United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, June 27, 1972*

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Lowell S. Garland, the United Methodist Church, La Vale, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come in gratitude today for the gift of life, for the blessings of home and family, and for the opportunity that is ours to serve our Nation and mankind. We thank You in this moment that You have not left us alone, but that You do govern with authority in the affairs of men.

We confess that our greatest need as individuals and as a nation is for Your help. When we rely upon our own wisdom we are given to despair. We find ourselves divided by our own partial interests, and our most cherished projects are confounded.

Come into our hearts, O Lord. Come with divine guidance and bless all the deliberations in this Chamber of Government today. Give these Your servants a vision of the needs of Your people, and then use them as instruments of Your holy will and purpose.

In the name of our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

REV. LOWELL S. GARLAND

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

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, we are honored today to have as our guest chaplain the Reverend Lowell S. Garland of the La Vale United Methodist Church in La Vale, Md. I am delighted Reverend Garland could be here with us today in the House of Representatives, and I hope he can return again.

Reverend Garland is a graduate in psychology of the American University in Washington, D.C. He followed his studies there at the Wesley Theological Seminary also here in Washington. He is married to the former Eula Ann Stone, and they have two children, Linda Sue Garland and Edward L. Garland. He has previously served in New Market, Md., Wytheville, Va., Brookville, Md., Chevy Chase, Md., and has been at his present pastorate since 1969, where he is a much-respected community leader.

I welcome Rev. Lowell S. Garland to the House of Representatives and thank him for his stirring prayer to open today's session of the House. I hope he and his family and friends will come back often to be with us.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 635, AMENDING MINING AND MINERAL POLICY ACT OF 1970

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 635) to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, with the House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, EDMONDSON, BARING, SAYLOR, and MCCLURE.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3284, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION INCREASE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3284) to increase the authorization for appropriation for completing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior, with the House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, HALEY, JOHNSON of California, HOSMER, and CAMP.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 13435, UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION INCREASE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13435) to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing works in the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior, 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 Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, HALEY, JOHNSON of California, HOSMER, and LLOYD.

ANSWERS OF CONSTITUENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I felt that Members of the House would be interested in a personally conducted survey in my district; the people questioned were both apartment dwellers and homeowners. A total of 283 persons were interviewed.

We asked the following questions with results as indicated:

1. There is a limit on how much a person can earn after age 65 without losing his Social Security benefits. Presently, the limit is $1680. Congressman Peyser has proposed legislation increasing this to $3600. Would you support this legislation? Yes 280; no 3.

2. Congressman Peyser has testified before the Price Commission complaining about the increase in food prices over the past six months. He has suggested that, if food prices do not drop in the immediate future, controls be placed on food prices. Would you support this legislation? Yes 235; no 46.

3. Do you agree with Congressman Peyser's position that money should not be spent to bus our children for racial balance, but rather should be spent to improve the quality of education? Yes 195; no 88.

THE LATE HONORABLE CARL W. RICH, FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the fact that a former Member from my district has died, Mr. Carl Rich. He was formerly mayor of the city of Cincinnati, formerly councilman, and formerly a judge of the court of common pleas. He died yesterday at the age of 73 at Cincinnati, Ohio. He served in this House from the First District of Ohio from 1962 to 1964.

I had the privilege of serving as a judge on the same court on which Carl Rich served. DONALD CLANCY, Congressman from the Second District, succeeded Carl

Rich as mayor of the city of Cincinnati, and those were probably the two most popular mayors who ever served in that category in the city of Cincinnati for many, many years.

It is therefore with deep regret that I have to report to the Congress the death of our former colleague, Carl W. Rich, who served with distinction in this House from the First District of Ohio.

Most of you know the outstanding record he performed while serving in the Congress.

But it is in our community of Cincinnati where Carl Rich made his imprint as a community leader, attorney, mayor, and businessman.

His unselfish dedication to those he served and to those who knew him and worked with him clearly made Carl Rich a man we all admired.

After a long and outstanding record as a judge, Carl Rich resigned from the bench to seek election for the congressional seat in my district, the First District, in 1962.

Born in Cincinnati, September 12, 1898, Carl Rich attended Avondale Public School and was graduated from Walnut Hills High School. His first business venture was selling newspapers at Reading Road and Rockdale Avenue. In 1922 he won his A.B. degree, in 1924 his law degree from the University of Cincinnati which also conferred an honorary LL.D. degree in 1939. He received the University of Cincinnati Distinguished Alumni Award in 1966.

In his early years of law practice, Carl Rich served on the faculties at the University of Cincinnati and other area schools, teaching oratory, public speaking, and commercial law.

