollar						\$1,065.41		\$1,800.04		\$2,900.31	
Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection Subcommittee	Dollar						150.00				150.00	
Defense Subcommittee	Dollar						1,644.37		3,433.24		5,077.61	
Foreign Operations Subcommittee	Dollar; Egyptian Pounds						3,215.00		6,834.47		10,049.47	
HUD-Space-Science-Veterans Subcommittee	Dollar						5,963.50		11,160.67		\$17,188.26	
Interior Subcommittee	Dollar						486.00		949.80		1,435.80	
Military Construction Subcommittee	Dollar						1,053.02		2,142.88		3,195.90	
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee	Dollar						5,915.50		13,017.38		18,932.88	
Transportation Subcommittee	Dollar						321.00		165.80		486.80	
Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Subcommittee	Dollar						648.00		1,666.00		2,314.00	
Surveys and Investigations Staff	Dollar						12,563.25		25,074.67		37,637.92	
Appropriations Committee, total							33,025.05		66,244.95		\$99,368.95	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

² Does not add due to miscellaneous entries.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (FULL COMMITTEE), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Charlotte Reid:												
United States	Dollar		12/27	1 1/2		\$35.00		\$17.50		\$10.75		\$28.25
Italy	Dollar	12/28	1/2	5		31.00		155.00		64.10		219.10
Denmark	Dollar	1/2	1/5	4		34.00		136.00		56.00		192.00
Finland	Dollar	1/5	1/7	2		32.00		64.00		74.53		138.53
U.S.S.R.	Dollar	1/7	1/10	3		35.00		105.00		3.00		108.00
Germany	Dollar	1/10	1/13	3		30.00		90.00		111.86		201.86
Switzerland	Dollar	1/13	1/15	1		34.00		34.00		97.73		131.73
United Kingdom	Dollar	1/15	1/16	2		36.00		72.00		65.90		137.90
Miscellaneous	Dollar											34.86
Air transportation	Dollar									1,310.00		1,310.00
Subtotal								673.50		1,793.87		2,502.23

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (FULL COMMITTEE), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Louis Stokes:												
United States	Dollar		3/1	1½		35.00		17.50		(*)		\$17.50
Liberia	Dollar	3/2	3/3	2		37.00		74.00				74.00
Ivory Coast	Dollar	3/3	3/5	2		34.00		68.00				68.00
Ghana	Dollar	3/5	3/7	1½		50.00		75.00				75.00
Subtotal								234.50				234.50
Hon. Bob Casey: France	Dollar	9/2	9/10	9				157.41		6.17		*\$163.58
Subtotal								157.41		6.17		163.58
Full committee, total								1,065.41		1,800.04		2,900.31

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.* Round-trip transportation to Africa provided at other-than-Government expense.
* For expenses not otherwise reimbursed.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William J. Scherle: Germany	Dollar	6/13	6/17	5		\$30.00		\$150.00		(*)		\$150.00
Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Subcommittee, total								150.00				150.00

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* Transportation at other-than-Government expense.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. George H. Mahon:												
United States	Dollar		1/2	1				\$3.00				\$3.00
Spain	Dollar	1/3	1/6	3½				74.65				74.65
Italy	Dollar	1/6	1/10	4				103.40		\$44.61		148.01
Germany	Dollar	1/10	1/14	4				34.89		15.85		50.74
Belgium	Dollar	1/14	1/16	2				46.57				46.57
England	Dollar	1/16	1/18	2				52.81				52.81
United States	Dollar	1/18		½				1.00				1.00
Transportation	Dollar									* 934.50		934.50
Subtotal								316.32		994.96		1,311.28
Hon. William E. Minshall:												
United States	Dollar		5/20	1		\$35.00		35.00				35.00
Spain	Dollar	5/21	5/23	3		28.00		84.00				84.00
Germany	Dollar	5/24	5/26	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
France	Dollar	5/27	5/29	3		40.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	5/30	6/1	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Transportation	Dollar									* 888.40		888.40
Subtotal								437.00		888.40		1,325.40
Mr. John M. Garrity:												
United States	Dollar		5/20	1		35.00		35.00				35.00
Spain	Dollar	5/21	5/23	3		28.00		84.00				84.00
Germany	Dollar	5/24	5/26	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
France	Dollar	5/27	5/29	3		40.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	5/30	6/1	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Transportation	Dollar									* 888.40		888.40
Subtotal								437.00		888.40		1,325.40
Hon. John J. Rhodes:												
Spain	Dollar	8/6	8/9	4		32.00		128.00				128.00
Italy	Dollar	8/10	8/12	3		38.00		114.00				114.00
Malta	Dollar	8/13	8/13	1		26.00		26.00				26.00
England	Dollar	8/14	8/15	2		36.00		72.00				72.00
Transportation	Dollar									559.58		559.58
Subtotal								340.00		559.58		899.58
Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes:												
Malta	Dollar	8/24	8/25	1				25.00				25.00
Italy	Dollar	8/25	8/25	1				20.00		101.90		121.90
Spain	Dollar	8/26	8/30	5				69.05				69.05
Subtotal								114.05		101.90		215.95
Defense Subcommittee, total								1,644.37		3,433.24		5,077.61

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* Transportation partially furnished by Government-owned aircraft and vehicles.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency
Hon. Garner E. Shriver:											
United States	Dollar		1/2	1		\$35.00		\$35.00			\$35.00
Japan	Dollar		1/3	2		31.00		62.00			62.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1/5	3		36.00		108.00			108.00
Thailand (Bangkok)	Dollar		1/8	2		28.00		56.00			56.00
Australia	Dollar		1/10	3		31.00		93.00			93.00
New Zealand (Auckland)	Dollar		1/13	2		31.00		62.00			62.00
United States	Dollar		1/15	5		35.00		175.00			175.00
Transportation	Dollar									\$1,378.13	1,378.13
Subtotal								591.00		1,378.13	1,969.13
Hon. Otto E. Passman:											
United States	Dollar		2/14	1		35.00		35.00			35.00
Switzerland	Dollar		2/17	3		34.00		102.00			102.00
France (Paris)	Dollar		2/18	2		38.00		76.00			76.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,201.60	1,201.60
Subtotal								213.00		1,201.60	1,414.60
Mr. Donald E. Richbourg:											
United States	Dollar		2/14	1		35.00		35.00			35.00
Switzerland	Dollar		2/17	3		34.00		102.00			102.00
France (Paris)	Dollar		2/18	2		38.00		76.00			76.00
Transportation	Dollar									983.75	983.75
Subtotal								213.00		983.75	1,196.75
Hon. Clarence D. Long:											
United States	Dollar		4/1	1		35.00		35.00			35.00
United Arab Republic	Dollar		4/2	5		50.00		250.00			250.00
Ethiopia	Dollar		4/7	2		28.00		56.00			56.00
Kenya (Nairobi)	Dollar		4/9	5		30.00		150.00			150.00
Ethiopia	Dollar		4/14	1		28.00		28.00			28.00
Israel	Dollar		4/15	3		50.00		150.00			150.00
Italy	Dollar		4/18	1		31.00		31.00			31.00
Transportation	Egyptian Pounds									812.00	812.00
Subtotal								700.00		812.00	1,512.00
Hon. Edward R. Roybal:											
Mexico, D. F.	Dollar		5/5	2½		30.00		75.00			75.00
Transportation	Dollar									503.73	503.73
Subtotal								75.00		503.73	578.73
Hon. William D. Hathaway:											
Mexico, D. F.	Dollar		5/5	2½		30.00		75.00			75.00
Transportation	Dollar									339.00	339.00
Subtotal								75.00		339.00	414.00
Hon. Robert C. McEwen:											
Mexico, D. F.	Dollar		5/5	3		30.00		90.00			90.00
Transportation	Dollar									339.00	339.00
Subtotal								90.00		339.00	429.00
Hon. Clarence D. Long:											
United States	Dollar		8/10	1		35.00		35.00			35.00
Colombia	Dollar		8/10	9		30.00		270.00			270.00
Aruba	Dollar		8/19	4		44.00		176.00			176.00
Venezuela	Dollar		8/23	3		35.00		105.00			105.00
Barbados	Dollar		8/27	3		35.00		105.00			105.00
United States	Dollar		8/30	1		35.00		35.00			35.00
Transportation	Dollar									705.15	705.15
Subtotal								726.00		705.15	1,431.15
Hon. Edward R. Roybal:											
Venezuela	Dollar		8/22	6		35.00		210.00			210.00
Trinidad	Dollar		8/28	2		33.00		66.00			66.00
Barbados	Dollar		8/30	1		35.00		35.00			35.00
French West Indies (Martinique)	Dollar		8/31	1		36.00		36.00			36.00
Puerto Rico (San Juan)	Dollar		9/1	2		42.00		84.00			84.00
Jamaica	Dollar		9/3	2		33.00		66.00			66.00
United States	Dollar		9/5	1		35.00		35.00			35.00
Transportation	Dollar									572.11	572.11
Subtotal								532.00		572.11	1,104.11
Foreign Operations Subcommittee, total								3,215.00		6,834.47	10,049.47

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUD-SPACE-SCIENCE-VETERANS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency
Hon. Robert Giaimo:											
United States	Dollar		12/27	1½		\$35.00		\$17.50			\$27.60
Italy	Dollar		12/28	8		31.00		248.00			322.10
Denmark	Dollar		1/4	1		34.00		34.00			57.55
Finland	Dollar		1/5	2		32.00		64.00			116.38

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUD-SPACE-SCIENCE-VETERANS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Robert Giaimo—Continued													
U.S.S.R.	Dollar	1/7	1/10	3		\$35.00		\$105.00		\$3.00		\$108.00	
Germany	Dollar	1/10	1/13	3		30.00		90.00		111.86		201.86	
Switzerland	Dollar	1/13	1/15	1		34.00		34.00		95.48		129.48	
United Kingdom	Dollar	1/15	1/16	2		36.00		72.00		65.25		137.25	
Miscellaneous	Dollar											36.49	
Air transportation	Dollar									1,310.00		1,310.00	
Subtotal								664.50		1,745.72		2,446.71	
Hon. Joseph McDade:													
United States	Dollar		1/2	1½		35.00		17.50		12.00		29.50	
Ireland	Dollar	1/3	1/4	1		34.00		34.00		18.35		52.35	
United Kingdom	Dollar	1/4	1/5	1		36.00		36.00		6.00		42.00	
Denmark	Dollar	1/5	1/6	1		34.00		34.00		7.05		41.05	
Finland	Dollar	1/6	1/7	2		32.00		64.00		52.38		116.38	
U.S.S.R.	Dollar	1/7	1/10	3		35.00		105.00		3.00		108.00	
Germany	Dollar	1/10	1/13	3		30.00		90.00		111.86		201.86	
Switzerland	Dollar	1/13	1/15	1		34.00		34.00		97.73		131.73	
United Kingdom	Dollar	1/15	1/16	2		36.00		72.00		76.15		148.15	
Miscellaneous	Dollar											27.60	
Air transportation	Dollar									1,218.80		1,218.80	
Subtotal								486.50		1,603.32		2,117.42	
Hon. David Pryor:													
Denmark	Dollar	2/3	2/6	4		34.00		136.00		77.70		213.70	
France	Dollar	2/7	2/11	4½		38.00		180.50		76.00		256.50	
Excess luggage	Dollar									36.65		36.65	
Subtotal								316.50		190.35		506.85	
Hon. George E. Shipley:													
United States	Dollar		5/31	1½		35.00		17.50				17.50	
England	Dollar	6/1	6/1	1		36.00		36.00				36.00	
Spain	Dollar	6/2	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00	
France	Dollar	6/4	6/6	3		40.00		120.00				120.00	
Air transportation	Dollar									907.00		907.00	
Subtotal								229.50		907.00		1,136.50	
Hon. Robert N. Giaimo:													
United States	Dollar		5/27	1½		35.00		17.50				17.50	
England	Dollar	5/31	6/1	2		36.00		72.00				72.00	
Spain	Dollar	6/2	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00	
France	Dollar	6/4	6/6	3		40.00		120.00				120.00	
Air transportation	Dollar									992.00		992.00	
Subtotal								265.50		992.00		1,257.50	
Hon. Joseph M. McDade:													
United States	Dollar		5/28	1½		35.00		17.50				17.50	
England	Dollar	5/31	6/1	2		36.00		72.00				72.00	
Spain	Dollar	6/2	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00	
France	Dollar	6/4	6/6	3		40.00		120.00				120.00	
Air transportation	Dollar									877.00		877.00	
Subtotal								265.50		877.00		1,142.50	
Mr. Hunter Spillan:													
United States	Dollar		5/29	1½		35.00		17.50				17.50	
England	Dollar	5/30	6/1	3		36.00		108.00				108.00	
Spain	Dollar	6/2	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00	
France	Dollar	6/4	6/6	3		40.00		120.00				120.00	
Air transportation	Dollar									877.00		877.00	
Subtotal								301.50		877.00		1,178.50	
Hon. Burt L. Talcott:													
United States	Dollar		8/7	1½		35.00		17.50				17.50	
Great Britain	Dollar	8/8	8/13	6		36.00		216.00				216.00	
U.S.S.R.	Dollar	8/13	8/19	6		35.00		210.00				210.00	
Austria	Dollar	8/19	8/23	4		36.00		144.00				144.00	
Yugoslavia	Dollar	8/23	8/27	4		50.00		200.00				200.00	
Italy	Dollar	8/27	8/29	2		31.00		62.00				62.00	
Denmark	Dollar	8/29	8/31	2		40.00		80.00				80.00	
Sweden	Dollar	8/31	9/3	3		40.00		120.00				120.00	
France	Dollar	9/3	9/5	1½		40.00		70.00				70.00	
Transportation	Dollar									1,309.96		1,309.96	
Subtotal								1,119.50		1,309.96		2,429.46	
Hon. Del Clawson:													
United States	Dollar		8/7	1½		35.00		17.50				17.50	
Great Britain	Dollar	8/8	8/13	6		36.00		216.00				216.00	
U.S.S.R.	Dollar	8/13	8/19	6		35.00		210.00				210.00	
Austria	Dollar	8/19	8/23	4		36.00		144.00				144.00	
Yugoslavia	Dollar	8/23	8/27	4		50.00		200.00				200.00	
Italy	Dollar	8/27	8/29	2		31.00		62.00				62.00	
Denmark	Dollar	8/29	8/31	2		40.00		80.00				80.00	
Sweden	Dollar	8/31	9/3	3		40.00		120.00				120.00	
Norway	Dollar	9/3	9/6	2½		40.00		110.00				110.00	
Transportation	Dollar									1,385.46		1,385.46	
Subtotal								1,159.50		1,385.46		2,544.96	
Mr. G. Homer Skarin:													
United States	Dollar		8/7	1½		35.00		17.50				17.50	
Great Britain	Dollar	8/8	8/13	6		36.00		216.00				216.00	
U.S.S.R.	Dollar	8/13	8/19	6		35.00		210.00				210.00	
Austria	Dollar	8/19	8/23	4		36.00		144.00				144.00	
Yugoslavia	Dollar	8/23	8/27	4		50.00		200.00				200.00	

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Mr. G. Homer Skarin—Continued													
Italy	Dollar	8/27	8/29	2		\$31.00		\$62.00				\$62.00	
Denmark	Dollar	8/29	8/31	2		40.00		80.00				80.00	
Sweden	Dollar	8/31	9/3	3		40.00		120.00				120.00	
Norway	Dollar	9/3	9/5	2		40.00		80.00				80.00	
Sweden	Dollar	9/5	9/7	5 ¹ / ₄		34.00		25.50				25.50	
Transportation	Dollar									1,272.86		1,272.86	
Subtotal								1,155.00		1,272.86		2,427.86	
HUD-Space-Science-Veterans Subcommittee, total													
								5,963.50		11,160.67		17,188.26	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

² Round-trip air transportation to Europe provided at other-than-Government expense.

³ May 28, through May 30 not at Government expense.

⁴ May 29 and May 30 not at Government expense.

⁵ Sept. 6 not at Government expense.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Wendell Wyatt:													
United States	Dollar		1/4	1		\$35.00		\$35.00				\$35.00	
France	Dollar	1/5	1/6	2		38.00		76.00				76.00	
Germany	Dollar	1/6	1/7	1		30.00		30.00				30.00	
Netherlands	Dollar	1/7	1/10	3		31.00		93.00				93.00	
Germany	Dollar	1/10	1/12	2		30.00		60.00				60.00	
Austria	Dollar	1/12	1/14	2		30.00		60.00				60.00	
Germany	Dollar	1/14	1/16	2		30.00		60.00				60.00	
United Kingdom	Dollar	1/16	1/18	2		36.00		72.00				72.00	
Transportation	Dollar									949.80		949.80	
Interior Subcommittee, total								486.00		949.80		1,435.80	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount as expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Charles R. Jonas:													
England (London)	Dollar	8/8	8/11	4				\$109.67				\$109.67	
Belgium (Brussels)	Dollar	8/12	8/15	4				131.74				131.74	
Germany (Heidelberg)	Dollar	8/16	8/19	4				90.75				90.75	
Austria (Vienna)	Dollar	8/20	8/23	4				144.00				144.00	
Germany (Munich)	Dollar	8/24	8/25	2				60.00				60.00	
France (Paris and other)	Dollar	8/26	8/31	6				175.25				175.25	
United States	Dollar	9/1		1				4.45				4.45	
Transportation	Dollar									\$1,207.89		1,207.89	
Subtotal								715.86		1,207.89		1,923.75	
Mr. Robert C. Nicholas III:													
United Kingdom	Dollar	8/8	8/11	4				117.83		23.64		141.47	
Belgium	Dollar	8/12	8/15	4				151.73		92.35		244.08	
Germany	Dollar	8/16	8/19	4				67.60				67.60	
Air transportation	Dollar									819.00		819.00	
Subtotal								337.16		934.99		1,272.15	
Military Construction Subcommittee, total								1,053.02		2,142.88		3,195.90	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. John J. Rooney:													
France	Dollar	12/28	12/31	4		\$38.00		\$152.00				\$152.00	
United Kingdom	Dollar	1/1	1/7	6		36.00		216.00				216.00	
Switzerland	Dollar	1/7	1/10	4		34.00		136.00				136.00	
Portugal	Dollar	1/10	1/12	2		26.00		52.00				52.00	
Spain	Dollar	1/13	1/17	4		25.00		100.00				100.00	
Portugal	Dollar	1/17	1/18	2		26.00		52.00				52.00	

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Arrival	Date		Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
			Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rooney—Continued												
Transportation	Dollar									\$1,016.60		\$1,016.60
Subtotal								\$708.00		1,016.60		1,724.60
Mr. Jay B. Howe:												
France	Dollar	12/28	12/31	4		\$38.00		152.00				152.00
United Kingdom	Dollar	1/1	1/7	6		36.00		216.00				216.00
Switzerland	Dollar	1/7	1/10	4		34.00		136.00				136.00
Portugal	Dollar	1/10	1/12	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Spain	Dollar	1/13	1/17	4		25.00		100.00				100.00
Portugal	Dollar	1/17	1/18	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,016.60		1,016.60
Subtotal								708.00		1,016.60		1,724.60
Hon. John J. Flynt:												
Japan	Dollar	1/3	1/5	2		31.00		62.00				62.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/5	1/8	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Thailand	Dollar	1/8	1/9	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Australia	Dollar	1/9	1/12	3		31.00		93.00				93.00
New Zealand	Dollar	1/12	1/16	4		31.00		124.00				124.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,810.07		1,810.07
Subtotal								443.00		1,810.07		2,253.07
Hon. Mark Andrews:												
Japan	Dollar	1/3	1/5	2		31.00		62.00				62.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/5	1/8	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Thailand	Dollar	1/8	1/9	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Australia	Dollar	1/9	1/13	4		31.00		124.00				124.00
New Zealand	Dollar	1/13	1/16	3		31.00		93.00				93.00
Hawaii	Dollar	1/16	1/19	3		35.00		105.00				105.00
Transportation	Dollar									2,042.47		2,042.47
Subtotal								548.00		2,042.47		2,590.47
Hon. Frank T. Bow:												
Spain	Dollar	8/9	8/12	3½		32.00		112.00				112.00
Italy (Rome)	Dollar	8/12	8/15	3		38.00		114.00				114.00
Yugoslavia	Dollar	8/15	8/18	3		50.00		150.00				150.00
Italy (Venice)	Dollar	8/18	8/21	3		31.00		93.00				93.00
England	Dollar	8/21	8/24	2½		36.00		90.00				90.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,048.92		1,048.92
Subtotal								559.00		1,048.92		1,607.92
Mr. Dempsey B. Mizelle:												
Spain	Dollar	8/9	8/12	3½		32.00		112.00				112.00
Italy (Rome)	Dollar	8/12	8/15	3		38.00		114.00				114.00
Yugoslavia	Dollar	8/15	8/18	3		50.00		150.00				150.00
Italy (Venice)	Dollar	8/18	8/21	3		31.00		93.00				93.00
England	Dollar	8/21	8/24	2½		36.00		90.00				90.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,048.92		1,048.92
Subtotal								559.00		1,048.92		1,607.92
Hon. Neal Smith:												
Israel	Dollar	8/15	8/18	3		50.00		150.00				150.00
Switzerland	Dollar	8/18	8/20	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Germany	Dollar	8/20	8/23	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Denmark	Dollar	8/23	8/25	2		40.00		80.00				80.00
England	Dollar	8/25	8/26	1		36.00		36.00				36.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,557.00		1,557.00
Subtotal								482.00		1,557.00		2,039.00
Hon. John M. Slack:												
Switzerland	Dollar	8/18	8/20	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Germany	Dollar	8/20	8/23	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Denmark	Dollar	8/23	8/26	3		40.00		120.00				120.00
Sweden	Dollar	8/26	8/28	2		40.00		80.00				80.00
England	Dollar	8/28	9/1	4		36.00		144.00				144.00
Transportation	Dollar									761.40		761.40
Subtotal								560.00		761.40		1,321.40
Hon. John J. Rooney:												
Italy (Naples)	Dollar	8/22	8/24	1½		31.00		38.75				38.75
Italy (Rome)	Dollar	8/24	8/29	5		38.00		190.00				190.00
Switzerland	Dollar	8/29	9/1	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Germany	Dollar	9/1	9/4	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
England	Dollar	9/4	9/8	4		36.00		144.00				144.00
Iceland	Dollar	9/8	9/10	2½		38.00		85.50				85.50
Transportation	Dollar									1,404.00		1,404.00
Subtotal								674.25		1,404.00		2,078.25
Mr. Jay B. Howe:												
Italy (Naples)	Dollar	8/22	8/24	1½		31.00		38.75				38.75
Italy (Rome)	Dollar	8/24	8/29	5		38.00		190.00				190.00
Switzerland	Dollar	8/29	9/1	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Germany	Dollar	9/1	9/4	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
England	Dollar	9/4	9/8	4		36.00		144.00				144.00
Iceland	Dollar	9/8	9/10	2½		38.00		85.50				85.50
Transportation	Dollar									1,311.40		1,311.40
Subtotal								674.25		1,311.40		1,985.65
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee, total								5,915.50		13,017.38		18,932.88

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Silvio O. Conte:												
Germany	Dollar	2/12	2/13	1		\$30.00		\$30.00		\$63.00		\$93.00
Italy	Dollar	2/13	2/16	3		31.00		93.00		91.80		184.80
United Kingdom	Dollar	2/16	2/18	3		36.00		108.00		11.00		119.00
Subtotal								231.00		165.80		396.80
Mr. Thomas J. Kingfield: Mexico	Dollar	6/10	6/13	3		30.00		90.00		(*)		90.00
Subtotal								90.00				90.00
Transportation Subcommittee, total								321.00		165.80		486.80