He served in World War I with distinction, entering the army as a private and being discharged as a second lieutenant. He also served in World War II as a lieutenant in the infantry and was separated as a lieutenant colonel after 3 years with the chemical warfare division.

He first entered public service when he served as assistant city solicitor in 1925.

In 1930 he was elected to a short term in common pleas court but resigned to accept the position of county prosecutor. He was reelected to that post in 1940 and again in 1944, resigning to fill a vacancy on the Cincinnati City Council. He was named mayor on March 5, 1947.

In 1957, Carl Rich was elected to the court of domestic relations where he served until he resigned his judgeship to run for Congress.

Carl Rich formerly was president and chairman of the board of the Cincinnati Royals basketball team and also was an officer and director of many building and loan institutions in the Cincinnati area including the Kennedy Savings & Loan Co., the Central Hyde Park Savings & Loan Co., the First National Bank of Morrow, the Grand Central Savings & Loan Co., the Home State Savings & Loan Co., and the Hamilton Mutual Insurance Co.

He was a 33d degree Mason and a Shriner, a member of the Moose and Eagles and the Hyde Park Community Church.

A widower, his wife, Frances Ivins Rich died in 1965. They had no children.

Mr. Speaker, truly our community will be saddened by the loss of Carl Rich. We all will miss him.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. I was sorry to learn of the passing of this good and fine man, Mr. Rich. I had the privilege and opportunity of serving with him during the time he was a Member of this body. He was a delightful individual, the type of person one enjoys visiting with, and working with. He was very diligent during the time he was in the Congress of the United States, dedicated to the service of this Nation, his State, and his country.

Those of us who were privileged to know him, we considered him one of the finest gentlemen who ever came to this body. I am indeed sorry to learn of his passing, and I extend to his family my deepest and sincere sympathy.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his gracious comments.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. I wish to commend the gentleman from Cincinnati for taking this time to commemorate the passing of our great former colleague, Carl Rich of Cincinnati. He was probably one of the most friendly, most cordial Members of Congress during the time I have had the honor to serve here. I recall that very frequently Carl Rich would take constituents to lunch, and it did not make any difference whether they were from his district or from the district of some other Member. If they were from Ohio, he was glad to accommodate them. He was a dedicated, hard-working man who served his Nation with honor and his city with distinction, not only as mayor but also as a judge and as a colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

INCREASE IN RETAIL SALES

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce reported recently that retail sales increased sharply during May. The volume was a seasonally adjusted $36.79 billion, up 2.3 percent from April and 9.8 percent above May 1971. Total retail sales, as seasonally adjusted, for the first 5 months of this year are 8.4 percent above the comparable period in 1971. In the important durable goods category, sales last month totaled an adjusted $12.22 billion, 3.3 percent above April and 15.5 percent above May 1971. Total durable goods sales, as adjusted, for the first 5 months of this year are 13.1 percent above sales in the comparable period last year.

Shortly after releasing the May retail sales figures, the Department of Commerce reported that last month industrial output also continued its recent strong growth. During May industrial production rose 0.5 percent to a seasonally adjusted 111.6 percent of the 1967 average. During the 9 months since the President introduced his new economic policy, the Index has risen from 105.3 to 111.6, an annual rate of increase of almost 8 percent. This compares to an increase in the 9 months preceding August 1971 from 102.6 to 105.3, an annual rate of increase of 3.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this strong industrial production, accompanied by the rapidly rising consumer demand reflected in the retail sales figures, is still further evidence that our economy is continuing to surge ahead.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15495) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1973 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations in connection with the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 15495, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Before rising on yesterday, it had been agreed that title I, on page 2, through line 23 would be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to be proposed to title I?

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like, if I may, to take this time simply to emphasize some of the salient points made in my speech yesterday.

In the first place, in all our defense planning our objective is not to make war. It is to deter war. We do not seek military superiority in any one category of weapons or on an overall basis. We seek a well-balanced defense, no more, and no less than is sufficient to our national safety and to deter aggression.

In determining what is sufficient we must necessarily take into account what our adversaries, real, and potential, have on hand and on order, and what we and our allies have on hand and on order.

And it is well to bear in mind that what is sufficient today may not be sufficient tomorrow. We must plan now for the distant tomorrow, several years hence.

The bill our committee presents to you today is based on these general premises: What is sufficient under all the circumstances as we look to the future?

Our committee made a total of $1.5 billion reductions in preparing this bill. This is the largest cut our committee has ever made in a defense bill. Part of this cut—$582 million—was the result of SALT. And independent of SALT our committee made reductions of almost a billion dollars—$981 million, to be exact.

The reduction made by our committee belies the allegations that there is really no saving from SALT, that the money would be spent on new strategic weapons. Obviously, this is not the case. But I must say that if SALT is not ratified there will have to be a supplemental. There would be no alternative.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word or two about some of this nonsense that has been circulated about military spending. Of course our defense budget is huge, and it may be politically popular to attack it. But we should make certain that the American people have the facts.

Our defense budget is huge, but it is not excessive. As a matter of fact, the new budget allocates more money to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare than to the Department of Defense.

As far as the trend of spending for procurement of weapons is concerned, it has been downward for several years. In real terms—that is after inflation is taken into account—procurement outlays have dropped almost every year since 1967.

In 1971 weapons procurement expenditures were only about 70 percent of the 1967 level.

Those who contend that our defense budget could be reduced by $10, $20, $30 billion or more should be reminded that 57 percent of our defense budget is for personnel and personnel-related costs. This is true even though President Nixon has been able to reduce the Armed Forces by 1 million men and has reduced defense civilian employment by several hundred thousand. The major reason why our personnel costs are so high is that the Congress insisted that we establish an all-vounteer force and to this end, substantially raised all military pay, particularly at the lower levels.

With 57 percent of our defense budget going for personnel and personnel-related costs, where are the billions to be found in weapons procurement when it is already at a low level?

There is one final point, Mr. Chairman, that I should like to emphasize and which I developed in my speech of yesterday: The offensive strategic weapons—the B–1 bombers to replace the B–52, and the Trident to replace the Polaris submarines included in this bill were requested prior to SALT. These are follow-on items to replace those that will be over 20 years old by the time these items, now to be authorized, are deployed. Our committee would have sought their authorization whether or not there was a SALT agreement. They are necessary if we are to continue to have a balanced national defense sufficient to deter aggression.

The SALT treaties address themselves to quantities but not to quality. It is to quality that we are addressing ourselves in the authorization bill. It is for this reason that the only increase in this bill over fiscal 1972 is for R.D.T. & E. funds. We are determined that we shall maintain our technological advantage. The SALT was only the beginning in our negotiations for a mutual reduction in military weapons. If we are able to be successful in our further negotiations with Russia, we must maintain a position of strength.

I hope this measure will receive the full support of the House. No item is entitled to a higher priority than our national safety. As President Nixon said in his state of the Union address:

Strong military defenses are not the enemies of peace. They are the guardians of peace.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: Page 2, line 14, strike out "$3,201,300" and insert "$2,954,300 none of which shall be used for the authorization of additional ships or the procurement of long lead time items for additional ships of the DD 963 class.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me in the well asked that in the debate on this bill we address ourselves to the facts and oh, man, would I love to. The problem is that most of the facts have been taken out of the hearings. Most of the facts have been classified.

We cannot find, reading the record, how bad the performance has been on the LHA contract, because it has been deleted. The only thing we will find, on page 10567, was that the original cost of one of the ships was supposed to be $43 million, and the current estimate is $183 million. From $43 million to $183 million per ship.

This amendment strikes out $347 million for the follow-on ship to be built at the same yard.

One cannot address himself to the facts on this one either, because again all of those facts have been taken out of the hearings. If one reads the testimony regarding the LHA contract and the DD 963 contract it is just replete with the word "deleted." One cannot find out how much the cost has escalated.

One cannot find out how much the time has been delayed, because that has all been deleted.

And then the gentleman from Illinois says, "Please address yourselves to the facts." I would dearly love to. I know how much they have been delayed, and I know how much the cost has grown, and there are a few indications in here.

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

Mr. PIKE. I have only 5 minutes, and I would say to the gentleman I would rather he got his own time on this particular amendment.

The gentleman declines to yield.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEGGETT. I wish to point up the absence of a quorum, Mr. Chairman. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty-six 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. 230]

Abernethy	Esch	McKinney
Abourezk	Findley	Macdonald, Mass.
Alexander	Fish	Metcalfe
Anderson, Tenn.	Flood	Minshall
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	Mollohan
Blanton	Ford, William D.	Morgan
Blatnik	Fulton	Mosher
Boggs	Gallagher	Moss
Brinkley	Goodling	Pepper
Broomfield	Gray	Pucinski
Burke, Fla.	Griffin	Rarick
Burton	Griffiths	Reid
Caffery	Hagan	Rosenthal
Celler	Hall	Scheuer
Chisholm	Hawkins	Schneebeli
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Schwengel
Clay	Holifield	Scott
Conyers	Johnson, Pa.	Teague, Tex.
Culver	Kastenmeier	Terry
Davis, S.C.	Kee	Ware
Dent	Kyl	Whalley
Dickinson	McDade	Wiggins
Dowdy	McDonald, Mich.	Wilson, Charles H.
Edwards, Calif.		
Erlenborn		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 15495, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 361 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 gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) had 2 minutes remaining in support of his amendment.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I find that, being a little old country boy, I left three zeros off my amendment on both the total amount and the amount to be stricken, so I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be corrected and reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: Page 2, line 4, strike out $3,201,300,000" and insert "$2,954,300,000 none of which shall be used for the authorization of additional ships or the procurement of long leadtime items for additional ships of the DD–963 class."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 7 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes $247 million. The $247 million is designated at the moment to go to pay for the purchase of long leadtime items for ships Nos. 17 through 23 of the DD–963 class.