¹ If foreign currency is used enter U.S. dollar equivalent. If U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.² Transportation expenses, Washington, D.C., to Frankfurt, Germany, and return, not claimed
³ Transportation provided by Government-owned aircraft.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE-GENERAL GOVERNMENT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Tom Steed: United Kingdom	Dollar	8/7	8/15	9		\$36.00		\$324.00		\$833.00		\$1,157.00
Subtotal								324.00		833.00		1,157.00
Mr. A. A. Gunnels: United Kingdom	Dollar	8/7	8/15	9		36.00		324.00		833.00		1,157.00
Subtotal								324.00		833.00		1,157.00
Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Subcommittee, total								648.00		1,666.00		2,314.00

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent. If U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Cornelius R. Anderson:												
England	Dollar	8/21	8/26	5		\$36		\$180.00		0		\$180.00
Germany	Dollar	8/26	9/9	14		8 at 36 6 at 40		468.00		0		468.00
Denmark	Dollar	9/9	9/13	4		40		160.00		0		160.00
Germany	Dollar	9/13	9/18	5		3 at 30 2 at 36		162.00		0		162.00
England	Dollar	9/18	9/20	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar								\$1,147.20			1,147.20
Thailand	Dollar	11/1	11/5	4		31		124.00		0		124.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/13	7½		36		279.00		0		279.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar								2,076.61			2,076.61
Subtotal								1,445.00		3,223.81		4,668.81
Warren F. Bedell:												
England	Dollar	8/21	8/24	3		36		108.00		0		108.00
Germany	Dollar	8/24	9/20	27¼		9 at 36 18¼ at 30		871.50		0		871.50
Spain	Dollar	9/20	9/23	2¾		32		88.00		0		88.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar								994.20			994.20
Subtotal								1,067.50		994.20		2,061.70
Carl L. Bennett:												
Thailand	Dollar	11/1	11/5	5		31		155.00		0		155.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Korea	Dollar	11/7	11/11	4		28		112.00		0		112.00
Japan	Dollar	11/12	11/20	9		31		279.00		0		279.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar								2,076.56			2,076.56
Subtotal								618.00		2,076.56		2,694.56
Andrew P. Bosko:												
Japan	Dollar	11/12	11/13	1		31		31.00		0		31.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/13	11/15	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Vietnam	Dollar	11/15	12/2	17		36		612.00		0		612.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	12/2	12/4	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Japan	Dollar	12/4	12/6	2		31		62.00		0		62.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar								2,063.82			2,063.82
Subtotal								849.00		2,063.82		2,912.82
Donald A. Brummitt:												
England	Dollar	8/21	8/24	3		36		108.00		0		108.00
Germany	Dollar	8/24	9/20	27¼		9 at 36 18¼ at 30		871.50		0		871.50
Spain	Dollar	9/20	9/23	2¾		32		88.00		0		88.00

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Arrival	Departure	Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
					Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Donald A. Brummitt—Continued												
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									\$994.20		\$994.20
Subtotal								\$1,067.50		994.20		2,061.70
W. Dana Carson:												
England	Dollar	8/21	8/26	5		36		180.00		0		180.00
Germany	Dollar	8/27	9/9	14		3 at 36 11 at 30		438.00		0		438.00
Denmark	Dollar	9/10	9/13	4		40		160.00		0		160.00
Germany	Dollar	9/14	9/20	7		3 at 30 4 at 36		234.00		0		234.00
Italy	Dollar	9/21	9/24	4		2 at 31 2 at 38		138.00		0		138.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									1,248.60		1,248.60
Subtotal								1,150.00		1,248.60		2,398.60
John G. Goedtel:												
Japan	Dollar	11/12	11/13	1		31		31.00		0		31.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/13	11/15	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Vietnam	Dollar	11/15	12/2	17		36		612.00		0		612.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	12/2	12/4	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Japan	Dollar	12/4	12/6	2		31		62.00		0		62.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									2,049.42		2,049.42
Subtotal								849.00		2,049.42		2,898.42
Leroy R. Kirkpatrick:												
England	Dollar	8/21	8/24	3		36		108.00		0		108.00
Germany	Dollar	8/24	9/20	27 1/4		14 at 36 13 1/4 at 30		901.50		0		901.50
Spain	Dollar	9/20	9/23	3		32		96.00		0		96.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									1,147.20		1,147.20
Subtotal								1,105.50		1,147.20		2,252.70
Willie C. Law:												
Thailand	Dollar	11/1	11/5	4 1/2		31		139.50		0		139.50
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Korea	Dollar	11/7	11/11	4		28		112.00		0		112.00
Japan	Dollar	11/11	11/20	8 3/4		31		271.25		0		271.25
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									2,076.56		2,076.56
Subtotal								594.75		2,076.56		2,671.31
Hugh B. McGahey:												
England	Dollar	8/21	8/26	5		36		180.00		0		180.00
Germany	Dollar	8/26	9/20	25		7 at 36 18 at 30		792.00		0		792.00
Italy	Dollar	9/20	9/24	4		2 at 31 2 at 38		138.00		0		138.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									1,019.00		1,019.00
Subtotal								1,110.00		1,019.00		2,129.00
Joseph E. Michalski:												
Thailand	Dollar	11/1	11/5	5		31		155.00		0		155.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/11	6		36		216.00		0		216.00
Philippines	Dollar	11/11	11/17	6		27		162.00		0		162.00
Okinawa	Dollar	11/18	11/20	3		29		87.00		0		87.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									2,027.66		2,027.66
Subtotal								620.00		2,027.66		2,647.66
Earle J. Morris:												
Thailand	Dollar	11/1	11/5	5		31		155.00		0		155.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/11	6		36		216.00		0		216.00
Philippines	Dollar	11/11	11/17	6		27		162.00		0		162.00
Okinawa	Dollar	11/18	11/20	3		29		87.00		0		87.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									2,027.66		2,027.66
Subtotal								620.00		2,027.66		2,647.66
Andrew J. Shannon:												
Thailand	Dollar	11/1	11/5	5		31		155.00		0		155.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Korea	Dollar	11/7	11/11	4		28		112.00		0		112.00
Japan	Dollar	11/12	11/20	9		31		279.00		0		279.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									2,076.56		2,076.56
Subtotal								618.00		2,076.56		2,694.56
Lyle J. Theisen:												
Japan	Dollar	11/12	11/13	1		31		31.00		0		31.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/13	11/15	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Vietnam	Dollar	11/15	12/2	17		36		612.00		0		612.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	12/2	12/4	2		36		72.00		0		72.00
Japan	Dollar	12/4	12/6	2		31		62.00		0		62.00
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									2,049.42		2,049.42
Subtotal								849.00		2,049.42		2,898.42
Surveys and Investigations staff, total								12,563.25		25,074.67		37,637.92

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
MASTER COMPILATION													
Subcommittee on Alleged Drug Abuse in Armed Services							\$3,430.62		\$16,207.90		\$19,638.52		
Subcommittee on Real Estate							935.88		7,210.63		8,146.51		
Subcommittee on Defense Communications							1,400.00		3,351.34		4,751.34		
Subcommittee to South Asia							2,917.08		14,091.75		17,008.83		
Subcommittee to Western Europe							4,509.97		6,153.11		10,663.08		
Subcommittee to Western Europe, Middle East, and North Africa							4,800.75		11,303.92		16,104.67		
Subcommittee to Western Europe							1,245.78		51.19		1,296.97		
Subcommittee on NATO Commitments							1,445.61		5,862.00		7,307.61		
Full Committee (travel by individual members)							3,709.98		10,115.55		13,825.53		
Grand total							24,395.67		74,347.39		98,743.06		

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds:	\$65,444.63
Government Department:	
Air Force	30,842.43
Navy	2,456.00
Total	98,743.06

F. EDWARD HEBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Mar. 13, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—SUBCOMMITTEE ON DRUG ABUSE IN ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

		Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
Name and country	Name of currency	Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. G. Elliott Hagan:												
Japan	Yen	1/3	1/4	1	18,000	\$50.00	18,000	\$50.00			18,000	\$50.00
Korea	K. won	1/4	1/5	1	15,759	50.00	7,000	22.08			7,000	22.08
Okinawa		1/5	1/6	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Taipei		1/6	1/7	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Vietnam	Piastre	1/7	1/13	6	13,750	50.00	82,500	300.00			82,500	300.00
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/15	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/15	1/17	3	307.00	50.00	906.00	150.00	449.80	\$73.96	1,355.80	223.96
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft	D. marks								6,651	1,812.80	6,651	1,812.80
Military aircraft	U.S. dollar									850.00		850.00
Hon. Floyd V. Hicks:												
Japan	Yen	1/3	1/4	1	18,000	50.00	18,000	50.00			18,000	50.00
Korea	K. won	1/4	1/5	1	15,759	50.00	10,397	32.91			10,397	32.91
Okinawa		1/5	1/6	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Taipei		1/6	1/7	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Vietnam	Piastre	1/7	1/13	6	13,750	50.00	57,500	209.09			57,500	209.09
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/15	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/15	1/17	3	307.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft	D. marks								6,651	1,812.80	6,651	1,812.80
Military aircraft	U.S. dollar									850.00		850.00
Hon. Richard C. White:												
Japan	Yen	1/3	1/4	1	18,000	50.00	18,000	50.00			18,000	50.00
Korea	K. won	1/4	1/5	1	15,759	50.00	8,259	26.09			8,259	26.09
Okinawa		1/5	1/6	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Taipei		1/6	1/7	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Vietnam	Piastre	1/7	1/13	6	13,750	50.00	82,500	300.00			82,500	300.00
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/15	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/15	1/17	3	307.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft	D. marks								6,651	1,812.80	6,651	1,812.80
Military aircraft	U.S. dollar									850.00		850.00
Hon. Bill Nichols:												
Japan	Yen	1/3	1/4	1	18,000	50.00	18,000	50.00			18,000	50.00
Korea	K. won	1/4	1/5	1	15,759	50.00	15,759	50.00			15,759	50.00
Okinawa		1/5	1/6	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Taipei		1/6	1/7	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Vietnam	Piastre	1/7	1/13	6	13,750	50.00	68,360	248.58			68,360	248.58
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/15	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/15	1/17	3	307.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft	D. marks								6,651	1,812.00	6,651	1,812.80
Military aircraft	U.S. dollar									850.00		850.00
Hon. John E. Hunt:												
Japan	Yen	1/4	1/6	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00	19,614.00	54.48	55,614	154.48
Okinawa		1/6	1/6	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Taipei		1/6	1/7	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				
Vietnam	Piastre	1/7	1/13	6	13,750	50.00	82,500	300.00			82,500	300.00
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft	D. marks								6,736.11	1,835.46	6,736.11	1,835.46
Military aircraft	U.S. dollar									930.00		930.00
William H. Hogan, Jr.:												
Japan	Yen	1/3	1/4	1	18,000	50.00	18,000	50.00			18,000	50.00
Korea	K. won	1/4	1/5	1	15,759	50.00	13,209	41.87			13,209	41.87
Okinawa		1/5	1/6	1	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)				

Footnotes at end of table.

RECAPITULATION		Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....		\$2,295.34
Appropriated funds:		
Government Department: Department of the Navy.....		2,456.00
Total.....		<u>4,751.34</u>

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES (SUBCOMMITTEE TO SOUTHEAST ASIA), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Jack Brinkley:												
Vietnam	Piastre	4/8	4/12	4	13,750	\$50.00	32,500	\$117.08			32,500	\$117.08
Hong Kong	Dollar	4/12	4/14	3	299	50.00	897	150.00	124.75	\$20.73	1,021.75	170.73
Taiwan	Dollar	4/14	4/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Korea	Won	4/16	4/17	1	16,904	50.00	16,904	50.00			16,904	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								2,345.17			2,345.17
Hon. Harold L. Runnels:												
Vietnam	Piastre	4/8	4/12	4	13,750	50.00	55,000	200.00			55,000	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	4/12	4/14	3	299	50.00	897	150.00			897	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	4/14	4/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Korea	Won	4/16	4/17	1	16,904	50.00	16,904	50.00			16,904	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								2,345.17			2,345.17
Hon. Bob Wilson:												
Vietnam	Piastre	4/8	4/12	4	13,750	50.00	55,000	200.00			55,000	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	4/12	4/14	3	299	50.00	897	150.00			897	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	4/14	4/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Korea	Won	4/16	4/17	1	16,904	50.00	16,904	50.00			16,904	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								2,345.17			2,345.17
Hon. C. W. (Bill) Young:												
Vietnam	Piastre	4/8	4/12	4	13,750	50.00	55,000	200.00			55,000	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	4/12	4/14	3	299	50.00	897	150.00			897	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	4/14	4/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Korea	Won	4/16	4/17	1	16,904	50.00	16,904	50.00			16,904	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								2,345.17			2,345.17
Hon. Floyd D. Spence:												
Vietnam	Piastre	4/8	4/12	4	13,750	50.00	55,000	200.00			55,000	200.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	4/12	4/14	3	299	50.00	897	150.00			897	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	4/14	4/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Korea	Won	4/16	4/17	1	16,904	50.00	16,904	50.00			16,904	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								2,345.17			2,345.17
Mr. Ralph Marshall:												
Vietnam	Piastre	4/8	4/12	4	13,750	50.00	55,000	200.00			55,000	200.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	4/12	4/14	3	299	50.00	897	150.00			897	150.00
Taiwan	T. dollar	4/14	4/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Korea	Won	4/16	4/17	1	16,904	50.00	16,904	50.00			16,904	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								2,345.17			2,345.17
Total							2,917.08		14,091.75			17,008.83

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	\$2,937.81
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department: Air Force	14,071.02
Total	17,008.83

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—SUBCOMMITTEE TO WESTERN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. O. C. Fisher:												
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	\$50.00	1,380	\$250.00			1,380	\$250.00
Transportation (commercial aircraft—military rate)	U.S. dollar								\$297.60			297.60
Hon. Samuel S. Stratton:												
France	Francs	6/1	6/3	3	276	50.00	607.20	109.97	1,009	182.35	1,616.20	292.32
Transportation (commercial aircraft—military rate)	U.S. dollar								297.60			297.60
Hon. Richard H. Ichord:												
France	Francs	5/28	6/6	10	276	50.00	2,760	500.00	3,051	553.23	5,811	1,053.23
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								398.84			398.84
Hon. Robert L. Leggett:												
France	Francs	5/25	6/3	9	276	50.00	2,484	450.00	2,587	469.19	5,071	919.19
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								398.84			398.84
Hon. Alexander Pirnie:												
Germany	D. marks	5/21	5/26	5	175	50.00	875	250.00			875	250.00
France	Francs	5/26	6/3	9	276	50.00	2,208	400.00			2,208	400.00
Transportation (commercial aircraft—military rate)	U.S. dollar								305.30			305.30
Hon. William L. Dickinson:												
France	Francs	5/27	5/30	4	276	50.00	1,104	200.00			1,104	200.00
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Transportation:												
(Commercial aircraft—military rate)	U.S. dollar								147.30			147.30
(Military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								427.79			427.79
Hon. Charles W. Whalen, Jr.:												
France	Francs	6/1	6/6	6	275	50.00	1,656	300.00	2,584.04	468.63	4,240.04	768.63
Transportation:												
(Commercial aircraft—military rate)	U.S. dollar								147.30			147.30
(Military aircraft)	U.S. dollar								308.84			308.84
Hon. Floyd D. Spence:												
Germany	D. marks	5/22	5/26	5	175	50.00	875	250.00			875	250.00
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	4	276	50.00	1,104	200.00			1,104	200.00
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/2	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft—military rate	U.S. dollar								147.30			147.30
Military aircraft	U.S. dollar								308.84			308.84

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—SUBCOMMITTEE TO WESTERN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Mr. Earl J. Morgan:												
Germany.....	D. marks.....	5/24	5/26	3	175	\$50.00	525	\$150.00			525	\$150.00
France.....	Francs.....	5/26	6/6	11	276	50.00	3,036	550.00	3,530.41	\$640.25	6,566.41	1,190.25
Transportation (military aircraft).....	U.S. dollars.....									314.81		314.81
Mr. John Ford:												
Germany.....	D. marks.....	5/24	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00			525	150.00
France.....	Francs.....	5/26	6/6	11	276	50.00	3,036	550.00	134	24.29	3,170	574.29
Transportation (military aircraft).....	U.S. dollars.....									314.81		314.81
Total.....								4,509.97		6,153.11		10,663.08

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....	Amount
Appropriated funds:	\$6,847.91
Government Department: Air Force.....	3,815.17
Total.....	10,663.08

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—SUBCOMMITTEE TO WESTERN EUROPE, MIDDLE EAST, AND NORTH AFRICA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Bill Nichols:												
Spain.....	Pesetas.....	8/20	8/22	3	3,480	\$50.00	10,440	\$150.00			10,440	\$150.00
Italy.....	Lire.....	8/22	8/24	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	42,298	\$68.02	1,045.98	168.02
Turkey.....	Liras.....	8/24	8/25	1	742.50	50.00	742.50	50.00			742.50	50.00
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	8/25	8/27	2	1,500	50.00	3,000	100.00	4,429	\$147.63	7,429	247.63
Germany.....	D. marks.....	8/27	8/30	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Transportation (military aircraft).....	U.S. dollar.....									1,392.40		1,392.40
Hon. Robert H. Mollohan:												
Spain.....	Pesetas.....	8/20	8/22	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
Italy.....	Lire.....	8/22	8/24	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	42,298	68.02	1,045.98	168.02
Turkey.....	Liras.....	8/24	8/25	1	742.50	50.00	742.50	50.00			742.50	50.00
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	8/25	8/27	2	1,500	50.00	3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
Germany.....	D. marks.....	8/27	9/1	5	170	50.00	850	250.00			850	250.00
Switzerland.....	Francs.....	9/1	9/3	2	198.75	50.00	397.50	100.00	203.00	51.05	600.50	151.05
Germany.....	D. marks.....	9/3	9/4	1	170	50.00	170	50.00			170	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft).....	U.S. dollar.....									1,683.72		1,683.72
Hon. W. C. "Dan" Daniel:												
Spain.....	Pesetas.....	8/20	8/22	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
Italy.....	Lire.....	8/22	8/24	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	42,298	68.02	1,045.98	168.02
Turkey.....	Liras.....	8/24	8/25	1	742.50	50.00	742.50	50.00			742.50	50.00
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	8/25	8/27	2	1,500	50.00	3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
Germany.....	D. marks.....	8/27	8/30	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Transportation (military aircraft).....	U.S. dollars.....									1,392.40		1,392.40
Hon. Bob Wilson:												
Italy.....	Lire.....	8/15	8/17	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Lebanon.....	Pounds.....	8/18	8/20	2	161	50.00	322	100.00			322	100.00
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	8/20	8/21	2	1,500	50.00	3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
Transportation (commercial aircraft).....	Guilders.....								5,743.72	1,677.00	5,743.72	1,677.00
Hon. William L. Dickinson:												
Kenya.....	Shillings.....	8/7	8/9	3	352.50	50.00	1,057.50	150.00	661.44	93.46	1,718.94	243.46
Ethiopia.....	Dollars.....	8/10	8/12	3	124.06	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	8/13	8/13	1	1,500	50.00	1,500	50.00			1,500	50.00
Switzerland.....	Francs.....	8/14	8/18	5	202.50	50.00	1,012.50	250.00	1,065	261.03	2,077.50	511.03
Transportation (commercial aircraft).....	D. marks.....								2,925	865.19	2,925	865.19
Hon. John E. Hunt:												
Spain.....	Pesetas.....	8/9	8/13	4	3,480	50.00	13,920	200.00	2,000	28.74	15,920	228.74
Italy.....	Lire.....	8/13	8/16	4	31,150	50.00	124,600	200.00	47,030	75.61	171,630	275.61
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	8/16	8/19	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
England.....	B. pounds.....	8/19	8/21	2	20.60	50.00	41.20	100.00	51.47	124.56	92.67	224.56
Transportation (commercial aircraft).....	D. marks.....								4,465.90	1,320.88	4,465.90	1,320.88
Hon. G. William Whitehurst:												
Germany.....	D. marks.....	8/16	8/28	12	170	50.00	1,167.63	350.75	93.20	26.40	1,260.93	377.15
England.....	Pounds.....	8/28	8/30	3	20.13	50.00	60.30	150.00			60.39	150.00
Transportation (military aircraft—MAC).....	U.S. dollars.....									157.00		157.00
Mr. James F. Shumate:												
Spain.....	Pesetas.....	8/20	8/22	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
Italy.....	Lire.....	8/22	8/24	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	42,298	68.02	1,045.98	168.02
Turkey.....	Liras.....	8/24	8/25	1	742.50	50.00	742.50	50.00			742.50	50.00
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	8/25	8/27	2	1,500	50.00	3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
Germany.....	D. marks.....	8/28	9/1	5	170	50.00	850	250.00			850	250.00
Switzerland.....	Francs.....	9/1	9/3	2	198.75	50.00	397.50	100.00	203.00	51.05	600.50	151.05
Germany.....	D. marks.....	9/3	9/4	1	170	50.00	170	50.00			170	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft).....	U.S. dollars.....									1,683.72		1,683.72
Total.....								4,800.75		11,303.92		16,104.67

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.² Local transportation for entire group.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....	Amount
Appropriated funds:	\$9,795.43
Government Department: Air Force.....	6,309.24
Total.....	16,104.67

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—SUBCOMMITTEE TO WESTERN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Charles H. Wilson:												
Iceland.....	Kronur.....	8/29	8/31	3	4,356	\$50.00	13,068	\$150.00			13,068	\$150.00
United Kingdom.....	Pounds.....	9/1	9/3	3	20.16	50.00	60.48	150.00			60.48	150.00
France.....	Francs.....	9/4	9/11	8	275	50.00	2,200	400.00			2,200	400.00
Transportation ²												
Hon. Alexander Pirnie:												
Iceland.....	Kronur.....	8/28	8/31	3	(?)	(?)	(?)					
United Kingdom.....	Pounds.....	8/31	9/1	2	20.16	50.00	40.32	100.00	21.15	\$51.19	61.47	151.19
France.....	Francs.....	9/1	9/10	9	275	50.00	2,450	445.78			2,450	445.78
Transportation ³												
Total.....							1,245.78		51.19			1,296.97

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.² Traveled as a member of the Interparliamentary Union under Committee on Foreign Affairs.³ No counterpart drawn.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....	Amount
	\$1,296.97

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATO COMMITMENTS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William J. Randall:												
Belgium.....	Francs.....	12/15	12/16	2	2,250	\$50.00	3,330	\$74.00			3,330	\$74.00
Germany.....	D. marks.....	12/17	12/19	3	162	50.00	227	70.00			227	70.00
Norway.....	Kroner.....	12/20	12/21	2	336.38	50.00	415.63	61.85			415.63	61.85
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft.....	D. marks.....								3,032.76	\$897.00	3,032.76	\$897.00
Military aircraft.....	U.S. dollar.....								278.60		278.60	
Hon. Samuel S. Stratton:												
Belgium.....	Francs.....	12/15	12/16	2	2,250	50.00	4,395	97.65			4,395	97.65
Germany.....	D. marks.....	12/17	12/19	3	162	50.00	437.60	135.05			437.60	135.05
Norway.....	Kroner.....	12/20	12/21	2	336.38	50.00	381.75	57.06			381.75	57.06
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft.....	D. marks.....								3,032.76	\$897.00	3,032.76	\$897.00
Military aircraft.....	U.S. dollar.....								278.60		278.60	
Hon. Charles S. Gubser:												
Belgium.....	Francs.....	12/15	12/16	2	2,250	50.00	4,500	100.00			4,500	100.00
Germany.....	D. marks.....	12/17	12/19	3	162	50.00	486.00	150.00			486.00	150.00
Norway.....	Kroner.....	12/20	12/21	2	336.38	50.00	672.75	100.00			672.75	100.00
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft.....	D. marks.....								3,032.76	\$897.00	3,032.76	\$897.00
Military aircraft.....	U.S. dollar.....								278.60		278.60	
Hon. Alexander Pirnie:												
Belgium.....	Francs.....	12/15	12/16	2	2,250	50.00	4,500	100.00			4,500	100.00
Germany.....	D. marks.....	12/17	12/20	3	162	50.00	486.00	150.00			486.00	150.00
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft.....	D. marks.....								3,032.76	\$897.00	3,032.76	\$897.00
Military aircraft.....	U.S. dollar.....								262.60		262.60	
Mr. John J. Ford:												
Belgium.....	Francs.....	12/15	12/16	2	2,250	50.00	4,500	100.00			4,500	100.00
Germany.....	D. marks.....	12/17	12/19	3	162	50.00	486	150.00			486	150.00
Norway.....	Kroner.....	12/20	12/21	2	336.37	50.00	672.75	100.00			672.75	100.00
Transportation:												
(Commercial aircraft).....	D. marks.....								3,032.76	\$897.00	3,032.76	\$897.00
(Military aircraft).....	U.S. dollars.....								278.60		278.60	
Total.....							1,445.61		5,862.00			7,307.61

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollars equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollars equivalent).....	Amount
	\$5,930.61
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department: Air Force.....	1,377.00
Total.....	7,307.61

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES (TRAVEL BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Charles S. Gubser:												
Spain.....	Pesetas.....	4/22	4/26	5	3,480	\$50.00	17,400	\$250.00			17,400	\$250.00
Switzerland.....	Francs.....	4/27	5/1	5	214.75	50.00	1,073.75	250.00	526.70	\$127.94	1,600.45	\$377.94
Italy.....	Lire.....	5/2	5/4	3	311.50	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Greece.....	Drachmas.....	5/5	5/7	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Transportation (commercial aircraft).....	D. marks.....								4,475.65	1,233.40	4,475.65	1,233.40
Hon. Samuel S. Stratton:												
Japan.....	Yen.....	7/12	7/13	2	18,000	50.00	14,085	39.12	2,748	7.63	16,833	46.75
Transportation (at no expense to the Government).....												

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 201, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES (TRAVEL BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Alvin E. O'Konski:													
Ireland	Pounds	8/9	8/11	3	20.65	\$50.00	61.95	\$150.00			61.95	\$150.00	
England	Pounds	8/11	8/12	1	20.60	50.00	20.60	50.00	202.31	\$489.62	222.91	\$539.62	
Poland	Zlotys	8/12	8/17	5	3,250	50.00	16,250	250.00			16,250	250.00	
Germany	D. marks	8/17	8/20	3	169	50.00	507	150.00	4,375.86	1,239.62	4,882.86	1,389.62	
Austria	Schillings	8/20	8/22	2	1,240	50.00	2,481	100.00	4,235	170.08	6,716	270.08	
Transportation (commercial aircraft)	Lotys								24,192	1,008.00	24,192	1,008.00	
Hon. Floyd D. Spence:													
Spain	Pesetas	8/10	8/13	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00	
Italy	Lire	8/13	8/16	4	31,150	50.00	124,600	200.00	60,560	97.36	185,160	297.36	
Lebanon	Pounds	8/17	8/18	2	161	50.00	322	100.00			322	100.00	
Greece	Drachmas	8/19	8/21	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00	
Malta	Pounds	8/22	8/23	1	19.11.08	50.00	19.11.08	50.00			19.11.08	50.00	
England	Pounds	8/23	8/25	3	20.21	50.00	70.63	150.00	64.98	157.26	125.61	307.26	
Transportation (commercial aircraft)	Guilders								6,176.90	1,803.47	6,176.90	1,803.47	
Hon. Bob Wilson:													
Ireland	Pounds	11/6	11/10	4	20.03	50.00	80.12	200.00			80.12	200.00	
England		11/10	11/11	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)					
Transportation:													
Commercial aircraft										440.52		440.52	
Military aircraft—MAC										90.00		90.00	
Hon. James A. Byrne:													
Spain	Pesetas	11/18	11/19	2	3,425	50.00	6,850	100.00			6,850	100.00	
Italy	Lire	11/20	11/23	4	30,600	50.00	122,400	200.00	60,576	97.23	182,976	297.23	
Germany	D. marks	11/24	12/1	8	166	50.00	1,328	400.00			1,328	400.00	
England	Pounds	12/2	12/4	3	19.97	50.00	59.92	150.00			59.92	150.00	
Transportation (commercial aircraft)	D. marks								3,339.60	968.00	3,339.60	968.00	
Hon. G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery:													
Japan	Yen	12/21	12/22	2	15,400	50.00	20,196	65.57			20,196	65.57	
Vietnam	Piastre	12/22	12/26	4	13,750	50.00	31,270	115.53			31,270	115.53	
Thailand	Baht	12/26	12/27	1	1,041.25	50.00	893.50	42.90			893.50	42.90	
Germany	D. marks	12/27	12/29	2	163	50.00	315.75	96.86			315.75	96.86	
Transportation (commercial aircraft)	D. marks								7,125	2,185.42	7,125	2,185.42	
Total							3,709.98		10,115.55			13,825.53	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

² No counterpart funds drawn.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds:	\$13,735.53
Government Department: Air Force	90.00
Total	13,825.53
March 1972,	

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 114, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
							\$31,150	\$50.00				
Hon. Frank Annunzio:												
Italy	Lire	8/9	8/11	3	31,150	\$50.00	93,450	150.00	102,402	\$164.63	195,852	\$314.63
France	Franc	8/12	8/15	4	275.50	50.00	1,102	200.00	8,170.55	1,476.70	9,272.55	1,676.70
Spain	Pesetas	8/16	8/20	5	3,480	50.00	17,400	250.00	4,731	67.97	22,131	317.97
Portugal	Escudos	8/21	8/23	3	1,421	50.00	4,263	150.00	2,366	83.25	6,629	233.25
Italy	Lire	8/24	8/26	3	18,690	50.00	93,450	150.00	84,425	132.30	177,875	282.30
Germany	D. mark								3,855.08	1,061.42	3,855.08	1,061.42
Hon. Thomas L. Ashley: Peru	Soles	5/9	5/14	6	2,169	50.00	10,845	250.00	2,475	57.05	13,320	307.05
Mr. John E. Barriere:												
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/9	9/1	24	20.62	50.00	494.84	1,200.00	269.39	651.96	764.24	1,851.96
France	Franc								3,827.80	691.81	3,827.80	691.81
Germany	D. mark								177.50	50.28	177.50	50.28
Hon. Tom Beville:												
Netherlands Antilles	Florins	2/25	2/26	2	93.50	50.00	187.00	100.00			187.00	100.00
Argentina	Pesos	2/27	3/3	4	200	50.00	800	200.00	741	185.25	1,541.00	385.25
Peru	Soles	5/9	5/14	6	2,169	50.00	10,845	250.00	2,700	62.24	13,545	312.24
Hon. Ben B. Blackburn:												
Argentina	Pesos	2/26	3/3	6	200	50.00	800	200.00	780	195.00	1,580	395.00
Vietnam	Piastres	8/23	8/25	3	13,750	50.00	27,500	100.00			27,500	100.00
Thailand	Bahts	8/26	8/27	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Indonesia	Rupiahs	8/28	8/28	1	20,750	50.00	20,750	50.00			20,750	50.00
Malaysia	Dollars	8/29	8/30	2	147.00	50.00	294.00	100.00	150	49.67	444	149.67
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/31	9/3	4	292.50	50.00	1,170	200.00	98.15	16.33	1,268.15	216.33
Japan	Yen	9/4	9/6	3	16,940	50.00	33,880	100.00	14,196	42.19	48,076	142.19
Germany	D. mark								6,414.15	1,766.26	6,414.15	1,766.26
Netherlands	Guilders								7,926.26	2,227.73	7,926.26	2,227.73
Hon. Garry Brown:												
Japan	Yen	4/8	4/11	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00			72,000	200.00
Malaysia	Dollars	4/12	4/17	6	151.38	50.00	908.25	300.00	213.75	70.54	1,122	370.54
Germany	D. mark								209.79	62.05	2,693.89	769.89
									7,693.89	2,231.34	7,693.89	2,231.34

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Philip M. Crane:												
Japan	Yen	8/20	8/22	3	18,000	\$50.00	54,000	\$150.00	19,431	\$53.98	73,431	\$203.98
Taiwan	Dollars	8/23	8/24	2	2,000	50.00	3,880	97.00			3,880	97.00
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/25	8/27	3	292.50	50.00	877.50	150.00	46.40	7.72	923.90	157.72
Vietnam	Piastres	8/28	8/28	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00			13,750	50.00
Laos	Kips	8/29	8/29	1	25,200	50.00	32,000	63.49			18,400	36.51
Thailand	Bahts	8/30	8/31	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00	1,415	67.96	3,497.50	167.96
Netherlands	Guilders								7,521.85	2,114.07	7,521.85	2,114.07
Mr. Orman S. Fink:												
Netherlands Antilles	Florins	2/25	2/26	2	93.50	50.00	187.00	100.00			187.00	100.00
Argentina	Pesos	2/27	3/3	5	200	50.00	800	200.00			800.00	200.00
Peru	Soles	5/9	5/14	6	2,169	50.00	13,014	300.00	21,302	491.06	34,316	791.06
Germany	D. mark	9/13	9/19	7	169	50.00	1,180.50	350.00	5,658.23	1,668.66	6,838.73	2,018.66
Hon. Tom S. Gettys:												
Netherlands Antilles	Florins	2/25	2/26	2	93.50	50.00	187.00	100.00			187.00	100.00
Argentina	Pesos	2/27	3/3	5	200	50.00	800	200.00	760.50	190.13	1,560.50	390.13
Germany	D. mark	6/11	6/15	5	175.50	50.00	877.50	250.00	225.18	63.79	1,102.68	313.79
Hon. Charles H. Griffin:												
Netherlands Antilles	Florins	2/25	2/26	2	93.50	50.00	187.00	100.00			187.00	100.00
Argentina	Pesos	2/27	3/3	5	200.00	50.00	800.00	200.00	832.00	208.00	1,632	408.00
Peru	Soles	5/9	5/14	6	2,169	50.00	10,845	250.00	4,950	114.11	15,795	364.11
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/8	8/10	3	20.62	50.00	61.85	150.00	38.25	92.57	100.10	242.57
France	Franc	8/11	8/13	3	275.50	50.00	826.50	150.00	690.71	124.83	1,517.21	274.83
Italy	Lire	8/14	8/15	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	43,730	70.31	106,030	170.31
Germany	D. mark								3,617.45	1,069.93	3,617.45	1,069.93
Hon. James M. Hanley:												
Italy	Lira	4/23	4/29	7	31,150	50.00	186,900	300.00	119,280	191.46	306,180	491.46
Germany	D. mark								3,617.45	996.54	3,617.45	996.54
Hon. Richard T. Hanna:												
Peru	Soles	2/23	2/25	3	2,169	50.00	6,507	150.00	2,700	62.24	9,207	212.24
Argentina	Pesos	2/26	2/28	3	200	50.00	600	150.00	481	120.25	1,081	270.25
Brazil	Cruzeiros	3/1	3/4	4	250	50.00	1,000	200.00	1,523.10	304.62	2,523.10	504.62
Japan	Yen	4/2	4/7	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	68,708	190.86	176,708	490.86
Korea	Won	4/8	4/11	4	16,064	50.00	64,256	200.00			64,256	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	4/12	4/13	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Malaysia	Dollars	4/14	4/18	5	150	50.00	750	250.00	1,712	565.02	2,462	815.02
Japan	Dollars	4/19	4/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00	4,929.50	893.67	4,929.50	893.67
France	Franc								7,468.22	2,166.44	7,468.22	2,166.44
Germany	D. mark											
Hon. Margaret M. Heckler:												
Italy	Lira	8/17	8/18	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	52,820	84.92	115,120	184.92
Israel	Pounds	8/19	8/21	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	6,563.68	1,587.28	7,088.68	1,737.28
Hon. Albert W. Johnson:												
Netherlands Antilles	Florins	2/25	2/26	2	200	50.00	800	200.00	754	188.50	1,554	388.50
Argentina	Pesos	2/27	3/3	5	93.50	50.00	187	100.00			187	100.00
Peru	Soles	5/9	5/14	6	2,169	50.00	10,845	250.00	4,950	114.11	15,795	364.11
Dr. Paul Nelson:												
Japan	Yen	4/7	4/10	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00			72,000	200.00
Malaysia	Dollars	4/11	4/16	6	151.38	50.00	908.25	300.00	427.50	141.09	1,335.75	441.09
Japan	Yen	4/17	4/17	1	18,000	50.00	18,000	50.00			18,000	50.00
Peru	Soles	5/9	5/14	6	2,169	50.00	13,014	300.00	2,700	62.24	15,714	362.24
Germany	D. mark								3,133.53	926.81	7,641.54	2,107.39
Hon. Thomas M. Rees:												
Peru	Soles	5/12	5/14	3	2,169	50.00	6,507	150.00	2,475	57.05	8,982	207.05
Chile	Escudos	5/9	5/11	3	1,016.50	50.00	2,149.50	87.19			2,149.50	87.19
Germany	D. mark								2,496.12	707.12	2,496.12	707.12
Hon. Henry S. Reuss:												
Japan	Yen	4/7	4/10	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	78,114	216.98	150,114	416.98
Malaysia	Dollars	4/11	4/17	7	150	50.00	1,058.25	350.00	213.75	70.54	1,272	420.54
Hong Kong	Dollars								57.30	9.52	57.30	9.52
Germany	D. mark								7,528.62	2,074.00	7,528.62	2,074.00
Hon. J. William Stanton:												
Netherlands Antilles	Florins	2/25	2/26	2	93.50	50.00	187.00	100.00			187.00	100.00
Argentina	Pesos	2/27	3/3	5	200	50.00	800	200.00	780	195.00	1,580	395.00
Germany	D. mark								3,232.70	956.14	7,641.54	2,107.39
Hon. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.:												
Netherlands Antilles	Florins	2/25	2/26	2	93.50	50.00	187	100.00			187	100.00
Argentina	Pesos	2/27	3/3	5	200	50.00	800	200.00	721.52	180.38	1,521.52	380.38
Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan:												
Portugal	Escudos	9/3	9/6	4	1,393	50.00	5,575	200.00			5,575	200.00
Spain	Pesetas	9/7	9/11	5	3,475	50.00	17,375	250.00	4,642	66.78	22,017	316.78
Germany	D. mark	9/12	9/16	6	169.16	50.00	1,017	300.00	3,896.06	1,147.47	4,913.06	1,447.47
Austria	Schillings	9/17	9/20	4	1,215.50	50.00	4,862	200.00	2,850	116.71	7,712	316.71
Hon. Lawrence G. Williams:												
Italy	Lira	8/10	8/13	4	3,115	50.00	124,600	200.00	98,142	157.78	222,742	357.78
Switzerland	Franc	8/14	8/17	4	202.50	50.00	810	200.00	1,132.50	277.60	1,942.60	477.60
Spain	Pesetas	8/18	8/21	4	3,480	50.00	13,920	200.00	16,196	232.70	30,116	432.70
Germany	D. mark								3,624.06	1,024.59	3,624.06	1,024.59
Hon. William B. Widnall: Germany	D. mark	9/13	9/19	7	169	50.00	1,180.50	350.00	3,636.45	1,070.68	4,816.95	1,420.68
Total								13,970.70		35,022.71		48,993.41

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.² Refund.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

Amount
\$48,993.41WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mar. 14, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 333 AND 434, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

COVER SHEET

Full committee	Amount
Special Subcommittee on Labor	\$2,868.16
General Subcommittee on Labor	13,035.62
Select Subcommittee on Education	72,465.10
	45,210.54

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds:	\$76,415.42
Government Department: Department of Air Force	57,164.00
Total	133,579.42

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Mar. 13, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 434, 1ST SESS., 92d CONG., FULL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John M. Ashbrook:												
Switzerland	Francs	6/19	6/30	12	277.7095	\$50.00	2,448.00	\$600.00			2,448.00	\$600.00
Switzerland	Francs	6/19	6/30						5,416.00	\$1,327.45	1,327.45	
Netherlands	Guilders	6/19	6/30						3,347.05	940.71	3,347.05	940.71
Total						50.00		600.00		2,268.16		2,868.16

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Note: Above travel under the auspices of the full committee.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
	\$2,868.16

Committee on Education and Labor.

Mar. 6, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 434, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr.:												
Italy	Lire	8/10	8/16	6	31,300	\$50.00	186,900	\$300.00	311,254	\$500.41	467,004	\$800.41
France	Francs	8/16	8/25	9	247.95	50.00	2,479.50	450.00	3,342.40	606.17	5,821.90	1,056.17
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/25	8/28	3	20.26	50.00	101.34	250.00	184.87	447.41	286.21	697.41
Netherlands	Guilders											\$ (50.00)
Hon. John Brademas: United Kingdom	Pounds	8/25	8/29	5	20.26	50.00	101.34	250.00	3,867.68	1,129.15	3,867.68	1,129.15
Hon. Roman C. Pucinski:									195.41	472.92	296.75	722.92
United Kingdom	Pounds	9/3	9/8	5	20.12	50.00	100.60	250.00	28.50	69.55	129.10	319.55
Germany	D. marks	8/71							2,873.85	850.00	2,893.85	850.00
Hon. Patsy T. Mink: United Kingdom	Pounds	8/25	8/29	5	20.26	50.00	101.34	250.00				
Hon. Lloyd Meeds: United Kingdom	Pounds	8/25	8/29	5	20.26	50.00	101.34	250.00				
Hon. John Dellenback:												
Germany	D. marks	8/26	8/28	3	169.00	50.00	507	150.00			507	150.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	9/5	9/7	3	20.18	50.00	60.55	150.00	18.60	45.01	79.15	195.01
Netherlands	Guilders	8/71							3,180.95	928.74	3,180.95	928.74
Hugh G. Duffy:												\$ (100.00)
Italy	Lire	8/9	8/16	6	31,300	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
France	Francs	8/16	8/25	10	247.95	50.00	3,033	550.00	172.72	31.22	3,205.72	581.22
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/25	8/28	3	20.26	50.00	101.34	250.00			101.34	250.00
Netherlands	Guilders								3,831.75	1,020.73	3,831.75	1,020.73
Jeunesse M. Beaumont:												\$ (100.00)
Italy	Lire	8/9	8/16	6	31,300	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
France	Francs	8/16	8/25	10	247.95	50.00	3,033	550.00	172.71	31.21	3,205.71	581.21
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/25	8/29	4	20.26	50.00	101.34	250.00			101.34	250.00
Netherlands	Guilders								3,719.35	1,085.94	3,719.35	1,085.94
John C. Miller:												\$ (50.00)
Italy	Lire	8/10	8/16	6	31,300	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
France	Francs	8/16	8/25	10	247.95	50.00	3,033	550.00	172.71	31.21	3,205.71	581.22
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/25	8/29	4	20.26	50.00	101.34	250.00			101.34	250.00
Netherlands	Guilders								3,719.35	1,085.94	3,719.35	1,085.94
Total												13,235.62

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.² Refund.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
	\$13,035.62

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Labor.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 434, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL LABOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John H. Dent:												
Kenya	Shillings	8/7	8/9	3	350.52	\$50.00	1,057.50	\$150.00	7,188.30	² \$1,015.73	8,245.80	\$1,165.73
Do ³	Shillings								661.44	93.46	661.44	93.46
Do ⁴	Shillings								200.00	28.26	200.00	28.26
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/10	8/12	3	125.06	50.00	372.19	150.00	211.50	² \$5.91	583.69	235.91
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00	9,060	118.82	12,873	168.82
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00	3,895	² \$59.50	10,100	409.50
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	2	170	50.00	340	100.00			340	100.00
Do ⁵	Marks								1,676.31	495.80	1,676.31	495.80
U.S. dollar refund										(472.00)		(472.00)
Hon. Phillip Burton:												
Kenya	Shillings	8/7	8/9	3	352.50	50.00	1,057.50	150.00			1,057.50	150.00
Do ⁵	Shillings								661.44	93.46	661.44	93.46
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/10	8/12	3	124.06	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00	1,117,661	² \$1,810.90	1,304,561	2,110.90
Hon. William L. Clay:												
Kenya	Shillings	8/7	8/9	3	352.50	50.00	1,057.50	150.00			1,057.50	150.00
Do ⁵	Shillings								661.44	93.46	661.44	93.46
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/10	8/12	3	124.06	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
Hon. William D. Ford:												
Austria	Schillings	8/14	8/20	7	1,241	50.00	8,687	350.00			8,687	350.00
Germany	Marks	8/21	8/23	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Italy	Lire	8/24	8/29	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
Netherlands ⁶	Guilders								3,647.45	1,064.95	3,647.45	1,064.95
Hon. Edith Green:												
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00	² \$1,693.95	² \$501.02	2,203.95	651.02
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
U.S. dollar refund								(195.00)				(195.00)
Hon. John N. Erlenborn:												
Kenya	Shillings	8/7	8/9	3	352.50	50.00	1,057.50	150.00			1,057.50	150.00
Do ⁵	Shillings								661.44	93.46	661.44	93.46
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/10	8/12	3	124.06	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
Hon. Marvin L. Esch:												
Iran	Rials	8/6	8/7	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/8	8/12	5	124.06	50.00	620.32	250.00			620.32	250.00
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Do ⁵	Marks								1,633	482.99	1,633	482.99
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
Robert E. Vagley:												
Kenya	Shillings	8/7	8/9	3	352.50	50.00	1,057.50	150.00			1,057.50	150.00
Do ⁵	Shillings								661.44	93.46	661.44	93.46
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/10	8/12	3	124.06	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
Netherlands ⁶	Guilders								1,854.20	521.14	1,854.20	521.14
Do ⁵	Guilders								(1,854.20)	(521.14)	(1,854.20)	(521.14)
Adrienne Fields:												
Kenya	Shillings	8/7	8/9	3	352.50	50.00	1,057.50	150.00			1,057.50	150.00
Do ⁵	Shillings								661.44	93.46	661.44	93.46
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/10	8/12	3	124.06	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
Michael Bernstein:												
Kenya	Shillings	8/7	8/9	3	352.50	50.00	1,057.50	150.00			1,057.50	150.00
Do ⁵	Shillings								661.44	93.46	661.44	93.46
Ethiopia	Dollars	8/10	8/12	3	124.06	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Iran	Rials	8/13	8/14	1	3,813	50.00	3,813	50.00			3,813	50.00
Austria	Schillings	8/15	8/21	5	1,241	50.00	6,205	250.00			6,205	250.00
Germany	Marks	8/22	8/24	3	170	50.00	510	150.00			510	150.00
Italy	Lire	8/25	8/30	6	131,150	50.00	186,900	300.00			186,900	300.00
Total						2,650.00		9,355.00		5,946.10		15,301.10

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

² Local transportation charges incurred by full subcommittee, but charged to chairman for bookkeeping purposes.

³ Commercial air transportation.

⁴ Miscellaneous expense.

⁵ Refund commercial air transportation.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	\$15,301.10
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department: Department of the Air Force	57,164.00
Total	72,465.10

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 333 AND 434, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1972

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. John Brademas:													
France	Francs	4/9	4/13	5	275.50	\$50.00	1,378.50	\$250.00			1,378.50	\$250.00	
Norway	Kroners	4/14	4/15	2	356.00	50.00	712.00	100.00			712.00	100.00	
Local transportation									7,229.00	\$1,013.17	7,229.00	1,013.17	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/16	4/20	5	20.60	50.00	103.00	250.00			103.00	250.00	
Local transportation									174.18	418.00	174.18	418.00	
Miscellaneous expense									4.00	9.60	4.00	9.60	
Germany													
Round trip air fare	Marks								3,356.22	924.58	3,356.22	924.58	
Poland	Zlotys	8/19	8/24	6	325.00	50.00	19,500.00	300.00			19,500.00	300.00	
Round trip air fare									25,392.00	1,058.00	25,392.00	1,058.00	
Local transportation									14,351.44	597.98	14,351.44	597.98	
Miscellaneous expense									5,221.73	217.57	5,221.73	217.57	
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/5	10	204.50	50.00	2,045.00	500.00			2,045.00	500.00	
Round trip air fare	Guilders								3,699.45	1,130.64	3,699.45	1,130.64	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Local transportation									1,576.04	385.34	1,576.04	385.34	
									306.75	75.00	306.75	75.00	
Jack G. Duncan:													
France	Francs	4/7	4/13	7	275.70	50.00	1,929.90	350.00			1,929.90	350.00	
Local transportation									1,622.04	294.06	1,622.04	294.06	
Norway	Kroners	4/14	4/15	2	356.00	50.00	712.00	100.00			712.00	100.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/16	4/20	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany	D. marks												
Round trip air fare									3,440.03	947.67	3,440.03	947.67	
Poland	Zlotys	8/18	8/23	6	325.00	50.00	19,500.00	300.00			19,500.00	300.00	
Refund							-4,120.00	-63.38			-4,120.00	-63.38	
Round trip air fare									24,600.00	1,025.00	24,600.00	1,025.00	
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/3	8	83.40	50.00	1,501.19	367.04			1,501.19	367.04	
Round trip air fare	Guilders								3,808.61	1,164.00	3,808.61	1,164.00	
Local transportation									1,576.04	385.34	1,576.04	385.34	
Do									153.37	37.50	153.37	37.50	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Christina Orth:													
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/5	10	204.50	50.00	2,045.00	500.00			2,045.00	500.00	
Round trip air fare	Guilders								3,880.98	1,186.12	3,880.98	1,186.12	
Local transportation									1,576.04	385.34	1,576.04	385.34	
Do									306.75	75.00	306.75	75.00	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Martin L. LaVor:													
France	Francs	4/7	4/13	7	275.70	50.00	1,929.90	350.00			1,929.90	350.00	
Refund							-551	-100.00			-551	-100.00	
Norway	Kroner	4/14	4/17	4	356	50.00	1,424	200.00			1,424	200.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/18	4/22	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany	Marks								3,440.03	947.67	3,440.03	947.67	
Round trip air fare													
Poland	Zlotys	8/18	8/23	6	325	50.00	19,500	300.00			19,500	300.00	
Round trip air fare									13,992	583.00	13,992	583.00	
David Lloyd-Jones:													
France	Francs	4/9	4/13	5	275.70	50.00	1,378.50	250.00			1,378.50	250.00	
Norway	Kroner	4/14	4/15	2	356	50.00	712	100.00			712	100.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/16	4/20	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany	Marks								3,356.22	924.58	3,356.22	924.58	
Round trip air fare													
Hon. Patsy T. Mink:													
Poland	Zlotys	8/18	8/23	6	325	50.00	19,500	300.00			19,500	300.00	
Round trip air fare									25,944	1,081.00	25,944	1,081.00	
William F. Gaul:													
Poland	Zlotys	8/20	8/25	6	325	50.00	19,500	300.00			19,500	300.00	
Round trip air fare									26,232	1,093	26,232	1,093.00	
Hon. Lloyd Meeds:													
France	Francs	4/8	4/12	5	275.70	50.00	1,378.50	250.00			1,378.50	250.00	
Norway	Kroners	4/13	4/14	2	356	50.00	712	100.00			712	100.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/15	4/19	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany	D. marks												
Round trip air fare									3,239.10	892.31	3,239.10	892.31	
Poland	Zlotys	8/18	8/23	6	325	50.00	19,500	300.00			19,500	300.00	
Round trip air fare									13,632	568.00	13,632	568.00	
Local transportation									3,462	144.25	3,462	144.25	
Hon. Jack F. Kemp:													
Poland	Zlotys	8/21	8/25	5	200	50.00	1,000	250.00			1,000	250.00	
Round trip air fare									22,440	935.00	22,440	935.00	
Hon. Alphonzo Bell:													
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/3	8	200.50	50.00	1,501.19	367.04			1,501.19	367.04	
Local transportation									830.43	203.04	830.43	203.04	
Local transportation									306.75	75.00	306.75	75.00	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Round trip air fare	Guilders								2,789.20	734.00	2,789.20	734.00	
Hon. Ogden R. Reid:													
Poland	Zlotys	8/20	8/25	6	325	50.00	19,500	300.00			19,500	300.00	
Round trip air fare									16,723.20	696.80	16,723.20	696.80	
Refund U.S. dollars									-100.00		-100.00		
Hon. James G. O'Hara:													
France	Francs	4/10	4/13	4	275.70	50.00	1,102.80	200.00			1,102.80	200.00	
Norway	Kroners	4/14	4/16	3	356	50.00	1,068	150.00			1,068	150.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/17	4/21	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany (round-trip air fare)	D. marks								2,089.86	575.72	2,089.86	575.72	
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/5	10	204.50	50.00	2,045	500.00			2,045	500.00	
Round-trip air fare	Guilders								3,933.27	1,202.10	3,933.27	1,202.10	
Local transportation									1,576.04	385.34	1,576.04	385.34	
Do									306.75	75.00	306.75	75.00	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Hon. James H. Scheuer:													
France	Francs	4/9	4/11	3	275.70	50.00	827.10	150.00			827.10	150.00	
Norway	Kroners	4/12	4/14	3	356	50.00	1,068	150.00			1,068	150.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/15	4/19	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany (round-trip air fare)	D. marks								2,094.54	577.01	2,094.54	577.01	
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/2	7	213.84	50.00	1,496.86	365.98			1,496.86	365.98	
Local transportation									1,427.33	348.98	1,427.33	348.98	
Round-trip air fare	Guilders								2,604.51	796.00	2,604.51	796.00	
Refund by personal check to U.S. Treasury										-15.98		-15.98	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Robert C. Andringa:													
France	Francs	4/8	4/12	5	277.7095	\$50.00	1,378.50	\$250.00			1,378.50	\$250.00	
Norway	Kroners	4/13	4/14	2	357.1430	50.00	712	100.00			712	100.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/15	4/19	5	20.8334	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany (Round-trip air fare)	D. marks								3,356.22	\$924.58	3,356.22	924.58	
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/3	8	200.50	50.00	1,501.19	367.04			1,501.19	367.04	
Local transportation									1,576.04	385.34	1,576.04	385.34	
Local transportation									153.37	37.50	153.37	37.50	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Round-trip air fare	Guilders								4,117.20	1,202.10	4,117.20	1,202.10	
Hon. William L. Clay:													
France	Francs	4/7	4/12	6	275.70	50.00	1,654.20	300.00			1,654.20	300.00	
Local transportation									78	14.14	78	14.14	
Refund									551	—100.00	551	—100.00	
Norway	Kroners	4/13	4/16	4	356	50.00	1,424	200.00			1,424	200.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/17	4/21	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Germany (round trip air fare)	D. marks								3,290	931.01	3,290	931.01	
Hon. John Dellenback:													
Finland	Markkas	12/28	1/3	7	200.5	50.00	1,366.47	334.10			1,366.47	334.10	
Local transportation									1,524.14	372.65	1,524.14	372.65	
Do									306.75	75.00	306.75	75.00	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Refund										—145.74		—145.74	
Do										—105.92		—105.92	
Netherlands (estimated round trip air fare)	Guilders								3,926.40	1,200.00	3,926.40	1,200.00	
Hon. Earl Landgrebe:													
Finland	Markkas	12/28	1/6	10	204.50	50.00	2,045	500.00			2,045	500.00	
Netherlands (round trip air fare)	Guilders								2,581.61	789.00	2,581.61	789.00	
Local transportation									1,576.04	385.34	1,576.04	385.34	
Do									306.75	75.00	306.75	75.00	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Hon. Orval Hansen:													
Norway	Kroners	4/12	4/14	3	356	50.00	1,068	150.00			1,068	150.00	
Local transportation									669	93.76	669	93.76	
United Kingdom	Pounds	4/15	4/19	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00	
Local transportation									5.65	13.56	5.65	13.56	
Germany	D. marks												
Round trip air fare									3,864.44	1,067.14	3,864.44	1,067.14	
Refund									—1,456.88	—430.90	—1,456.88	—430.90	
Finland	Markkas	12/27	1/3	8	92.31	50.00	1,661.56	406.25			1,661.56	406.25	
Netherlands (round trip air fare)	Guilders								4,119.15	1,258.91	4,119.15	1,258.91	
Local transportation									1,420.33	347.27	1,420.33	347.27	
Do									306.25	75.00	306.25	75.00	
Miscellaneous expense									40.90	10.00	40.90	10.00	
Total						2,350.00		12,594.07		32,616.47		45,210.54	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount
\$45,210.54

Mar. 10, 1972.

Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 109, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Melvin O. Benson:													
Italy	Lire	2/8	2/8	1	31,150	\$50.00	31,150	\$50.00			31,150	\$50.00	
Somalia	Shilling	2/9	2/12	3	355	50.00	1063.9	150.00			1,063.9	150.00	
Kenya	Shilling	2/12	2/16	4	352.70	50.00	1,410.80	200.00			1,410.80	200.00	
Madagascar	FMG	2/16	2/20	4	13,850	50.00	55,400	200.00			55,400	200.00	
Mauritius	Rupees	2/20	2/22	2	275	50.00	550	100.00			550	100.00	
Gabon	CFA franc	2/22	2/23	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00	800.00	\$2.90	14,550	52.90	
Central African Republic	CFA franc	2/23	2/27	4	13,850	50.00	55,400	200.00			55,400	200.00	
Congo (K)	Zaires	2/27	2/28	1	24,500	50.00	24,500	50.00			24,500	50.00	
Cameroon	CFA franc	2/28	3/1	1	13,850	50.00	13,850	50.00	24,563	88.99	38,413	138.99	
Ghana	New cedis	3/1	3/5	4	51.00	50.00	204.00	200.00	16.01	15.70	220.01	215.70	
Togo	CFA franc	3/5	3/7	2	13,350	50.00	27,700	100.00			27,700	100.00	
Nigeria	Pound	3/7	3/11	4	17,120.03	50.00	70,900	200.00			70,900	200.00	
England	Pound	3/11	3/15	4	20.65	50.00	82.60	200.00			82.60	200.00	
Transportation	D. mark								7,742.00	2,114.20	7,742.00	2,114.20	
Portugal	Escudo	8/5	8/7	2	1,421	50.00	2,842	100.00			2,842	100.00	
Portuguese Guinea	Escudo	8/7	8/10	3	1,421	50.00	4,263	150.00			4,263	150.00	
Cape Verde	Escudo	8/10	8/11	1	1,421	50.00	1,421	50.00			1,421	50.00	
South Africa	Rand	8/11	8/19	8	35.05	50.00	280.40	400.00	948.02	1,342.42	1,228.42	1,742.42	
Senegal	Franc	8/19	8/20	1	13,000	50.00	13,000	50.00			13,000	50.00	
Mauritania	Franc	8/20	8/21	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00	3,437	12.50	17,187	62.50	
Senegal	Franc	8/21	8/23	2	13,000	50.00	26,000	100.00	2,080	8.00	28,080	108.00	
Gambia	Dalasy	8/23	8/26	3	100	50.00	300	150.00			300	150.00	
Senegal	Franc	8/26	8/27	1	13,000	50.00	13,000	50.00			13,000	50.00	
Morocco	Dirham	8/27	8/29	2	251	50.00	502	100.00			502	100.00	
Algeria	Dinar	8/29	9/2	4	246.50	50.00	986	200.00			986.00	200.00	
France	Franc	9/2	9/7	6	275	50.00	1,650	300.00			1,650.00	300.00	
Transportation	N. guildor								8,754.42	2,449.94	8,754.42	2,449.94	

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 109, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert K. Boyer:												
Hong Kong	HK dollars	11/1	11/2	2	290	\$50.00	580	\$100.00	36	\$6.11	616	\$106.11
Khmer Republic	Riel	11/2	11/12	10	6,986	50.00	69,860	500.00	8,625	61.74	78,485	561.74
South Vietnam	Piastre	11/12	11/16	3	13,750	50.00	41,250	150.00			41,250	150.00
Thailand	Baht	11/16	11/19	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Transportation	D. mark								7,285.99	2,111.88	7,285.99	2,111.88
John J. Brady, Jr.:												
Switzerland	S. franc	4/5	4/6	1	214.60	50.00	214.60	50.00			214.60	50.00
France	F. franc	4/6	4/9	4	275.70	50.00	1,102.80	200.00			1,102.80	200.00
Italy	Lire	4/9	4/10	1	31,150	50.00	31,150	50.00			31,150	50.00
Turkey	Lira	4/10	4/12	2	742.50	50.00	1,185	79.80			1,185	79.80
Iran	Rial	4/12	4/14	2	4,125	50.00	8,250	100.00			8,250	100.00
Thailand	Baht	4/14	4/17	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
South Vietnam	Piastre	4/17	4/18	1	13,750	50.00	2,250	8.10			2,250	8.10
Hong Kong	HK dollar	4/19	4/20	2	299	50.00	598	100.00			598	100.00
Japan	Yen	4/20	4/22	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation	D. mark								7,829.11	2,156.78	7,829.11	2,156.78
Hon. William S. Broomfield:												
Japan	Yen	12/31	1/2	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Korea	Won	1/2	1/7	4	15,758.50	50.00	63,034	200.00			63,034	200.00
Japan	Yen	1/7	1/9	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Transportation	D. mark								5,928.87	1,632.40	5,928.87	1,632.40
Hon. J. Herbert Burke:												
Italy	Lire	2/8	2/8	1	31,150	50.00	31,150	50.00			31,150	50.00
Somalia	Shilling	2/9	2/12	3	355	50.00	1,063.9	150.00			1,063.9	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	2/12	2/16	4	352.70	50.00	1,410.80	200.00			1,410.80	200.00
Madagascar	FMG	2/16	2/20	4	13,850	50.00	55,400	200.00			55,400	200.00
South Africa	Rand	2/20	2/27	7	35.71	50.00	215	300.00	126.51	177.11	341.51	477.11
Zambia	Kwacha	2/27	3/2	3	35	50.00	105	150.00	30.10	42.51	135.10	192.51
United Kingdom	Pound	3/2	3/3	2	20.66	50.00	41.32	100.00			41.32	100.00
Transportation	D. mark								7,266.30	1,983.17	7,266.30	1,983.17
Germany	D. mark	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00			525	150.00
France	Franc	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00			1,380	250.00
Spain	Peseta	5/30	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Transportation	U.S. dollar									620.86		620.86
Germany	D. mark	8/16	8/19	3	169.50	50.00	508.50	150.00	354.09	100.31	862.59	250.31
England	Pound	8/19	8/22	4	20.61	50.00	82.45	200.00	86.84	210.16	169.29	410.16
Portugal	Escudo	8/22	8/25	3	1,421	50.00	4,263	150.00	3,068.00	107.95	7,331	257.95
Morocco	Dirham	8/25	8/29	4	227.5	50.00	910	200.00	2,927.22	583.11	3,837.22	783.11
Algeria	Dinar	8/29	8/31	2	246.50	50.00	493	100.00			493.00	100.00
France	Franc	8/31	9/3	3	275.50	50.00	826.50	150.00	1,013.70	183.84	1,840.20	333.84
Transportation	N. guildier								896.18	251.88	896.18	251.88
Goler T. Butcher:												
Portugal	Escudo	8/5	8/7	2	1,421	50.00	2,842	100.00			2,842	100.00
Portuguese Guinea	Escudo	8/7	8/10	3	1,421	50.00	4,263	150.00			4,263	150.00
Cape Verde	Escudo	8/10	8/11	1	1,421	50.00	1,421	50.00			1,421	50.00
South Africa	Rand	8/11	8/19	8	35.05	50.00	280.40	400.00	948.02	1,342.42	1,228.42	1,742.42
Senegal	CFA franc	8/19	8/20	1	13,000	50.00	13,000	50.00			13,000	50.00
Mauritania	CFA franc	8/20	8/21	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00	3,437	12.50	17,187	62.50
Senegal	CFA franc	8/21	8/23	2	13,000	50.00	26,000	100.00	2,080	8.00	28,080	108.00
Gambia	Dalasi	8/23	8/26	3	100	50.00	300	150.00			300.00	150.00
Senegal	CFA franc	8/26	8/27	1	13,000	50.00	13,000	50.00			13,000	50.00
Morocco	Dirham	8/27	8/29	2	251	50.00	502	100.00			502.00	100.00
Algeria	Dinar	8/29	9/2	4	246	50.00	986	200.00			986.00	200.00
France	Franc	9/2	9/4	3	275	50.00	825	150.00	270.70	48.92	1,095.70	198.92
Netherlands	N. guildier	9/4	9/5	1	177.90	50.00	177.90	50.00			177.90	50.00
Denmark/Sweden	Kroner	9/6	9/8	2	253.75	50.00	507.50	100.00			507.50	100.00
Transportation	N. guildier								8,775.40	2,466.39	8,775.40	2,466.39
John Chapman Chester:												
Pakistan	P. rupee	9/29	10/3	5	500	50.00	2,500	250.00			2,500	250.00
India	I. rupee	10/3	10/8	5	380	50.00	1,710	225.00			1,710	225.00
Greece	Drachmae	10/8	10/11	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Transportation	I. rupee								13,192	1,735.78	13,192	1,735.78
Harry C. Cromer:												
Japan	Yen	12/31	1/2	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	67,308	186.97	121,308	336.97
Korea	Won	1/2	1/7	4	15,758.50	50.00	63,034	200.00			63,034	200.00
Japan	Yen	1/7	1/9	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Transportation	D. mark								5,928.87	1,632.40	5,928.87	1,632.40
John C. Culver:												
France/Morocco	Franc	2/16	2/19	3	275.90	50.00	827.70	150.00			827.70	150.00
Germany	D. marks	2/19	2/21	3	18.13	50.00	224	61.76			224	61.76
Marian A. Czarnecki:												
Costa Rica	Colones	1/24	1/27	4	331	50.00	1,324	200.00	794	119.94	2,118	319.94
Guatemala	Quetzales	1/28	1/31	4	50	50.00	200	200.00			200	200.00
Transportation	D. marks								1,604.80	441.06	1,604.80	441.06
Poland	Zlotys	6/10	6/15	5	3,250	50.00	16,250	250.00	5,627	106.33	21,877	356.33
Transportation	Zlotys								25,713.60	1,071.40	25,713.60	1,071.40
Panama	Dollar (U.S.)	9/15	9/19	5		40.00		200.00				200.00
Transportation	D. marks								1,496.92	442.74	1,496.92	442.74
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski:												
England	Pound	2/12	2/13	1	20.66	50.00	20.66	50.00			20.66	50.00
Italy	Lire	2/13	2/15	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	18,130	29.15	80,430	129.15
Kenya	Shilling	2/15	2/16	1	352.50	50.00	352.50	50.00			352.50	50.00
Madagascar	FMG	2/16	2/20	4	13,850	50.00	55,400	200.00			55,400	200.00
Mauritius	Rupee	2/20	2/22	2	275	50.00	400	72.73			400	72.73
South Africa	Rand	2/22	2/25	3	35.71	50.00	107.14	150.00	126.51	177.11	233.65	327.11
Transportation	D. mark								8,102.37	2,230.97	8,102.37	2,230.97
Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.:												
Italy	Lire	2/8	2/8	1	31,150	50.00	31,150	50.00			31,150	50.00
Somalia	Shilling	2/9	2/12	3	355	50.00	1,063.9	150.00			1,063.9	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	2/12	2/16	4	352.70	50.00	1,410.80	200.00	2,338.00	327.73	3,748.80	527.73
Madagascar	FMG	2/16	2/20	4	13,850	50.00	55,400	200.00	224,935	814.99	280,335	1,014.99
Mauritius	Rupees	2/20	2/22	2	275	50.00	450	81.82			450	81.82
Gabon	CFA franc	2/22	2/23	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00	800.00	2.90	14,550	52.90
Central African Republic	CFA franc	2/23	2/27	4	13,850	50.00	55,400	200.00	226,985	822.41	282,385	1,022.41
Congo (K)	Zaire	2/27	2/28	1	24.50	50.00	24.50	50.00			24.50	50.00
Cameroon	CFA franc	2/28	3/1	1	13,850	50.00	13,850	50.00	24,563	89.00	38,413	139.00
Ghana	New cedis	3/1	3/5	4	51	50.00	204	200.00	147.42	144.54	351.42	344.54
Togo	CFA franc	3/5	3/7	2	13,350	50.00	27,700	100.00			27,700	100.00
Transportation	F. franc								13,274.71	2,406.59	13,274.71	2,406.59
Portugal	Escudos	8/5	8/7	2	1,421	50.00	2,842	100.00			2,842	100.00

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.—Continued													
Portuguese Guinea	Escudos	8/7	8/10	3	1,421	\$50.00	4,263	\$150.00			4,263	\$150.00	
Cape Verde	Escudos	8/10	8/11	1	1,421	50.00	1,421	50.00			1,421	50.00	
South Africa	Rand	8/11	8/19	8	35.05	50.00	280.40	400.00	870.01	\$1,231.96	1,150.41	1,631.96	
Senegal	Franc	8/19	8/20	1	13,000	50.00	13,000	50.00			13,000	50.00	
Mauritania	Franc	8/20	8/21	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00	3,437	12.50	17,187	62.50	
Senegal	Franc	8/21	8/23	2	13,000	50.00	26,000	100.00	2,080	8.00	28,080	108.00	
Gambia	Dalasy	8/23	8/26	3	100	50.00	300	150.00			300	150.00	
Senegal	Franc	8/26	8/27	1	13,000	50.00	13,000	50.00			13,000	50.00	
Morocco	Dirham	8/27	8/29	2	251	50.00	502	100.00			502	100.00	
Algeria	Dinar	8/29	9/2	4	246	50.00	986	200.00			986	200.00	
France	Franc	9/2	9/4	3	275	50.00	825	150.00	922.20	167.07	1,747.20	317.07	
Netherlands	Guilder	9/4	9/5	1	177.90	50.00	177.90	50.00			177.90	50.00	
Denmark	D. kroner	9/6	9/7	1	367.50	50.00	367.50	50.00	181.50	24.21	549	74.21	
Sweden	S. krona	9/7	9/8	2	258.10	50.00	516.20	100.00	214.20	41.50	730.40	141.50	
Transportation	N. guilder								8,921.25	2,508.97	8,921.25	2,508.97	
Hon. Dante B. Fascell:													
Costa Rica	Colones	1/24	1/27	4	331	50.00	993	150.00	794	119.94	1,787	269.94	
Guatemala	Quetzales	1/28	1/31	4	50	50.00	200	200.00			200	200.00	
Transportation	D. marks								1,604.84	441.06	1,604.84	441.06	
Mexico	Pesos	6/24	6/29	5									
Transportation	D. marks								1,203.45	340.92	1,203.45	340.92	
Hon. Paul Findley:													
Germany	D. marks	2/19	2/21	2	181.5	50.00	278.10	76.66			278.10	76.66	
France	Franc	2/21	2/23	3	275.90	50.00	827.70	150.00			827.70	150.00	
Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/27	4	50	50.00	200	200.00			200	200.00	
Transportation	U.S. dollar									68.04		68.04	
R. Michael Finley:													
Venezuela	Bolivars	8/22	8/28	6	224	50.00	867.24	193.58	1,500	401.78	2,367.24	595.36	
Transportation	D. mark								845.81	250.17	845.81	250.17	
Transportation	U.S. dollar									132.12		132.12	
Hon. Donald M. Fraser:													
Switzerland	S. franc	9/6	9/9	4	198	50.00	792	200.00	49.80	12.21	841.80	212.21	
Italy	Lire	9/9	9/12	3	30,800	50.00	92,400	150.00			92,400	150.00	
Transportation	D. marks								3,463.80	1,024.49	3,463.80	1,024.49	
Hon. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen:													
United Kingdom	Pound	1/7	1/13	6					3.26	7.82	3.26	7.82	
Belgium	Franc	1/13	1/15	2					379	7.63	379	7.63	
Netherlands	Guilders	1/15	1/17	2	179	50.00	358.00	100.00			358	100.00	
France	Franc	1/17	1/19	3	276	50.00	828	150.00			828	150.00	
Transportation	D. mark								1,826.34	502.85	1,826.34	502.85	
Pakistan	P. rupee	9/29	10/3	5	500	50.00	2,500	250.00			2,500	250.00	
India	I. rupee	10/3	10/8	5	380	50.00	1,710	225.00			1,710	225.00	
Greece	Drachmae	10/8	10/11	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00	
Transportation	I. rupee								13,192	1,735.78	13,192	1,735.78	
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher:													
Hong Kong	HK dollar	2/2	2/5	4	300	50.00	1,200	200.00	71.60	11.77	1,271.60	211.77	
Taiwan	T. dollar	2/6	2/7	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00	
Korea	Won	2/7	2/12	5	15,868	50.00	79,340	250.00			79,340	250.00	
Philippine Islands	Peso	2/12	2/16	4	319.5	50.00	1,278	200.00			1,278	200.00	
Transportation	D. mark								7,839.50	2,158.45	7,839.50	2,158.45	
Taiwan	T. dollars	5/28	5/29	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollars	5/29	6/1	3	299	50.00	897	150.00	45.85	7.62	942.85	157.62	
India	Rupee	6/2	6/4	2	380	50.00	760	100.00	656	86.32	1,416	186.32	
Transportation	D. mark								4,823.58	1,347.17	4,823.58	1,347.17	
Clifford P. Hackett:													
Sweden	Kroner	8/20	8/25	5	256.75	50.00	1,283.75	230.95			1,283.75	230.95	
Greece	Drachmae	8/25	9/1	7	1,500	50.00	9,000	326.67	2,442	81.40	12,242	408.07	
Spain	Pesetas	9/1	9/5	4	3,475	50.00	13,474	193.88	7,573	108.95	21,047	302.83	
Belgium	Franc	9/5	9/8	4	2,400	50.00	8,095	168.83			8,095	168.83	
Transportation	Guilders								4,774.38	1,341.87	4,774.38	1,341.87	
Hon. Seymour Halpern:													
Switzerland	S. franc	2/7	2/19	13	214.65	50.00	2,791	650.00	2,716.30	680.97	5,607.30	1,330.97	
Austria	Schilling	2/19	2/21	2					3,200	124.22	3,200	124.22	
France	F. franc	2/21	2/24	3	275.85	50.00	827.60	150.00	1,113.02	201.71	1,940.62	351.71	
Transportation	D. mark								2,481.13	671.23	2,481.13	671.23	
Philippine Islands	Peso	4/11	4/12	1	319.50	50.00	319.50	50.00			319.50	50.00	
Vietnam	Piastre	4/12	4/14	2	13,750	50.00	23,080	83.93			23,080	83.93	
Singapore/Malaysia	M. dollar	4/14	4/18	5	182	50.00	750	250.00	109.05	35.99	859.05	285.99	
Thailand	Baht	4/18	4/20	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00	
Israel	I. pound	4/20	4/22	2	175	50.00	350	100.00	72.90	20.83	422.90	120.83	
Cyprus	C. pound	4/22	4/23	1	20,555	50.00	20,555	50.00			20,555	50.00	
Lebanon	L. pound	4/23	4/24	1	162.50	50.00	162.50	50.00			162.50	50.00	
Turkey	Lira	4/24	4/27	3	742.50	50.00	2,227.50	150.00			2,227.50	150.00	
France	Franc	4/27	5/1	4	275.70	50.00	1,102.80	200.00			1,102.80	200.00	
Transportation	D. mark								7,993.44	2,202.05	7,993.44	2,202.05	
Portugal	Escudo	8/15	8/19	4	1,500	50.00	1,500	50.00			1,500	50.00	
Spain	Peseta	8/19	8/27	8	3,475	50.00	3,475	50.00			3,475	50.00	
Morocco	Dirham	8/27	8/29	3	251	50.00	502	100.00			502	100.00	
Algeria	Dinar	8/29	8/31	2	246.5	50.00	493	100.00			493	100.00	
Spain	Peseta	8/31	9/4	6									
Transportation	F. franc								2,681.00	486.22	2,681	486.22	
Hon. Sherman P. Lloyd:													
Poland	Zlotys	11/4	11/9	5	3,250	50.00	8,230	126.62			8,230	126.62	
Austria/Denmark	Schilling	11/9	11/14	5	1,206.50	50.00	4,826	200.00			4,826	200.00	
Transportation	U.S. dollar									1,096.60		1,096.60	
Hon. F. Bradford Morse: Venezuela													
Transportation	Bolivares	8/25	8/28	3	224.0	50.00	672.0	150.00			672.0	150.00	
Hon. Morgan F. Murphy:													
Switzerland	S. franc	4/6	4/6	1	214.60	50.00	214.60	50.00			214.60	50.00	
France	F. franc	4/6	4/9	4	275.70	50.00	1,102.80	200.00			1,102.00	200.00	
Italy	Lira	4/9	4/10	1	31,150	50.00	31,150	50.00	9,630	15.46	40,780.0	65.46	
Turkey	Lira	4/10	4/12	2	742.50	50.00	1,485	100.00			1,485	100.00	
Iran	Rial	4/12	4/14	2	4,125	50.00	8,250	100.00			8,250	100.00	
Thailand	Baht	4/14	4/17	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00	
South Vietnam	Piastre	4/17	4/19	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00			13,750	50.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollar	4/19	4/20	2	299	50.00	598	100.00	42.15	7.00	640.15	107.00	
Japan	Yen	4/20	4/22	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00	87,302	242.51	123,302	342.51	

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 109, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Morgan F. Murphy—Continued												
United Kingdom	Pound	9/2	9/4	3	20.12	\$50.00	60.36	\$150.00	118.75	\$289.72	179.11	\$439.72
Ireland	Pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.31	50.00	20.31	50.00			20.31	50.00
Transportation	D. mark								10,867.96	3,053.36	1,086.96	3,053.36
Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal:												
Germany	D. mark	4/15	4/18	3	181.5	50.00	544.50	150.00			544.50	150.00
Israel	I. pound	4/18	4/22	4	175	50.00	700	200.00	166.92	47.70	866.94	247.70
France	Franc	4/22	4/24	3	275.70	50.00	827.10	150.00			827.10	150.00
Transportation	D. mark								5,259.12	1,448.79	5,259.12	1,448.79
Franklin J. Schupp:												
Germany	D. mark	4/15	4/18	3	181.5	50.00	544.50	150.00			544.50	150.00
Israel	I. pound	4/18	4/22	4	175	50.00	700	200.00	166.92	47.69	866.93	247.69
France	Franc	4/22	4/24	3	275.70	50.00	827.10	150.00			827.10	150.00
Transportation	D. mark								4,926.73	1,350.63	4,926.73	1,350.63
Hon. Robert H. Steele:												
Switzerland	S. franc	4/4	4/6	2	214.60	50.00	429.25	100.00	79	18.36	508.25	118.36
France	F. franc	4/6	4/9	4	275.70	50.00	1,102.80	200.00			1,102.80	200.00
Italy	Lira	4/9	4/10	1	31,150	50.00	31,150	50.00			31,150.00	50.00
Turkey	Lira	4/10	4/12	2	742.50	50.00	1,485	100.00			1,485.00	100.00
Iran	Rial	4/12	4/13	1	4,125	50.00	4,125	50.00			4,125.00	50.00
Thailand	Baht	4/14	4/16	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
S. Vietnam	Plastre	4/17	4/18	2	13,750	50.00	25,250	88.91			25,250.00	88.91
Hong Kong	HK dollar	4/19	4/20	2	299	50.00	598	100.00			598.00	100.00
Japan	Yen	4/20	4/23	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000.00	150.00
Transportation	D. mark								7,741.27	2,132.58	7,741.27	2,132.58
John H. Sullivan:												
Hong Kong	HK dollars	11/1	11/2	2	290	50.00	580	100.00	36	6.11	616	106.11
Khmer Republic	Riel	11/2	11/12	10	6,986	50.00	69,860	500.00	8,625	61.74	78,485	561.74
South Vietnam	Plastre	11/12	11/16	3	13,750	50.00	41,250	150.00			41,250.00	150.00
Thailand	Baht	11/16	11/19	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Transportation	D. mark								7,285.98	2,111.88	7,285.98	2,111.88
Hon. Guy Vander Jagt:												
Portugal	Escudo	8/5	8/7	3	1,421	50.00	4,263	150.00	1,700	59.82	5,963	209.82
Portuguese Guinea	Escudo	8/7	8/10	3	1,421	50.00	4,263	150.00			4,263.00	150.00
Cape Verde Islands	Escudo	8/10	8/11	1	1,421	50.00	1,421	50.00			1,421.00	50.00
South Africa	Rand	8/11	8/19	8	35.05	50.00	280.40	400.00	948.02	1,342.42	1,228.42	1,742.42
Senegal	Franc	8/19	8/20	1	13,000	50.00	13,000	50.00			13,000.00	50.00
Mauritania	Franc	8/20	8/21	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00	3,437	12.50	17,187	62.50
Senegal	Franc	8/21	8/23	2	13,000	50.00	26,000	100.00	2,080	8.00	28,080	108.00
France	F. franc	8/23	8/25	2	275.5	50.00	551	100.00			551.00	100.00
Transportation	N. guilder								5,024.23	1,371.23	5,024.23	1,371.23
Jamaica	J. dollar	12/27	12/31	5	40.16	50.00	200.8	250.00			200.8	250.00
Transportation	D. mark								835.11	247.00	835.11	247.00
Hon. J. Irving Whalley:												
Germany	D. mark	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00			525	150.00
France	Franc	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00			1,380	250.00
Spain	Peseta	5/30	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960.00	100.00
Transportation	U.S. dollars									620.86		620.86
Venezuela	Bolivares	8/22	8/28	6	224	50.00	1,344	300.00	1,500	401.79	2,844	701.79
Trinidad	T. dollars	8/28	8/30	2	100	50.00	200	100.00	330	169.49	530	269.49
Barbados	Dollar	8/31	9/1	2	95.55	50.00	95.55	50.00	40	20.54	135.55	70.54
Jamaica	Dollar	9/2	9/5	3	41.32	50.00	123.96	150.00			123.96	150.00
Transportation	D. mark								1,355.98	401.18	1,355.98	401.18
Italy	Lira	2/8	2/8	1	31,150	50.00	31,150	50.00			31,150.00	50.00
Somalia	Shilling	2/9	2/12	3	355	50.00	1,063.9	150.00			1,063.9	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	2/12	2/16	4	352.70	50.00	1,410.80	200.00			1,410.80	200.00
Madagascar	FMG	2/16	2/20	4	13,850	50.00	55,400	200.00	38,000	137.68	93,400	337.68
South Africa	Rand	2/20	2/27	7	35.71	50.00	215	300.00	126.51	177.11	341.51	477.11
Zambia	Kwacha	2/27	3/2	3	35.00	50.00	105.00	150.00	30.10	42.51	135.10	192.51
United Kingdom	Pound	3/2	3/3	2	20.66	50.00	41.32	100.00			41.32	100.00
Transportation	D. mark								7,565.22	2,071.95	7,565.22	2,071.95
Hon. Lester L. Wolff:												
Germany	D. mark	4/15	4/18	3	181.5	50.00	544.50	150.00			544.50	150.00
Israel	I. pound	4/18	4/22	4	175	50.00	700	200.00	166.92	47.69	866.93	247.69
France	Franc	4/22	4/24	3	275.70	50.00	827.10	150.00			827.10	150.00
Transportation	D. mark								4,926.73	1,350.63	4,926.73	1,350.63
Hon. Gus Yatron:												
Israel	I. pound	7/24	7/26	2	175	50.00	350	100.00	227.85	65.10	577.85	165.10
Transportation	I. pound								1,044.96	248.80	1,044.96	248.80
Hon. Clement J. Zablocki:												
Poland	Zlotys	6/10	6/15	5	3,250	50.00	16,250	250.00	5,627	106.33	21,877	356.33
Transportation	Zlotys								25,713.60	1,071.40	25,713.60	1,071.40
Total							31,194.24		73,434.65		104,628.89	

1 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds:	\$101,890.41
H. Res. 288, 92d Cong.	
Government department:	400.16
Department of Defense	1,241.72
U.S. Information Agency	1,096.60
Total	104,628.89

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,

Mar. 17, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 676, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. James Kee: Spain	Pesetas	10/28	11/7	10	3,425	\$50.00	34,250	\$500.00	9,458.50	\$136.08	43,708.50	\$636.08
	D. marks								3,073.67	942.84	3,073.67	942.84
Hon. James McClure: Spain	Pesetas	10/28	11/7	10	3,425	50.00	34,250	500.00	9,458.50	136.08	43,708.50	636.08
	D. marks								3,073.67	942.84	3,073.67	942.84
Hon. Joe Skubitz: United Kingdom	Pounds	10/28	10/30	3	19.97	50.00	59.92	150.00	5.50	13.42	65.42	163.42
Spain	Pesetas	10/30	11/7	8	3,425	50.00	27,400	400.00	9,458.50	136.08	36,858.50	536.08
	D. marks								2,010.25	616.64	2,010.25	616.64
William L. Shafer: Spain	Pesetas	10/28	11/7	10	3,425	50.00	34,250	500.00	9,458.50	136.08	43,708.50	636.08
	D. marks								3,073.67	942.84	3,073.67	942.84
Total								2,050.00		4,002.90		6,052.90

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
	\$6,052.90

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,

Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mar. 15, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 170, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Torbert H. Macdonald: Haiti	Gourdes	2/7	2/16	10	250.00	\$50.00	2,500	\$500.00			2,500	\$500.00
Transportation	D. marks								1,438.38	\$396.03	1,438.38	\$396.03
Japan	Yen	4/8	4/12	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	60,244	167.34	150,244	417.34
Transportation	D. marks								8,168.46	2,250.26	8,168.46	2,250.26
Total								750.00		2,813.63		3,563.63
Hon. Ray Blanton: Israel	Pounds	7/22	7/24	2	175	50.00	350	100.00	339	97.27	689	197.27
Transportation	Pounds								1,044.96	248.80	1,044.96	248.80
Total								100.00		346.07		446.07
Hon. Henry Helstoski: Poland	Zlotys	6/14	6/20	6	3,250	50.00	19,500	300.00			19,500	300.00
Transportation	Zlotys								25,411.68	1,058.82	25,411.68	1,058.82
Total								300.00		1,058.82		1,358.82
Hon. John Jarman: Iceland	Kronur	8/28	8/31	3	4,356	50.00	13,068	150.00			13,068	150.00
Scotland	Pounds	8/31	9/2	3	20.16	50.00	60.48	150.00			60.48	150.00
France	Francs	9/2	9/10	8	275	50.00	2,200	400.00			2,200	400.00
England	Pounds	9/12	9/19	8	20.16	50.00	161.33	400.00			161.33	400.00
Total								1,100.00				1,100.00
Hon. Robert O. Tiernan: Japan	Yen	1/5	1/10	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00			90,000	250.00
Hong Kong	Dollars	1/10	1/12	3	302	50.00	906	150.00	82.35	13.54	988.35	163.54
Thailand	Bahts	1/12	1/14	2	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Refund of overpayment								-50.00				-50.00
Vietnam	Piastres	1/15	1/15	1/2		50.00	9,250	16.36		1 (16.36)		
Greece	Drachmas	1/15	1/17	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Transportation	D. marks								7,532	2,074.02	7,532	2,074.02
Switzerland	Francs	6/6	6/12	5	203.55	50.00	1,018.75	250.00	1,537.30	357.18	1,537.30	670.18
Transportation	Guilders								3,356.65	943.41	3,356.65	943.41
Total								966.36		3,388.15		4,354.51
Hon. William L. Springer: Japan	Yen	8/20	9/5	16		50.00	31,978.80	88.83	157,236	458.92	189,214	547.75
Transportation	D. marks								3,159.64	895.08	3,159.64	895.08
Netherlands Antilles	Florin	12/6	12/17	11		50.00	456.20	250.00			456.20	250.00
Transportation	D. marks								645.77	191.00	645.77	191.00
Total								338.83		1,545.00		1,883.83
Hon. Bob Eckhardt: United Kingdom	Pounds	10/15	10/18	4	20	50.00	80	200.00			80	200.00
Germany	D. marks	10/19	10/28	10	166	50.00	1,660	500.00			1,660	500.00
Belgium	Francs	10/28	10/29	2	2,350	50.00	4,700	100.00				
Refund of overpayment								-50.00			2,350	50.00
France	Francs	10/30	11/1	3	276	50.00	828	150.00			828.00	150.00
Transportation	D. marks									917		917.00
Total								900.00		917.00		1,817.00
Hon. Samuel L. Devine: United Kingdom	Pounds	5/25	5/26	2	20.62	50.00	41.24	100.00	7.87	18.89	49.11	118.89
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	4	276.00	50.00	1,104.00	200.00	1,348.19	243.66	2,452.19	443.66
Israel	Pounds	5/31	6/3	4	175.00	50.00	700.00	200.00			700.00	200.00
Transportation	Pounds								5,099.50	1,457.00	5,099.50	1,457.00
Total								500.00		1,719.55		2,219.55

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 170, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Fletcher Thompson:												
France	Francs	5/28	6/2	6	276.00	\$50.00	1,656.00	\$300.00	905.35	\$163.63	2,561.35	\$463.63
Transportation	Guilders								3,201.00	899.66	3,201.00	899.66
Total								300.00		1,063.29		1,363.29
Hon. Donald Brotzman:												
Japan	Yen	1/5	1/10	6	18,000.00	50.00	108,000.00	300.00	66,229	183.97	174,229	483.97
Hong Kong	HK dollars	1/10	1/12	3	302.00	50.00	906.00	150.00	66.28	10.90	972.28	160.90
Philippines	Pesos	1/12	1/15	3	319.00	50.00	957.50	150.00			957.50	150.00
Refund of overpayment								-50.00				-50.00
Transportation	D. marks								4,248.31	1,169.69	4,248.31	1,169.69
Total								550.00		1,364.56		1,914.56
Hon. Paul G. Rogers:												
Thailand	Bahts	8/8	8/12	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165.00	200.00	72.00	3.46		
Refunded							825	39.63			3,412	163.83
Vietnam	Piastres	8/12	8/14	2	13,750	50.00	27,500	100.00				
Refunded							23,000	83.64			4,500	16.36
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/14	8/18	5	299	50.00	1,495	250.00	715.60	119.08	2,210.60	369.08
Japan	Yen	8/18	8/22	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	33,008.33	91.69	105,008.33	291.69
Transportation	D. marks								7,356.17	2,175.14	7,356.17	2,175.14
Total								626.73		2,389.37		3,016.10
Hon. Richardson Preyer:												
Thailand	Bahts	8/8	8/12	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00	72	3.46		
Refunded								-14.41			-3,937	189.05
Vietnam	Piastres	8/12	8/14	2	13,750	50.00	27,500	100.00				
Refunded							25,500	92.73			2,000	7.27
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/14	8/18	5	299	50.00	1,495	250.00	2,838.40	118.08	4,333.40	368.08
Japan	Yen	8/18	8/21	3	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00				
Refunded							21,000	58.33			51,000	141.67
Transportation	D. marks								7,356.15	2,175.73	7,356.15	2,175.73
Total								584.53		2,297.27		2,881.80
Hon. Hastings Keith:												
Switzerland	Francs	7/1	7/4	3	204	50.00	613.50	150.00			613.50	150.00
Transportation	Guilders								2,449.15	688.35	2,449.15	688.35
Total								150.00		688.35		838.35
Hon. Clarence J. Brown:												
Switzerland	Francs	6/9	6/14	6	204	50.00	1,224	300.00	410.00	95.26	1,634	395.26
Denmark	Kroner	6/14	6/15	1	375	50.00	375	50.00	380.16	50.72	755.16	100.72
Transportation	Guilders								2,131.60	599.10	2,131.60	599.10
Total								350.00		745.08		1,095.08
Hon. Dan Kuykendall:												
France	Francs	2/10	2/11	2	275.90	50.00	551.80	100.00			551.80	100.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	2/17	2/18	2	22.30	50.00	44.60	100.00	6.42	15.41	51.02	115.41
Transportation	D. marks								486.30	82.72	486.30	82.72
Spain	Pesetas	8/21	8/24	4	230	50.00	13,920	200.00			13,920	200.00
Switzerland	Francs	8/27	8/28	2								
Transportation		8/24	8/27	3	199	50.00	597	150.00			597	150.00
Total								550.00		98.13		648.13
Hon. Bertram L. Podell:												
Japan	Yen	1/1	1/5	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	38,300	106.47		306.47
Korea	Won	1/5	1/6	2	15,758.50	50.00	31,517	100.00				100.00
Taiwan	T dollars	1/6	1/8	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00				100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	1/9	1/12	3	302.00	50.00		150.00		37.31		187.31
Thailand	Bahts	1/13	1/15	3	1,041.25	50.00		150.00			2,123.75	150.00
Vietnam	Piastres	1/12	1/12	1	13,750	50.00		50.00				
Transportation	D. marks								7,331.16	2,018.49	7,331.16	2,018.49
Israel	l Pounds	4/7	4/12	5	175	50.00	875	250.00	520.05	148.59		398.59
Greece	Drachma	4/13	4/15	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Spain	Pesetas	4/15	4/19	4	3,480	50.00	13,920	200.00			13,920	200.00
Transportation	D. marks								5,266.15	1,450.73	5,266.15	1,450.73
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/9	8/15	6	299.00	50.00	1,794	300.00	215.30	35.82		335.82
Thailand	Bahts	8/15	8/19	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Malaysia	Dollars	8/19	8/20	2	150.00	50.00	300	100.00	180	59.60		159.60
Indonesia	Rupiah	8/20	8/24	4	19,050	50.00	76,200	200.00	36,230	95.09		295.09
Australia	Dollars	8/24	8/26	2	44.26	50.00	88.52	100.00		162.71		262.71
Transportation	D. marks								9,285.13	2,630.35	9,285.13	2,630.35
Total								2,200.00		6,745.16		8,945.16
Hon. James F. Hastings:												
France	Francs	2/2	2/3	2	276	50.00	552	100.00			552	100.00
Austria	Schillings	2/3	2/7	4	1,290	50.00	5,160	200.00	4,687.00	181.95	9,847	381.95
Hungary	Forints	2/7	2/9	2	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			3,000	100.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	2/9	2/11	2	20.82	50.00	41.65	100.00			41.65	100.00
Transportation	D. marks								3,468.22	954.91	3,468.22	954.91
United Kingdom	Pounds	5/20	5/22	3	20.63	50.00	61.85	150.00			61.85	150.00
Denmark	Kroner	5/23	5/25	3	375	50.00	1,125	150.00	300.00	40.02	1,425	190.02
Germany	D. marks	5/25	5/26	1	175	50.00	175	50.00			175	50.00
Belgium	Francs	5/27	5/29	3	2,750	50.00	7,500	150.00	5,862.00	118.13	13,362	268.13
France	Francs	5/30	6/3	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00			1,380	250.00
Transportation	Guilders								3,341.21	930.61	3,341.21	930.61
Total								1,250.00		2,225.62		3,475.62

Footnotes at end of table.

		Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
Name and country	Name of currency	Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹
						equivalent or U.S. currency		equivalent or U.S. currency		equivalent or U.S. currency		
Hon. Lionel Van Deerlin:												
Japan	Yen	1/5	1/10	6	18,000	\$50.00	108,000	\$300.00	76,294	\$211.93	184,294	\$511.93
Hong Kong	HK dollars	1/10	1/13	3	302	50.00	906	150.00	66.27	10.90	972.28	160.90
Philippines	Pesos	1/13	1/15	3	319.50	50.00	975.50	150.00				
Refund of overpayment								(50.00)			638.00	100.00
Transportation	D. marks								4,114.20	1,132.76	4,114.20	1,132.76
Total								550.00		1,355.59		1,905.59
Hon. Charles J. Carney:												
France	Francs	5/27	6/1	6	276	50.00	1,656	300.00			1,656	300.00
Ireland	Pounds	6/1	6/5	4	20.63	50.00	82.58	200.00	106	256.72	188.58	456.72
Transportation	Guilders								3,201	899.66	3,201	899.66
Ireland	Pounds	9/3	9/12	10	20.31	50.00	203.10	500.00	333.65	814.18		1,314.18
Transportation	D. marks								2,756.55	815.31	2,756.55	815.31
Total								1,000.00		2,785.87		3,785.87
Hon. Peter N. Kyros:												
Japan	Yen	1/5	1/10	5	18,000	50.00	90	250.00	129,723	360.34	219,723	610.34
Hong Kong	Dollars	1/10	1/12	3	302	50.00	906	150.00	82.35	13.54	988.35	163.54
Thailand	Bahts	1/12	1/14	2	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			2,082.50	100.00
Refund of overpayment								50.00				
Greece	Drachmas	1/15	1/17	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Transportation	D. marks								7,532.83	2,074.02	7,532.83	2,074.02
France	Francs	2/2	2/3	2	276	50.00	552	100.00			522	100.00
Austria	Schillings	2/3	2/7	4	1,290	50.00	5,160	200.00	1,618	62.81	10,154	393.83
Hungary	Forints	2/7	2/9	2	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00		2 (50.00)	3,000	100.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	2/9	2/11	2	20.82	50.00	41.65	100.00	5.16	12.38	5,403	112.38
Transportation	D. marks								3,468.21	954.90	3,468.21	954.90
Thailand	Bahts	8/8	8/12	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00	72.00	3.46	3,937	189.05
Vietnam	Piastres	8/12	8/14	2	13,750	50.00	27,500	100.00		2 (14.41)	22,500	81.82
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/14	8/18	5	299	50.00	1,495	250.00			1,495	250.00
Transportation	D. marks								7,356.15	2,175.73	7,356.15	2,175.73
Transportation refund									213.79	63.23		
Total								1,667.41		5,724.97		7,392.38
Hon. Louis Frey, Jr.:												
United Kingdom	Pounds	5/20	5/22	3	20.62	50.00	61.85	150.00			61.85	150.00
Denmark	Kroner	5/23	5/25	3	375	50.00	1,125	150.00	300	40.02	1,425	190.02
Germany	D. marks	5/25	5/26	1	175	50.00	175	50.00			175	50.00
Belgium	Francs	5/27	5/29	3	2,500	50.00	7,500	150.00	679	13.68	8,179	163.68
France	Francs	5/30	6/3	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00			1,380	250.00
Transportation	D. marks								1,727.52	475.90	1,727.52	475.90
Mexico	Pesos	10/21	10/24	4		50.00	2,498	200.00			2,498	200.00
Transportation	D. marks								1,531.80	453.06	1,531.80	453.06
Total								950.00		982.66		1,932.66
James Menger:												
Japan	Yen	1/7	1/12	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00			108,000	300.00
Hong Kong	Dollars	1/13	1/15	3	302	50.00	906	150.00			906	150.00
Thailand	Bahts	1/15	1/18	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Transportation	D. marks								6,952.79	1,914.31	6,952.79	1,914.31
Total								600.00		1,914.31		2,514.31
Hon. Tim Lee Carter:												
Austria	Schillings	1/9	1/13	4	1,288.50	50.00	5,154	200.00	2,335	90.64	7,489	290.64
Switzerland	Francs	1/13	1/15	2	212.25	50.00	430.50	100.00	360	83.55	790.50	183.55
France	Francs	1/15	1/17	3	276	50.00	828	150.00	352.80	63.94	1,180.80	213.94
Transportation	D. marks								3,610.51	994.08	3,610.51	994.08
Total								450.00		1,232.21		1,682.21
Hon. David E. Satterfield:												
Thailand	Bahts	8/8	8/11	4	1,041.25	50.00	3,865	185.59	72.00	3.46	3,937	189.05
Vietnam	Piastres	8/11	8/13	1	13,750	50.00	7,500	27.27			7,500	27.27
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/13	8/17	5	299	50.00	1,495	250.00	709.60	118.08	2,204.60	368.08
Japan	Yen	8/18	8/22	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	33,008.33	91.69	123,008	341.69
Transportation (air fare)	D. marks								7,356.15	2,175.73	7,356.15	2,175.73
Total								712.86		2,388.96		3,101.82
W. E. Williamson:												
Japan	Yen	1/7	1/12	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00			108,000	300.00
Hong Kong	Dollars	1/13	1/15	3	302	50.00	906	150.00			906	150.00
Thailand	Bahts	1/15	1/18	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Transportation	D. marks								6,952.79	1,914.31	6,952.79	1,914.31
Total								600.00		1,914.31		2,514.31
Stephen E. Lawton:												
Thailand	Bahts	8/8	8/12	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00	72.00	3.46	4,237	203.46
Vietnam	Piastres	8/12	8/14	1	13,750	50.00	27,500	100.00		2 (86.55)	3,700	13.45
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/14	8/18	5	299	50.00	1,495	250.00	709.60	118.08	2,204.60	368.08
Japan	Yen	8/18	8/22	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	33,008	91.69	105,000	291.69
Transportation	D. marks								7,356.17	2,175.00	14,356.17	2,175.14
Total								663.45		2,388.37		3,051.82

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.² Refunded.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
	\$68,802.47

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mar. 16, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 161, 1ST SESSION, 92D CONGRESS, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Edward G. Biester, Jr.:													
France	Francs	7/5	7/12	7	275	\$50.00	1,884	\$341.56	303.58	\$54.87	2,187.58	\$396.43	
Netherlands	Guilders								2,244.75	630.90	2,244.75	630.90	
Total								341.56		685.77		1,027.33	
Hon. Emanuel Celler:													
France	Francs	8/10	8/15	5	20.62	50.00	103.10	250.00	9,253.35	1,672.39	9,253.35	1,672.39	
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/15	8/18	4	354.34	50.00	1,417.37	200.00	68.99	166.98	174.19	416.98	
Norway	Kroners	8/15	8/18	4	354.34	50.00	1,417.37	200.00	612	86.17	2,029.37	286.17	
Sweden	Kroners	8/18	8/21	3	258	50.00	774	150.00	400	77.55	1,174	227.55	
Denmark	Kroners	8/21	8/25	4	375	50.00	1,500	200.00	665.50	88.78	2,165.50	288.78	
Portugal	Escudos	8/25	9/4	10	1,421	50.00	14,210	500.00	4,362.47	153.50	18,572.47	653.50	
Total								1,300.00		2,245.37		3,545.31	
Frances F. Christy:													
France	Francs	8/10	8/15	5	20.62	50.00	103.10	250.00	8,216.45	1,484.34	8,216.45	1,484.34	
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/15	8/18	4	354.34	50.00	1,417.37	200.00	68.99	166.98	174.19	416.98	
Norway	Kroners	8/15	8/18	4	354.34	50.00	1,417.37	200.00	612	86.17	2,029.37	286.17	
Sweden	Kroners	8/18	8/21	3	258	50.00	774	150.00	400	77.55	1,174	227.55	
Denmark	Kroners	8/21	8/25	4	375	50.00	1,500	200.00	1,040.50	138.78	2,540.50	338.78	
Total								800.00		1,953.82		2,753.82	
Garner J. Cline:													
France	Francs	5/16	5/19	3	276	50.00	828	150.00	5,440.80	983.34		1,133.34	
Switzerland	Swiss francs	5/7	5/13	7	209	50.00	1,466	350.00	432	100.37	1,898	450.37	
Austria	Shillings	5/13	5/16	3	1,245	50.00	3,735	150.00	338	13.57	4,073	163.57	
Total								650.00		1,097.28		1,747.28	
Peru	Soles	8/18	8/11	3	2,169	50.00	6,507	150.00			6,507	150.00	
Argentina	Pesos	8/11	8/14	3	235	50.00	705	150.00			705	150.00	
Brazil	Cruzeiros	8/14	8/17	4	268.50	50.00	1,074	200.00			1,074	200.00	
Italy	Lire	8/17	8/20	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00	
Portugal	Escudos	8/20	9/2	13	1,421	50.00	18,473	650.00	2,884	101.50	21,357	751.50	
Germany	Marks								6,952.75	2,056.42	6,952.75	2,056.42	
Total								1,300.00		2,157.92		3,457.92	
Switzerland	Swiss francs	11/23	12/5	13	198	50.00	2,575	650.00	457	112.56	3,032	762.56	
Italy	Lire	11/20	11/23	3	30,600	50.00	91,800	150.00			91,800	150.00	
France	Francs	12/5	12/8	3	375.50	50.00	826.50	150.00			826.50	150.00	
Germany	Marks								3,515.55	1,119.00	3,515.55	1,119.00	
Total								950.00		1,231.56		2,181.56	
Bess E. Dick:													
France	Francs	8/10	8/15	5	20.62	50.00	103.10	250.00	8,486.41	1,533.78	8,486.41	1,533.78	
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/15	8/18	4	354.34	50.00	1,417.37	200.00	68.99	166.98	174.19	416.98	
Norway	Kroners	8/15	8/18	4	354.34	50.00	1,417.37	200.00	612	86.17	2,029.37	286.17	
Sweden	Kroners	8/18	8/21	3	258	50.00	774	150.00	400	77.55	1,174	227.55	
Denmark	Kroners	8/21	8/25	4	375	50.00	1,500	200.00	665.50	88.78	2,165.50	288.78	
Portugal	Escudos	8/25	9/4	10	1,421	50.00	14,210	500.00			14,210	500.00	
Total								1,300.00		1,953.26		3,253.26	
Hon. Don Edwards:													
Vietnam	Piasters	8/20	8/22	3	19,750	50.00	39,890	145.05			39,890	145.05	
Hong Kong, B.C.C.	H.K. dollars	8/18	8/19	2	299	50.00	598	100.00	24.85	4.13	622.85	104.13	
Japan	Yen	8/15	8/17	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	30,264	84.07	84,264	234.07	
Iran	Rials	8/22	8/24	2	3,812.50	50.00	6,250	81.97			6,250	81.97	
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/24	8/27	3	20.27	50.00	60.81	150.00	66.75	161.54	127.56	311.54	
Netherlands	Guilders								7,960.10	2,237.24	7,960.10	2,237.24	
Total								627.02		2,486.98		3,114.00	
Hon. Joshua Eilberg:													
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/9	8/15	6	20.62	50.00	123.70	300.00	121.70	294.53	245.40	594.53	
France	Francs	8/15	8/19	5	275.50	50.00	1,377.50	250.00	2,021.40	365.34	3,398.90	615.34	
Italy	Lire	8/19	8/31	12	31,150.00	50.00	93,450	600.00	495,410	796.48	8,692.10	1,396.48	
Germany	Marks						373,800		3,464.80	1,024.79	3,464.80	1,024.79	
Total								1,150.00		2,481.14		3,631.14	
Hon. Joshua Eilberg:													
Switzerland	Swiss francs	11/29	12/2	3	197.25	50.00	591.75	150.00	1,165.00	286.95	1,756.75	436.95	
Germany	Marks								3,073.95	891.00	3,073.95	891.00	
Total								150.00		1,177.95		1,327.95	
Hon. Walter Flowers:													
Germany	Marks	5/26	5/26	1	175	50.00	175	50.00			175	50.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	5/20	5/22	3	20.15	50.00	61.85	150.00	42.24	101.37	104.09	251.37	
Belgium	Francs	5/27	5/29	3	2,500	50.00	7,500	150.00	6,003	120.98	13,503	270.98	
France	Francs	5/30	6/3	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00			1,380	250.00	
Denmark	Kroners	5/23	5/25	3	375	50.00	1,125	150.00	761.12	101.54	251.54	251.54	
Netherlands	Guilders								3,308.36	921.46	3,308.36	921.46	
Total								750.00		1,245.35		1,995.35	
Mr. Herbert Fuchs:													
France	Francs	7/1	7/22	21	276	50.00	5,796	1,050.00	1,333.41	241.82	7,129.41	1,291.82	
Sweden	Kroners	7/23	7/24	1	258	50.00	258	50.00			258	50.00	
Netherlands	Guilders								3,221.05	902.26	3,221.05	902.26	
Total								1,100.00		1,144.08		2,244.08	

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Lawrence J. Hogan:												
Israel.....	Israeli pounds.....	11/24	11/27	3	210	50.00	630	\$150.00	6,062	\$1,443.33		\$1,593.33
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	11/27	11/30	4	197.18	50.00	788.75	200.00	1,325	326.35		526.35
Total.....								350.00		1,769.68		2,119.68
Hon. William L. Hungate:												
France.....	Francs.....	7/17	7/20	2	276	50.00	552	100.00			552	100.00
Yugoslavia.....	Dinars.....	7/20	7/29	9	750	50.00	6,750	450.00	13,350	890.00	20,100	1,340.00
United Kingdom.....	Pounds.....	7/29	7/30	2	20.62	50.00	32.78	79.62	5.01	12.12	37.79	91.74
Total.....								629.62		902.02		1,531.74
Hon. Edward Hutchinson:												
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	10/19	10/25	5	198	50.00	840	213.05			840	213.50
Germany.....	Marks.....								3,163.65	935.71	3,163.65	935.71
Total.....								213.05		935.71		1,148.76
Hon. Robert W. Kastenmeier:												
France.....	Franc.....	7/6	7/13	8	276	50.00	2,208	400.00	2,353.46	426.82	4,561.46	826.82
Netherlands.....	Guilders.....								3,201.05	899.68	3,201.05	899.68
Total.....								400.00		1,326.50		1,726.50
Hon. Robert McClory:												
France.....	Francs.....	9/4	9/10	6	276	50.00	1,650	300.00			1,650	300.00
Iceland.....	Kroner.....	8/28	8/31	3	4,356	50.00	13,068	150.00			13,068	150.00
United Kingdom.....	Pounds.....	9/1	9/4	3	20.16	50.00	60.48	150.00			60.48	150.00
Total.....								600.00				600.00
Hon. Robert McClory:												
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	11/22	12/1	10	199	50.00	1,592	400.00	2,017.40	496.90	3,609.40	896.90
Germany.....	Marks.....								2,063.10	598.00	2,063.10	598.00
Total.....								400.00		1,094.90		1,494.90
Hon. James D. McKevitt:												
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	11/28	11/30	3	197.25	50.00	591.75	150.00	602.50	148.40	3,609.40	298.40
Germany.....	Marks.....								3,163.65	917.00	3,163.65	17.00
Total.....								150.00		1,065.40		1,215.40
Hon. James R. Mann:												
United Kingdom.....	Pounds.....	4/15	4/18	3	20.66	50.00	61.98	150.00			61.98	150.00
Denmark.....	Kroners.....	4/18	4/22	4	375	50.00	1,500	200.00	374.66	49.98	1,874.66	249.98
France.....	Francs.....	4/22	4/26	4	275.70		1,102.80	200.00			1,102.80	200.00
Germany.....	Marks.....								3,356.22	924.58	3,356.22	924.58
Total.....								550.00		974.56		1,524.56
Hon. Wiley Mayne:												
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	5/10	5/13	4	216	50.00	858.50	200.00			858.50	200.00
United Kingdom.....	Pounds.....	5/9	5/10	1	20.83	50.00	20.83	50.00				50.00
Germany.....									2,111.82	598.25		598.25
Total.....								250.00		598.25		848.25
Hon. Abner J. Mikva:												
France.....	Franc.....	7/8	7/13	6	276	50.00	1,656	300.00	1,329.24	240.24	2,985.24	540.24
Netherlands.....	Guilders.....								2,668.15	749.90	2,668.15	749.90
Total.....								300.00		990.14		1,290.14
Hon. Tom Railsback:												
United Kingdom.....	Pounds.....	4/12	4/15	3	20.66	50.00	61.98	150.00			61.98	150.00
Denmark.....	Kroners.....	4/15	4/18	4	375	50.00	1,500.00	200.00			1,500	200.00
France.....	Francs.....	4/18	4/22	4	275.70	50.00	1,102.80	200.00			1,102.80	200.00
Germany.....	Marks.....								3,356.22	924.58	3,356.22	924.58
Total.....								550.00		924.58		1,474.58
Hon. Tom Railsback:												
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	11/29	12/2	4	193.92	50.00	591.75	150.00	1,026.00	252.71	1,617.75	402.71
Germany.....									3,163.65	917.00	3,163.65	917.00
Total.....								150.00		1,169.71		1,319.71
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:												
Peru.....	Soles.....	8/8	8/11	3	2,169	50.00	6,507	150.00	2,700	62.24	9,207	212.24
Argentina.....	Pesos.....	8/11	8/14	3	235	50.00	705	150.00	280.29	44.56	985.29	194.56
Brazil.....	Cruzeiros.....	8/14	8/17	4	268	50.00	1,074	200.00			1,074	200.00
Italy.....	Lire.....	8/17	8/20	4	31,150	50.00	124,600	200.00	93,125	149.72	217,725	349.72
Portugal.....	Escudos.....	8/25	8/26	4	1,421	50.00	7,105	250.00	5,504	193.67	12,609	443.67
Germany.....	Marks.....	8/20	8/25	5					6,928.18	2,049.15	6,928.18	2,049.15
Total.....								950.00		2,499.34		3,449.34
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:												
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	11/27	12/4	8	197.22	50.00	1,577.75	400.00	2,205	543.10	3,782.75	943.10
Germany.....	Marks.....								3,163.65	917.00	3,163.65	917.00
Total.....								400.00		1,460.10		1,860.10
Hon. Henry P. Smith III:												
Yugoslavia.....	Dinars.....	7/17	7/25	7		50.00	5,250	350.00	11,505	767.00	16,755	1,117.00
Total.....								350.00		767.00		1,117.00

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 161, 1ST SESSION, 92D CONGRESS, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Mr. Jerome Zeifman:												
Vietnam	Piasters	8/20	8/22	3	19,750	\$50.00	39,250	\$142.73			39,250	\$142.73
Hong Kong, B.C.C.	B.C. dollars	8/18	8/19	2	299	50.00	598	100.00			598	100.00
Japan	Yen	8/15	8/17	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Iran	Rials	8/22	8/24	2	3,812.50	50.00	7,624.00	100.00			7,624	100.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/23	8/29	5	20.27	50.00	101.34	250.00			101.34	250.00
Netherlands	Guilders								7,960.10	2,237.24	7,960.10	2,237.24
Total								742.73	2,237.24			2,979.97
Total							17,403.98		38,575.71			55,979.69

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

March 16, 1972.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 21, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Frank M. Clark:												
Hong Kong	Dollars	5/23	5/26	4	299	\$50.00	1,196	\$200.00			1,196	\$200.00
Thailand	Bahts	5/27	5/30	4	1,041	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Vietnam	Piastres	5/31	6/2	3	13,750	50.00	41,000	149.09			41,000	149.09
Hong Kong	Dollars	6/3	6/6	4	299	50.00	1,196	200.00	89.70	\$14.91	1,285	\$214.91
Japan	Yen	6/7	6/8	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00	26,988	74.97	62,988	174.97
	D. marks								7,361	2,085.31	7,361	2,085.31
Hon. Philip E. Ruppe:												
Hong Kong	Dollars	5/23	5/26	4	299	50.00	1,196	200.00			1,196	200.00
Thailand	Bahts	5/27	5/30	4	1,041	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Vietnam	Piastres	5/31	6/2	3	13,750	50.00	31,000	112.73			31,000	112.73
Hong Kong	Dollars	6/3	6/6	4	299	50.00	1,196	200.00	59.70	9.92	1,255	209.92
	D. marks								7,361	2,085.31	7,361	2,085.31
Refunded to Department of State for credit to Committee account (personal check)												165.00
Capt. John H. Bruce:												
Hong Kong	Dollars	5/23	5/26	4	299	50.00	1,196	200.00			1,196	200.00
Thailand	Bahts	5/27	5/30	4	1,041	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Vietnam	Piastres	5/31	6/2	3	13,750	50.00	41,000	150.00	250.00	2.55	41,250	152.55
Hong Kong	Dollars	6/3	6/6	4	299	50.00	1,196	195.85	17.90	2.97	1,213	198.82
Japan	Yen	6/7	6/8	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
	D. marks								7,361	2,085.31	7,361	2,085.31
Ernest J. Corrado:												
Hong Kong	Dollars	5/23	5/26	4	299	50.00	1,196	200.00			1,196	200.00
Thailand	Bahts	5/27	5/30	4	1,041	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Vietnam	Piastres	5/31	6/2	3	13,750	50.00	41,000	149.09			41,000	149.09
Hong Kong	Dollars	6/3	6/6	4	299	50.00	1,196	200.00	96.60	16.05	1,292	216.05
Japan	Yen	6/7	6/8	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
	D. marks								7,361	2,085.31	7,361	2,085.31
H. C. Shephard:												
England	Pounds	3/13	3/20	7	20.62	50.00	144.62	350.00			144.62	350.00
Do	Pounds	10/4	10/16	13	20.62	50.00	260.32	650.00	245	599.19	505.87	1,249.19
	D. marks								2,931	807.62	2,931	807.62
Robert J. McElroy:												
Italy	Lire	8/22	8/28	6	31,150	50.00	186,900	300.00	8,280	13.31	195,913	313.31
	F. francs								2,556	462.04	2,556	462.04
	D. marks								2,015	596.12	2,015	596.12
Richard N. Sharood:												
Switzerland	Francs	3/21	4/2	13	214.71	50.00	2,791	650.00	2,768	622.26	5,559	1,272.26
	D. marks								3,239	892.31	3,239	892.31
Total						1,150.00		5,209.31		12,452.91		17,497.22

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount \$17,497.22

March 17, 1972

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 415, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Morris K. Udall:												
Netherlands ²	Guilders								2,719.35	\$1,045.35	3,719.35	\$1,045.35
Italy	Lire	7/2	7/6	4	31,200	\$50.00	124,800	\$200.00	367,975	*\$91.60	492,775	791.60
Germany	D. marks	7/6	7/9	3	175	50.00	525	150.00			525	150.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	7/9	7/13	4	20.62	50.00	82.45	200.00	542.83	*1,313.72	625.28	1,513.72
Germany (local transportation provided by the military)										106.31		106.31

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per item		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Lawrence Hogan:													
Netherlands ²	Guilders												
Italy	Lire	7/2	7/5	4	31,200	\$50.00	124,800	\$200.00	3,719.35	\$1,045.35	3,719.35	\$1,045.35	
Germany	D. marks	7/5	7/9	5	175	50.00	875	250.00	601.10	170.28	1,476.10	420.28	
United Kingdom	Pounds	7/10	7/13	3	13.74	33.42	41.23	100.27	74.56	180.45	115.79	280.72	
Germany (local transportation provided by military).										106.31		106.31	
Hon. Graham Purcell:													
Netherlands ²	Guilders								1,679	449.63	1,679	449.63	
Italy	Lire	7/2	7/6	5	31,000	50.00	156,000	250.00	12,700	20.42	12,700	270.42	
Germany	D. marks	7/6	7/9	3	175	50.00	525	150.00			525	150.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	7/9	7/13	4	20.62	50.00	82.45	200.00			82.45	200.00	
Germany (local transportation provided by military).										106.31		106.31	
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski:													
Netherlands ²	Guilders								3,456.55	971.49	3,456.55	971.49	
Germany	D. marks	7/6	7/9	3	175	50.00	525	150.00			525	150.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	7/5	7/6	2	20.62	50.00	41.24	100.00			41.24	100.00	
Germany (local transportation provided by military).										106.31		106.31	
Hon. William D. Ford:													
Netherlands ²	Guilders								3,719.35	1,045.35	3,719.35	1,045.35	
Italy	Lire	7/2	7/6	4	31,200	50.00	124,800	200.00			124,800	200.00	
Germany	D. marks	7/6	7/8	2	175	50.00	350	100.00			350	100.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	7/8	7/13	6	20.62	50.00	123.70	300.00	45.07	109.08	168.77	409.08	
Germany (local transportation provided by military).										106.31		106.31	
Anthony J. Raymond:													
Netherlands ²	Guilders								3,719.35	1,045.35	3,719.35	1,045.35	
Italy	Lire	7/2	7/6	4	31,200	50.00	124,800	200.00			124,800	200.00	
Germany	D. marks	7/6	7/9	4	175	50.00	700	200.00			700	200.00	
United Kingdom	Pounds	7/9	7/13	3	16.53	40.10	49.58	120.30	20	48.40	69.58	168.70	
Germany (local transportation provided by military).										106.31		106.31	
John Gabusi:													
Netherlands ²	Guilders								3,719.35	1,045.35	3,719.35	1,045.35	
Italy	Lire	7/2	7/6	4	31,200	50.00	124,800	200.00			124,800	200.00	
Germany	D. marks	7/6	7/9	4	175	50.00	700	200.00	333.50	94.48	1,033.50	294.48	
United Kingdom	Pounds	7/9	7/13	3	20.62	50.00	61.85	150.00			61.85	150.00	
Germany (local transportation provided by military).										106.31		106.31	
Hon. David N. Henderson:													
Netherlands ²	Guilders								3,662.41	1,029.35	3,662.41	1,029.35	
United Kingdom	Pounds	8/6	8/8	2	20.60	50.00	41.20	100.00			41.20	100.00	
Belgium	Francs	8/8	8/10	3	2,500	50.00	7,500	150.00	1,052	21.79	8,552	171.79	
Belgium (appropriated funds used for local transportation)										31.33		31.33	
Germany	D. marks	8/10	8/21	10	169	50.00	1,706	500.00			1,706	500.00	
Germany (appropriated funds)			8/22	1				31.81		47.44		79.25	
Italy	Lire	8/22	8/25	4	31,150	50.00	124,600	200.00	218,800	351.77	343,400	551.77	
Italy (appropriated funds)			8/26	1				18.36		73.75		92.11	
Spain	Pesetas	8/26	8/28	2	3,475	50.00	6,950	100.00		19.00	6,950	119.00	
Other transportation provided by military aircraft.										703.50		703.50	
Hon. Charles H. Wilson:													
Germany ³	D. marks								8,093.59	2,292.80	8,093.59	2,292.80	
Japan	Yen	7/31	8/3	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00		\$ 7.62		207.62	
Local transportation all delegation members.									88,560	246.00	88,560	246.00	
Taiwan	Dollars	8/4	8/6	3	2,000	50.00	6,000	150.00		\$ 5.66		155.66	
Local transportation all delegation members.									2,880	72.00	2,880	72.00	
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/7	8/9	3	299	50.00	897	150.00		\$ 7.95		157.95	
Local transportation all delegation members.									3,063	509.68	3,063	509.68	
Thailand	Bahts	8/10	8/14	5	1,041.25	50.00	5,206.25	250.00		\$ 9.82		259.82	
Local transportation all delegation members.									5,160	247.84	5,160	247.84	
Australia	Dollars	8/15	8/18	4	44.26	50.00	177.02	200.00		\$ 11.28		211.28	
Local transportation all delegation members.									773.90	892.41	773.90	892.41	
Victor Smiroldo:													
Germany ³	D. marks								8,093.59	2,292.80	8,093.59	2,292.80	
Japan	Yen	7/29	8/3	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00		\$ 7.62	108,000	307.62	
Taiwan	Dollars	8/4	8/6	3	2,000	50.00	6,000	150.00		\$ 5.66	6,000	155.66	
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/7	8/9	3	299	50.00	897	150.00		\$ 7.95	897	157.95	
Vietnam	Piastres	8/10	8/11	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00		\$ 2.66	13,750	52.66	
Thailand	Bahts	8/11	8/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00		\$ 7.16	4,165	207.16	
Australia	Dollars	8/15	8/18	4	44.26	50.00	177.02	200.00		\$ 11.28	177.02	211.28	
George B. Gould:													
Germany ³	D. marks								8,093.59	\$2,292.80	8,093.59	\$2,292.80	
Japan	Yen	7/29	8/3	6	18,000	\$50.00	108,000	\$300.00		\$ 7.62	108,000	307.62	
Taiwan	Dollars	8/4	8/6	3	2,000	50.00	6,000	150.00		\$ 5.66	6,000	155.66	
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/7	8/9	3	299	50.00	897	150.00		\$ 7.95	897	157.95	
Vietnam	Piastres	8/10	8/11	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00		\$ 2.66	13,750	52.66	
Thailand	Bahts	8/11	8/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00		\$ 7.16	4,165	207.16	
Australia	Dollars	8/15	8/18	4	44.26	50.00	177.02	200.00		\$ 11.28	177.02	211.28	
Maj. Mack Howard:													
Germany ³	D. marks								8,093.59	2,292.80	8,093.59	2,292.80	
Japan	Yen	7/31	8/3	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00			72,000	200.00	
Taiwan	Dollars	8/4	8/6	3	2,000	50.00	6,000	150.00			6,000	150.00	
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/7	8/9	3	299	50.00	897	150.00			897	150.00	
Thailand	Bahts	8/10	8/14	5	1,041.25	50.00	5,206.25	250.00			5,206.25	250.00	
Australia	Dollars	8/15	8/18	4	44.26	50.00	177.02	200.00			177.02	200.00	
Sgt. John Knewell:													
Germany ³	D. marks								8,093.59	2,292.80	8,093.59	2,292.80	
Japan	Yen	7/29	8/3	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00			108,000	300.00	

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 415, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Sgt. John Knewell—Continued												
Taiwan	Dollars	8/4	8/6	3	2,000	\$50.00	6,000	\$150.00			6,000	\$150.00
Hong Kong	Dollars	8/7	8/9	3	299	50.00	897	150.00			897	150.00
Vietnam	Piastres	8/10	8/11	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00			13,750	50.00
Thailand	Bahts	8/11	8/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Australia	Dollars	8/15	8/18	4	44.26	50.00	177.02	200.00			177.02	200.00

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

² Transportation to Europe and return.

³ Includes cost of local transportation supplied by Department of Defense.

⁴ Appropriated funds.

⁵ Transportation to Far East and return.

*Note: Local transportation for party charged to chairman of the delegation.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	\$33,731.71
Appropriated funds:	
Government department: Dept. of Defense	1,796.35
Total	35,528.06

T. J. DULSKI,

Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mar. 16, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 649, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Kenneth J. Gray:													
Germany	D. marks	10/25	10/28	3	166.50	\$50.00	499.50	\$150.00	1,332.92	\$394.23	1,832.42	\$544.23	
United Kingdom	Pounds	10/28	10/30	3	19.73	50.00	59.92	150.00	87.12	212.59	147.04	362.59	
Hon. James J. Howard: Germany		10/26	10/30	5	166.50	50.00	832.50	250.00			832.50	250.00	
	D. marks								3,438.89	1,017.12	3,438.89	1,017.12	
Robert Loftus: Germany	D. marks	10/25	10/29	4	166.50	50.00	666	200.00	1,054.55	311.90	1,720.55	511.90	
Richard C. Peet:													
Germany	D. marks	10/25	10/28	3	166.50	50.00	499.50	150.00	1,054.55	311.90	1,554.05	461.90	
United Kingdom	Pounds	10/28	10/31	4	19.73	50.00	79.90	200.00			79.90	200.00	
Total								1,100.00		2,247.74		3,347.74	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
	\$3,347.74

JOHN A. BLATNIK,

Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

Mar. 17, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 142, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Patrick T. Caffery:													
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	\$50.00	1,920	\$100.00			1,920	\$100.00	
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.12	\$58.18	716.12	108.18	
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00	
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00	
Netherlands	Guilders								2,248.40	625.25	2,248.40	625.25	
Hon. Don H. Clausen:													
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00	
Colombia (refund)	Pesos						(945)	(49.84)					
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.12	58.18	716.12	108.18	
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00	
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00	
Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.42	793.07	
Ecuador	Sucres	11/19	11/23	5	1,375	50.00	6,875	250.00	4,835.05	175.82	11,710.05	425.82	
Germany	D. marks								1,775	568.00	1,775	568.00	

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John Paul Hammerschmidt:												
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	\$50.00	331	\$50.00			331	\$50.00
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Germany	D. marks								8,374.42	\$653.75	374.42	653.75
Subtotal								1,000.16		2,932.25		3,932.41
Hon. James J. Howard:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Guatemala	Quetzales	2/7	2/9	2	50	50.00	100	100.00			100	100.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Netherlands	Guilders								2,893.87	804.75	2,893.87	804.75
Netherlands (transportation refund)	Guilders								(1,204.50)	(351.68)		
Ecuador	Sucres	11/20	11/23	4	1,375	50.00	5,500	200.00			5,500	200.00
Germany	D. marks								1,971.20	543.00	1,971.20	543.00
Hon. John C. Kluczynski:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.11	58.17	716.11	108.17
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.42	793.07
Hon. Jack McDonald:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Netherlands	Guilders								1,660.75	461.83	1,660.75	461.83
Hon. Jim Wright:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00	3,600	189.87	5,520	289.87
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.11	58.17	716.11	108.17
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00	3,371.05	481.57	3,721.05	531.57
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00	5,718.15	457.82	6,967.15	557.82
Subtotal								2,200.16		6,428.82		8,628.98
Hon. Jim Wright: Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.42	793.07
Salvatore D'Amico:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.12	58.18	716.12	108.18
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.42	793.07
Martha E. Downie:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.11	58.17	716.11	108.17
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.42	793.07
Betty Hay:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.11	58.17	716.11	108.17
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.42	793.07
Do	D. marks								99.25	27.34	99.25	27.34
Colombia (refund)	Pesos						(888)	(46.84)				
Subtotal								3,053.32		9,802.96		12,856.28
Joseph A. Italiano:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.11	58.17	716.11	108.17
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Germany	D. marks								3,045.85	838.64	3,045.85	838.64
Robert F. Spence:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.11	58.17	716.11	108.17
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00			1,249	100.00
Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.42	793.07
Do	D. marks								99.26	27.34	99.26	27.34
Ecuador	Sucres	11/20	11/23	4	1,375	50.00	5,500	200.00			5,500	200.00
Germany	D. marks								1,971.20	543.00	1,971.20	543.00
Gordon Wood:												
Ecuador	Sucres	11/19	11/23	5	1,375	50.00	6,875	250.00			6,875	250.00
Germany	D. marks								1,971.20	543.00	1,971.20	543.00
Paul R. S. Yates:												
Colombia	Pesos	2/1	2/3	2	960	50.00	1,920	100.00			1,920	100.00
Costa Rica	Colones	2/7	2/8	1	331	50.00	331	50.00	385.11	58.17	716.11	108.17
Nicaragua	Cordobas	2/8	2/9	1	350	50.00	350	50.00			350	50.00
Subtotal								4,303.32		12,722.52		17,025.84
Paul R. S. Yates:												
Mexico	Pesos	2/9	2/11	2	624.50	50.00	1,249	100.00	300.40	24.05	1,549.40	124.05
Germany	D. marks								2,880.42	793.07	2,880.49	793.07
Total								4,403.32		13,539.64		17,942.96

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: H. Res. 142

Amount

\$17,942.96

Mar. 17, 1972.

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 243, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. George P. Miller:												
Italy	Lire	5/1	5/8	7	30,650	\$50.00	217,700	\$350.00	164,220	\$263.60	381,920	\$613.60
Germany	Marks								3,617.4	996.54	3,617.4	996.54
France	Francs	5/27	5/30	4	276	50.00	1,104	200.00	817.56	148.25	1,921.56	348.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
Italy	Lire	10/1	10/9	8	30,650	50.00	275,850	400.00	99,890	160.34	375,740	510.34
Netherlands	Guilders ²								1,606	451.38	1,606	451.38
France	Francs	10/10	10/17	8	276	50.00	2,200	400.00	0	0	2,200	400.00
Germany	Marks ²								552	163.27	552	163.27
										* 424.40		424.40
Total												4,159.34
Hon. J. E. Karth:												
Switzerland	Francs	2/8	2/19	11	214.7	50.00	2,361.7	550.00	0	0	2,361.7	550.00
Germany	Marks ²								3,246.13	893.76	3,246.13	893.76
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										* 620.86		620.86
Total												2,988.30
Hon. J. W. Davis:												
New Zealand	Dollars	1/13	1/14	1	43.37	50.00	43.37	50.00	0	0	43.37	50.00
Germany	Marks ²								6,143.3	1,691.44	6,143.3	1,691.44
Total												1,741.44
P. B. Yeager:												
France	Francs	10/11	10/16	5	275	50.00	1,225	223.00	0	0	1,225	223.00
Germany	Marks ²								3,032.2	896.86	3,032.2	896.86
Total												1,119.86
R. A. Carpenter: France	Francs	7/15	7/17	2	276	50.00	500	88.90	0	0	500	88.90
Hon. Don Fuqua:												
Spain	Pesetas	8/14	8/16	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00	0	0	10,440	150.00
Portugal	Escudos	8/16	8/17	1	1,424	50.00	1,424	50.00	306	10.77	1,730	60.77
Germany	Marks	8/17	8/19	2	170	50.00	340	100.00	0	0	340	100.00
Austria	Schillings	8/19	8/22	3	1,241	50.00	3,723	150.00	3,249	130.48	6,972	280.48
Greece	Drachmas	8/22	8/25	4	1,500	50.00	6,000	200.00	0	0	6,000	200.00
Italy	Lire	8/26	8/31	5	31,150	50.00	155,750	250.00	171,840	276.10	327,590	526.10
France	Francs	8/31	9/2	2	275	50.00	550	100.00	782.8	141.97	1,332.8	241.97
Germany	Marks	9/2	9/3	1	170	50.00	170	50.00	44.60	12.63	214.6	62.63
Netherlands	Guilders ²								2,098.2	589.71	2,098.2	589.71
Total												2,211.66
Hon. Robert Price:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										* 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
Hon. R. A. Roe:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										* 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
Hon. Larry Winn:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										* 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
Hon. John N. Happy Camp:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										* 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
W. G. Wells:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										* 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
Carl Swartz:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	\$50.00	525	\$150.00	449.6	\$123.87	974.6	\$273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										* 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
D. C. Quigley:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	\$50.00	525	\$150.00	449.6	\$123.87	974.6	\$273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										\$ 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
W. B. Arnold:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										\$ 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
M. L. Boswell: France	Francs	5/27	5/30	4	276	50.00	1,104	200.00	817.56	148.25	1,921	348.25
J. D. McDonald:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
France	Francs ²								1,544.9	279.23	1,544.9	279.23
										\$ 196.40		196.40
Total												1,147.75
Philip Drew:												
France	Francs	5/20	5/30	10	276	50.00	2,760	500.00	817.56	148.25	3,577.5	648.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
	Guilders ²								1,606	451.38	1,606	451.38
Total												1,351.19
P. O. VanGilder:												
France	Francs	5/20	5/30	10	276	50.00	2,760	500.0	817.56	148.25	3,577.5	648.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.0	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
	Guilders ²								1,606	451.38	1,606	451.38
Total												1,351.19
J. S. Manolovich:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										\$ 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
William McCord:												
Germany	Marks	5/23	5/26	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	449.6	123.87	974.6	273.87
France	Francs	5/26	5/30	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	817.56	148.25	2,197.5	398.25
Spain	Pesetas	5/31	6/1	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	10,548	151.56	17,508	251.56
										\$ 620.86		620.86
Total												1,544.54
Thomas Odhiambo	Shillings ⁴								12,071.95			1,692.17
Abdus Salam	Lire ⁴								661,950			1,064.23
Francesco DiCastri	Escudos ⁵								20,300			1,416.61
Adriano Buzzati-Traverso	Francs ⁴								4,696.08	851.05		851.05
Staffan Burenstam Linder	Kroner ⁴								4,900	948.33		948.33
Bengt Lundholm	Kroner ⁵								3,325	645.25		645.25

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used enter amount expended.² Cost of overseas transportation.³ Cost of transportation furnished by Department of Air Force.⁴ Special consultant to committee as per authority of House Administration Committee, Nov. 25, 1970 and Dec. 14, 1970.⁵ Special consultant to committee as per authority of House Administration Committee, May 5, 1971.

Mar. 17, 1972.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 538, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski:												
Germany	D. mark	11/11	11/14	3	167	\$50.00	501	\$150.00			501	\$150.00
Spain	Peseta	11/14	11/17	4	3,425	50.00	13,700	200.00			13,700	200.00
Total									350.00			350.00
U.S. dollar refund									-95.00			-95.00
Total									255.00			255.00
Hon. Roman C. Pucinski:												
Vietnam	Piastres	8/16	8/19	4	13,750	50.00	27,500	100.00			27,500	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollar	8/19	8/21	3	299	50.00	897	150.00	77.70	\$12.93	974.70	162.93
Japan	Yen	8/21	8/23	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	25,558	70.99	79,558	220.99
Netherlands (transportation only)	Guilders								6,340.05	1,781.91	6,340.05	1,781.91
Total									400.00	1,865.83		2,265.83

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 538, 1ST SESS., 92D CONG., COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Louise Day Hicks:													
Hong Kong	HK dollar	4/9	4/12	3	299	\$50.00	897	\$150.00	91.70	\$15.24	988.70	\$165.24	
Japan	Yen	4/6	4/9	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	12,142	33.73	66,142	183.73	
Korea	Won	4/12	4/13	1	16,064	50.00	16,064	50.00			16,064	50.00	
Philippines	Peso	4/13	4/16	3	319.50	50.00	958.50	150.00			958.50	150.00	
Taiwan	NT dollar	4/16	4/17	1	2,000	50.00	2,000	50.00			2,000	50.00	
Vietnam	Piastre	4/17	4/22	6	13,750	50.00	45,650	166.00			45,650	166.00	
Germany (transportation only)	D. mark								8,397.28	2,313.30	8,397.28	2,313.30	
Total								716.00		2,362.27		3,078.27	
Hon. John Paul Hammerschmidt:													
Vietnam	Piastre	8/12	8/16	3	13,750	50.00	39,750	144.55			39,750	144.55	
Japan	Yen	8/11	8/12	6	18,000	50.00	93,619	260.05			93,619	260.05	
		8/16	8/18										
		8/19	8/20										
Korea	Won	8/18	8/19	1	18,457	50.00	18,457	50.00			18,457	50.00	
Germany (transportation only)	D. mark								6,574.90	1,944.66	6,574.90	1,944.66	
Total								454.60		1,944.66		2,399.26	
Hon. G. V. Montgomery:													
Vietnam	Piastre	8/12	8/14	3	13,750	50.00	41,750	151.82			41,750	151.82	
		8/18	8/19										
Laos	Kip	8/15	8/17	3	25,200	50.00	67,500	133.93			67,500	133.93	
		8/11	8/12										
Japan	Yen	8/19	8/20	4	18,000	50.00	58,654	162.93	10,465	29.07	69,119	192.00	
Germany (transportation only)	D. mark								7,500.88	2,218.54	7,500.88	2,218.54	
Total								448.68		2,247.61		2,696.29	
Hon. George E. Danielson:													
Japan	Yen	7/5	7/7	3	18,000	50.00	46,500	129.17	14,980	41.61	61,480	170.78	
		7/7	7/8	1	18,457	50.00	15,447	41.86			15,447	41.86	
Korea	Won	7/8	7/10	3	299	50.00	897	150.00	122.25	20.34	1,019.25	170.34	
Hong Kong	HK dollar	7/8	7/10	3	13,750	50.00	29,130	105.93			29,130	105.93	
Vietnam	Piastre	7/10	7/14	3	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00	
Thailand	Baht	7/14	7/16	2	319	50.00	319	50.00	19.46	3.02	338.46	53.02	
Philippines	Pesos	7/16	7/17	1					7,568.49	2,117.18	7,568.49	2,117.18	
Netherlands (transportation only)	Guilder												
Total								576.96		2,182.15		2,759.11	
Total								2,851.24		10,602.52		13,453.76	

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
	\$13,453.76
Mar. 3, 1972.	OLIN E. TEAGUE, Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, PARLIAMENTARY GROUP TO KOREA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total		
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	
Hon. Carl Albert:													
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	\$50.00	73,828.00	\$200.00			73,828.00	\$200.00	
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00	
Philippines	Pescs.	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00	
Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo:													
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00	
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/16	2	299.00	50.00	597.00	100.00	6.80	\$1.13	603.80	101.13	
Netherlands (transportation)	Guilders								3,485.75	979.69	3,485.75	979.69	
Hon. Edward P. Boland:													
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00	
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00	
Philippines	Pesos.	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00	
Hon. William G. Bray:													
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00	
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00	
Philippines	Pesos.	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00	
Col. Lloyd L. Burke:													
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00	
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00	
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00	
Hon. Tim Lee Carter:													
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00	
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00	
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00	
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00	

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Silvio O. Conte:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	\$50.00	73,828.00	\$200.00			73,828.00	\$200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. John C. Culver:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Eligio de la Garza:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Frank E. Denholm:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. John J. Duncan:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Thomas S. Foley:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Richard Hanna:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Imogene Holmes:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Justin R. Keiser:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Tamara Kitchens:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Eugene L. Krizek:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Delbert Latta:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	3,830.00	95.75			3,830.00	95.75
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. John M. Murphy:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Col. William P. Nelson:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Edward Patten:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. William Poage:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Netherlands (transportation).....	Guilders.....			1			319.00	50.00	3,124.40	\$878.13	3,124.40	\$878.13
Hon. Melvin Price:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Robert Price:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. James H. Quillen:												
Korea.....	Won.....	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan.....	NT dollars.....	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong.....	HK dollars.....	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines.....	Pesos.....	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00

Footnotes at end of table.

CXVIII—865—Part 11

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, FOR TRAVEL, PARLIAMENTARY GROUP TO KOREA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael A. Reed:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	\$50.00	73,828.00	\$200.00			73,828.00	\$200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. James Scheuer:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. William J. Stanton:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Marna L. Steger:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Susan Thompson:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Larry Winn:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Hon. Lester Wolff:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Harry C. Cromer:												
Korea	Won	8/9	8/13	4	18,457.00	50.00	73,828.00	200.00			73,828.00	200.00
Taiwan	NT dollars	8/13	8/15	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/15	8/17	3	299.00	50.00	897.00	150.00			897.00	150.00
Philippines	Pesos	8/17	8/20	3	319.00	50.00	957.00	150.00			957.00	150.00
Delegation Expenses:												
Korea	Won								892,597	\$2,412.42	892,597	2,412.42
Taiwan	NT dollars								99,344.20	2,483.61	99,344.20	2,483.61
Hong Kong	HK dollars								13,523.30	2,250.13	13,523.30	2,250.13
Philippines	Pesos								18,144.28	2,813.08	18,144.28	2,813.08
Total									20,095.75	11,818.19		31,913.94

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....\$31,913.94

CARL ALBERT,
Chairman, Parliamentary Group to Korea.

March 17, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 551, 1ST SESS., 88TH CONG., HOUSE DELEGATION TO NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Jack Brooks:												
Belgium	B. franc	5/25	5/28	4	2,500	\$50.00	10,000	\$200.00	12,311	\$248.11	22,311	\$448.11
Do	Netherlands guilder								3,201	899.66	3,201	899.66
United Kingdom	Pound	5/28	5/29	1	20.62	50.00	20.62	50.00			20.62	50.00
Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/28	6	50	50.00	300	300.00			300	300.00
Hon. Phillip Burton: Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/26	4	50	50.00	200	200.00	63	63.00	263	263.00
Hon. Charles J. Carney:												
Belgium	B. franc	8/7	8/21	15	2,500	50.00	37,500	750.00			37,500	750.00
Do	Netherlands guilder								3,208.05	936.66	3,208.05	936.66
Hon. Frank M. Clark: Canada	C. dollar	9/24	9/28	5	50	50.00	250	250.00	50	50.00	300	300.00
Hon. Mendel J. Davis:												
Belgium	B. franc	8/7	8/21	15	2,500	50.00	37,500	750.00			37,500	750.00
Do	Netherlands guilder								3,287.80	959.94	3,287.80	959.94
Hon. Sam Gibbons:												
Belgium	B. franc	3/14	3/16	3	2,500	50.00	7,500	150.00			7,500	150.00
Do	D. mark								3,092.70	851.98	3,092.70	851.98
Do	B. franc	5/23	5/27	5	2,500	50.00	12,500	250.00	10,260	206.77	22,760	456.77
Do	Netherlands guilder								1,857.85	522.16	1,857.85	522.16
Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/28	6	50	50.00	300	300.00			300	300.00
Hon. Wayne L. Hays:												
United Kingdom	Pound	2/26	3/2	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00	49.69	119.25	152.99	369.25
Do	Pound	4/18	4/20	2	20.66	50.00	41.32	100.00	31.92	76.60	73.24	176.60
Do	Pound	5/26	5/27	2	20.62	50.00	41.24	100.00	34.74	83.37	75.98	183.37
Belgium	B. franc	5/27	5/29	2	2,500	50.00	5,000	100.00			5,000	100.00
Do	Netherlands guilder								3,201.05	891.66	3,201.05	891.66
United Kingdom	Pound	5/29	5/30	1	20.62	50.00	20.62	50.00			20.62	50.00
Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/28	6	50	50.00	300	300.00			300	300.00
United Kingdom	Pound	11/20	11/28	9	19.97	50.00	179.77	450.00			179.77	450.00
Hon. Albert W. Johnson: Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/28	6	50	50.00	300	300.00			300	300.00

Footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Robert B. Mathias:												
Belgium	B. franc	5/28	5/29	2	2,500	\$50.00	5,000	\$100.00			5,000	\$100.00
Do.	F. franc								74	\$13.42	74	\$13.42
Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/26	4	50	50.00	200	200.00	63	63.00	263	263.00
Hon. Bertram L. Podell:												
Belgium	B. franc	2/24	2/26	3	2,500	50.00	7,500	150.00	4,212	84.88	11,712	234.88
Do.	F. franc								4,703.95	852.78	4,703.95	852.78
Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/25	3	50	50.00	150	150.00			150	150.00
Hon. Peter Rodino: Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/26	4	50	50.00	200	200.00	63	63.00	263	263.00
Hon. Philip E. Ruppe: Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/26	4	50	50.00	200	200.00			200	200.00
Hon. Sidney R. Yates: Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/25	3	50	50.00	150	150.00			150	150.00
Peter Abbruzzese:												
Belgium	B. franc	5/23	5/29	7	2,500	50.00	17,500	350.00	14,690	296.05	32,190	646.05
Do.	Netherlands guilder								1,938.15	539.87	1,938.15	539.87
United Kingdom	Pound	5/29	5/30	1	20.62	50.00	20.62	50.00			20.62	50.00
Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/28	6	50	50.00	300	300.00			300	300.00
Boyd Crawford: United Kingdom	Pound	2/26	3/2	5	20.66	50.00	103.30	250.00			103.30	250.00
Paula Peak: Canada	C. dollar	9/23	9/28	6	50	50.00	300	300.00			300	300.00
Delegation expenses including office rental, telephone, transportation, and official representation:												
United Kingdom												250.00
Canada												3,684.02
Total								7,250.00		7,822.16		19,006.18

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.² Arrived in Canada evening of Sept. 23.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount
\$19,006.18

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman, North Atlantic Assembly.

March 17, 1972.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, 1971, AND DEC. 31, 1971

Individual	Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
			Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent
Representative Robert N. C. Nix	Mexico	U.S. dollar		\$130.24		\$22.50		\$12.00		\$15.50		\$180.24
Representative James C. Wright, Jr.	do.	do.		25.00		17.25		113.00		10.00		165.25
Representative Eligio de la Garza	do.	do.		107.10		21.50		169.40		18.50		316.50
Representative John E. Moss	do.	do.		98.69		13.24		8.00		17.00		136.93
Representative Abraham Kazen, Jr.	do.	do.		94.36		18.75		16.00		15.25		144.36
Representative Morris K. Udall	do.	do.		26.21		8.00		119.00		8.00		161.21
Representative William J. Randall	do.	do.		99.35								99.35
Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen	do.	do.		81.85								81.85
Representative Vernon W. Thomson	do.	do.		78.95						5.00		83.95
Representative Sam Steiger	do.	do.		92.60						8.00		100.60
Representative Charles E. Wiggins	do.	do.		99.76		17.50		14.50		10.00		141.76
Representative Manuel Lujan, Jr.	do.	do.		91.24		20.50		17.00		12.50		141.24
Albert C. F. Westphal	do.	do.		64.11		28.00				12.00		104.11
Paula L. Peak	do.	do.		61.61		8.00		3.08		7.00		79.69
Delegation expenses												3,995.03

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420..... Total amount
\$5,932.07

March 17, 1972

ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Chairman, House of Representatives Delegation,
Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, U.S. GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	840	\$186.67	898.45	\$200.44	993	\$221.65	333	\$74.00	3,064.45	\$682.76
Iceland	Krona	5,570	64.18	3,577	41.65	13,068	150.00			22,215	255.83
United Kingdom	Pound	51.77	128.39	60.48	150.00					112.25	278.39
France	Franc	2,668	485.09	772.70	140.49	2,090	380.00	174.50	31.72	5,705.20	1,037.30
Hon. Jackson Betts:											
Iceland	Krona	5,570	64.18	11,600	133.76			5,223	59.90	22,393	257.84
United Kingdom	Pound	31.58	78.32	53.94	133.78			10.48	25.99	96	238.09
France	Franc	1,656	301.09	2,180.25	396.40	200	36.36	678	123.28	4,714	857.13

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, U.S. GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1971—Continued

Name of country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar ¹ equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Bob Casey:											
Iceland	Krona	4,120	\$47.29	3,301	\$37.89					7,421	\$85.18
United Kingdom	Pound	31.58	78.32					6.32	\$15.67	37.90	93.99
France	Franc	1,656	301.09	403.35	73.34			2	.36	2,061.35	374.79
Hon. Lee Hamilton:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	840	186.67	1,029.75	229.07			52.40	11.65	1,922.15	427.39
Iceland	Krona	5,570	64.18	15,239	174.81			2,655	30.50	23,464	269.49
United Kingdom	Pound	31.58	78.32	60.97	151.20			3.48	8.64	96.03	238.16
France	Franc	1,536.50	279.36	1,536.50	281.17	1,040	\$189.10	153	27.80	4,266	777.43
Hon. John Jarman:											
Iceland	Krona	5,570	64.18	16,076	184.50			1,890	21.69	23,536	270.37
United Kingdom	Pound	31.58	78.32	5.86	16.02			.12	.30	38.16	94.64
France	Franc	1,656	301.09	1,031	187.46			48.50	18.82	2,735.50	507.37
Hon. John S. Monagan:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	840	186.67	821.90	183.20			101.70	22.60	1,763.60	392.47
Iceland	Krona	5,570	64.18	13,030	150.58			3,068	35.22	21,668	249.98
United Kingdom	Pound	30.65	76.01			61.47	151.20			92.12	227.21
France	Franc	1,863	338.72	1,824.95	331.81	1,610	292.90	209	38.00	5,506.95	1,001.43
Hon. Robert McClory:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	840	186.67	188.40	41.86			3.50	.77	1,031.90	229.30
Do	U.S. dollars				20.00						20.00
Iceland	Krona	5,570	64.18	14,867	170.63			2,045	23.33	22,482	258.14
United Kingdom	Pounds	31.58	78.32	51.92	128.76			10.58	25.85	94.08	232.93
France	Franc	1,656	301.09	1,423.70	260.78			981.80	179.01	4,061.50	740.88
Germany	D. mark					2,063.10	598.00			2,063.10	598.00
Hon. F. Bradford Morse:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	680	151.11	1,968.45	438.82			129.95	28.88	2,778.40	618.31
Iceland	Krona	2,780	31.91	1,420	16.33			90	1.01	4,290	49.25
United Kingdom	Pounds	31.58	78.32	66.87	165.85			3.38	8.38	101.83	252.55
France	Franc	1,656	301.09	3,063.20	556.95			282	51.27	5,001.20	909.31
Netherlands	Guilder					2,949.20	846.22			2,949.20	846.22
Hon. Alexander Pirnie:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	680	151.11	203.75	45.28					883.75	196.39
Iceland	Krona	2,780	31.91	1,651	18.96					4,431	50.87
France	Franc	1,138.50	207.00	41.50	7.54			10.70	5.20	1,190.70	219.74
Hon. Charles H. Wilson:											
Iceland	Krona	4,120	47.29	3,355	38.13					7,475	85.42
United Kingdom	Pound	31.58	78.32	4.17	10.34			.08	.20	35.83	88.86
France	Franc	1,656	301.09	129.20	23.49			162.50	29.54	1,947.70	354.12
W. Pat Jennings:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	840	186.67	503.85	111.96					1,343.85	298.63
Iceland	Krona	4,120	47.30	3,190	36.65					7,310	83.95
United Kingdom	Pound	3,158	78.32	3.74	9.27					35.39	87.59
France	Franc	1,656	301.09	661.60	120.29			103.50	18.89	2,421.10	440.27
Mary Sweet:											
Iceland	Krona	2,780	31.91	1,390	15.96					4,170	47.87
United Kingdom	Pounds	15.79	39.16							15.79	39.16
France	Franc	1,012	184.00	207.90	37.80					1,219.90	221.80
Jay Long:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	680	151.11	279.20	62.04			48.75	10.84	1,007.95	223.99
Iceland	Krona	2,780	31.91	1,891	21.71					4,671	53.62
France	Franc	1,138.50	207.00	1,754	31.89			198	36.00	1,511.90	274.89
Delegation expenses:											
Venezuela:											
Hotel office	Bolivars	3,228.80	721.25							3,228.80	721.25
	U.S. dollars		151.66								151.66
Meals	Bolivars			2,133.40	477.65					2,133.40	477.65
	U.S. dollars				708.35						708.35
Gratuities	Bolivars							410	93.20	410	93.20
Printing	Bolivars							85	19.00	85	19.00
Gifts	U.S. dollars								451.88		451.88
Transportation	Bolivars					9,980	2,227.68			9,980	2,227.68
	U.S. dollars						755.16				755.16
Iceland:											
Hotel office	Krona	121,179	1,390.94							121,179	1,390.94
Meals	U.S. dollars				356.58						356.58
Gratuities	U.S. dollars							19.50			19.50
Transportation	Krona					82,073	939.73			82,073	939.73
United Kingdom:											
Hotel office	Pounds	15.56	38.58							15.56	38.58
Meals	Pounds			306.36	759.77					306.36	759.77
Gratuities	Pounds							41.50	102.92	41.50	102.92
Miscellaneous	Pounds							58.75	145.70	58.75	145.70
Transportation	Pounds					407.84	990.13			407.84	990.13
Do	U.S. dollars						512.25				512.25
France:											
Hotel office	Franc	5,708.90	1,037.97							5,708.90	1,037.97
Office expenses	U.S. dollars		33.85								33.85
Meals	Franc			852.40	154.98					852.40	154.98
Gratuities	Franc							185.00	33.64	185.00	33.64
Gifts	U.S. dollars								228.25		228.25
Transportation	Franc					19,254.58	3,500.83			19,254.58	3,500.83
Luxembourg:											
Miscellaneous	U.S. dollars								41.52		41.52
Transportation	Franc					10,560.00	213.16			10,560.00	213.16
Germany:											
Official reception	U.S. dollars				540.00						540.00
Transportation	D. mark					1,655.77	489.73			1,655.77	489.73
Total			10,094.45		8,586.19		12,494.10		2,100.92		33,275.66

¹ If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other (22 U.S.C. 276)	\$14,424.96
Total	18,850.70
	33,275.66

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
Chairman, President, IPU Group.

Mar. 16, 1972.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1889. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment, covering the quarter ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1890. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting an explanation of the requested appropriation for security assistance activities in Cambodia in fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 655(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1891. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed grant with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University for a research project entitled "Preparation of Pure and Impurity-Stabilized Polymorphs of SiO₂ in the Minus Five Micron Particle Size Range by Non-comminution Techniques," pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1892. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on water pollution control manpower development and training activities, pursuant to section 5(g)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

1893. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting prospectuses for the proposed construction or alteration of Federal facilities at various locations, pursuant to 73 Stat. 480; to the Committee on Public Works.

1896. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the disclosure of ingredients on the labels of all foods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1894. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on providing guidance to States in establishing rates of payment for nursing home care under the medicaid program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1895. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an assessment of the operations and management of Opportunities Industrialization Centers, in which Federal participation is administered by the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2725. A bill for the relief of Fred Robert Dreilich with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLOWERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3698. A bill for the relief of Louisa DiLeonardo with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Latife

Hassan Mahmoud; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1010). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10676. A bill for the relief of Lester L. Stiteler (Rept. No. 92-1011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11632. A bill for the relief of Vincent J. Sindone (Rept. No. 92-1012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLOWERS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 65. An act for the relief of Dennis Ylantos; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1923. An act for the relief of Harold Donald Koza (Rept. No. 92-1014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 14503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct certain pumping facilities for the Mammoth Spring National Fish Hatchery, Arkansas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 14504. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LENT, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. QUITE, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THONE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 14505. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LINK, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 14506. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14507. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to permit the equitable reappointment of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, and the Executive Protective Service; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

H.R. 14508. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide that the Federal Government shall pay all of the costs of providing such assistance; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14509. A bill to amend title II of the

Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to benefits shall continue through the month of his death (except where the continuation of such entitlement and the consequent delay in the payment of survivor benefits would reduce the total amount payable to the family); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14510. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DORN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GAIMO, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAYS, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RANDALL, and Mr. RARICK):

H.R. 14511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 14512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BARING, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BROTHILL of North Carolina, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MANN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SLACK, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. BURLESON of Texas):

H.R. 14513. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an estate tax charitable trust in the case of certain charitable remainder trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 14514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14515. A bill to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to suspend the use of eminent domain within any part of the park in any county which has in force a valid zoning bylaw, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 14516. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to regulate the mailing of certain advertising matter unsolicited by the addressee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 14517. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical or

mental handicap in federally assisted programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14518. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the lower Hudson area in the State of New York; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 14519. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of certain surplus property for court and law enforcement purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 14520. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 to provide for the registration of automobiles at least 25 years old as antiques; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 14521. A bill to provide for the issuance of special registration certificates and identification tags for motor vehicles operated by members of the Department of the District of Columbia Disabled American Veterans; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 14522. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROVER (for himself, Mr.

HALPERN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. HUNT, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 14523. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (to the outer limits of the Continental Shelf) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14524. A bill 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.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 14525. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an itemized deduction for motor vehicle insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 14527. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide prevention and control of venereal disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. ARENDT) (by request):

H.R. 14528. A bill to amend section 3031 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of authorized Deputy Chiefs of Staff for the Army Staff, and eliminate the provisions for the Assistant Chiefs of Staff for the Army Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14529. A bill to prevent the loss of pay and allowances by certain officers designated for the performance of duties of great importance and responsibility; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14530. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14531. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, with respect to accountability and responsibility for U.S. property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14532. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide entitlement to round trip transportation to the home port for a member of the uniformed services on permanent duty aboard a ship being inactivated away from home port whose dependents are residing at the home port; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14533. A bill to amend section 5504 of title 10, United States Code, relating to assignment of lineal position to certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14534. A bill to amend section 203 of title 37, United States Code, to provide additional pay for permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14535. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish the amount of compensation paid to members of the Naval Research Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14536. A bill to amend section 8376 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that an Air Force Reserve, or Air National Guard, officer serving on extended active duty in a temporary grade which is higher than his reserve grade must apply for promotion to the next higher reserve grade, when otherwise eligible; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14537. A bill to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14538. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14539. A bill to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14540. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to suspend operation of the restrictions on authorized strength of Army officers in the grade of major for fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14541. A bill to amend section 269(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the voluntary assignment of certain Reserve members who are entitled to retired or retainer pay in the Ready Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14542. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1966, Public Law 89-606, to extend for 4 years the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel and colonel in the Air Force may be increased, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14543. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of the Navy to establish annually the total number of limited duty officers permitted on the active list of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14544. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Military Selective Service Act to permit the overseas assignment of members of the Armed Forces who have completed basic training and who have been awarded a military specialty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14545. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the

special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14546. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of health maintenance organizations in providing health care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 14547. A bill to provide that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District of Columbia shall be deemed to have given his consent, under certain circumstances, to give a specimen of his blood, breath, or urine for chemical testing to determine its alcoholic content, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 14548. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the best and most feasible means of protecting and preserving the Great Dismal Swamp and the Dismal Swamp Canal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 14549. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Controlled Substances Act relating to marihuana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG,

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 14550. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. O'KONSKI):

H.R. 14551. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RABICK, Mr. REID, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 14552. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 14553. A bill to establish an independent Board of Parole, to provide for fair and equitable Federal parole procedures, to establish a National Parole Institute, and to provide assistance to the States for the operation of fair and adequately staffed parole systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 14554. 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. NELSEN:

H.R. 14555. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin):

H.R. 14556. A bill to repeal the act terminating Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; to reinstitute the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin as a federally-recognized, sovereign Indian tribe; and to restore to the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin those Federal services furnished to American Indians because of their status as American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14557. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the prevention of Cooley's Anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 14558. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent benefit increase with a \$150 minimum and subsequent cost-of-living increases, to improve the computation of benefits and eligibility therefor, to increase widow's and widower's benefits and provide for payment of such benefits in full at age 50 without regard to disability, to raise the earnings base, to eliminate the actuarial reduction and lower the age of entitlement, to provide optional coverage for Federal employees, and to eliminate the retirement test; to amend title XVIII of such act to reduce to 60 the age of entitlement to medicare benefits and make such benefits available to the disabled without regard to age, to provide coverage for certain governmental employees, to include qualified prescription drugs and free annual physical examinations under the supplementary medical benefits program, and to eliminate monthly premiums under such program for those whose gross annual income is below \$4,800; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14559. 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 Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 14560. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 14561. A bill to authorize a Coast Guard appropriation for alteration of bridges over the navigable waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 14562. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to increase maximum mortgage amounts thereunder, and to eliminate the downpayment requirement in certain cases involving relatively low-income mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14563. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to contract for the construction of certain parking facilities on federally owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 14564. A bill to repeal section 5532 of title 5, United States Code, relating to reductions in the retired or retirement pay of retired officers of regular components of the uniformed services who are employed in civilian offices or positions in the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14565. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase payments of vocational rehabilitation subsistence under chapter 31, to provide for the payment of tuition, subsistence, and educational assistance allowances on behalf of or to certain eligible veterans pursuing programs of education under chapter 34 of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 14566. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) (by request):

H.R. 14567. A bill to foster the development and implementation of an integrated system, to be privately owned and operated, for the prompt and accurate processing and settlement of securities transactions effected on national securities exchanges and in the over-the-counter markets, which will assist in assuring the proper functioning of the securities markets and which will be responsive on a nondiscriminatory basis to the needs of issuer companies, brokers, dealers, banks and other members of the securities industry and the public investors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 14568. A bill: Omnibus Fire Protection Act of 1972; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 14569. A bill to protect game and wildlife resources by prohibiting the use of lead shot for hunting on public lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. POFF, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. SATTERFIELD, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 14570. A bill to limit the authority of the government of the District of Columbia with respect to the levying and collecting of certain taxes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.J. Res. 1172. 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. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 1173. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Con. Res. 587. Concurrent resolution to urge each American family to plant a vegetable garden; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H. Con. Res. 588. Concurrent resolution to stop the bombing of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mrs. MINK):

H. Con. Res. 589. Concurrent resolution to stop the bombing of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H. Res. 637. Resolution providing for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 938. Resolution urging supplemental appropriations to implement the President's message of March 17, 1972, calling for equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H. Res. 939. Resolution to express the sentiment of the House of Representatives in condemnation of the North Vietnamese Communist invasion of South Vietnam and in support of actions taken by the United States to repel the invasion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HILLS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KING, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. QUILEN, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. ROUSSELOT):

H. Res. 940. Resolution to express the sentiment of the House of Representatives in condemnation of the North Vietnamese Communist invasion of South Vietnam and in support of actions taken by the United States to repel the invasion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. VESSEY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ZION):

H. Res. 941. Resolution to express the sentiment of the House of Representatives in condemnation of the North Vietnamese Communist invasion of South Vietnam and in support of actions taken by the United States to repel the invasion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14571. A bill for the relief of Louisa B. Gunther Farcasanu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14572. A bill for the relief of Lucille de Saint Andre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

215. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, Palo Alto, Calif., relative to the San Felipe division of the Central Valley project, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.