In other words, we have already authorized 16 DD–963's and we have not laid the keel for No. 1 yet and here we are going ahead with money for 17 through 23.

Now, why should we stop it? At the moment the same shipyard which has the contract to produce these ships is working on another ship called the LHA and on that contract they are 400 percent over cost and 2 years behind schedule.

Now, that contract—and you can elicit a few things from the hearings on this—has at the end of 40 months a very major clause in it and the clause simply says that when that contract is 40 months old they go from the procedure of payments as money is expended to payments as progress is made; and the fact of the matter is that when we reach that point the Government is not going to owe the contractor any money, the contractor is going to owe the Government money because the contractor has already been paid for more work than he has done on the ships.

I do not think there is any member of the committee who really believes that this contractor can produce these DD–963's for the scheduled cost and within the scheduled time period. I do not think the Navy believes this. I do not think the chairman of our committee believes this and I guarantee you I do not believe this. It is absolutely impossible for them to do it.

The testimony shows that as to their manpower requirements—and I call your attention to page 10589 of the hearings:

Admiral GOODING. The projection is even with their current hiring rate, they will be 2,000 men short by the end of the calendar year.

The CHAIRMAN. 2,000 men short by the end of the calendar year. What is their retention rate?

Admiral GOODING. About 50 percent, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. About 50 percent is the retention.

Admiral GOODING. Yes, sir.

So they are having a 50-percent turnover in personnel, they are 2,000 men short, this despite the fact that they are paying $1,000 bonuses to get people to come work there. They are not only paying $1,000 bonuses to get people to come work there, their rate of pay for production workers in the last year has gone from $3.60 an hour to $4.80 an hour. The production work on the prior contract, the LHA contract, in April when we were talking about this, was only 2 percent done, 2 percent of the production work had been done.

Now, there is just no way on earth that this contractor can perform this contract.

What I am asking is that we stop this thing right here, right now, with the 16 which have already been authorized, see how badly it turns out, and it has got to turn out badly, but see how badly it turns out.

You are going to hear a lot of talk from the other side—that if we cancel the contract, there are going to be all these penalty payments due to the contractor.

Well, I guarantee you that penalty payments due are going to be nothing compared to the cost overruns if we do not stop the contract.

As I say, they are at 400 percent overcost on the ships which they are building right now. They are short of manpower. Their wage rates have increased by 33⅓ percent by last year and the most reasonable thing we can do on this contract is to call a halt to it right now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more on some of the things that the gentleman from New York has said in connection with this contract. I do not believe that any one contract or any one subject matter which we have discussed and considered in committee caused more anguish and more agonizing moments than did this particular contract.

We recognized immediately the shortcomings based on the past performance of this particular shipyard. But I think what it does show demonstrated the alertness of the committee as a result of this strong investigation and in-depth study of the situation as it related to the seven DD–963 destroyers, which at no time did the chairman after knowing the facts of the case, intend to ask the committee to authorize. Nor did I believe the committee would authorize these seven extra destroyers, in view of the performance of this particular shipyard in the past.

However, there was an obligation on the part of the committee to keep the subcontractor line open if at all possible, within reason, to be assured that the Government would get its product within reasonable cost parameter.

Now the gentleman from New York has described the LHA contract. This has absolutely nothing to do with the DD–963 contract.

So do not become confused.

The committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) and Mr. Slatinshek and Mr. Norris and I went down and made a special personal investigation on the site of this shipyard.

We came away, after looking at what is the most magnificent shipyard that I think I have ever seen, with a new understanding of ship production line techniques, but with the realization that the LHA ships had not yet been produced in accordance with the requirements of the LHA contract.

Keep in mind now what we are talking about is that this shipyard has met every obligation under the contract on the 16 destroyers. The gentleman from New York has said that the keel has not been laid. I inform him that the keel was just recently laid 6 months ahead of time. Under the contract, the first keel was not to be laid until January. The metal has been cut 6 months ahead of time.

The eagerness of the company to produce is quite evident.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) has said they are paying $1,000 bonus to hire people. We examined that thoroughly in committee, and I was much disturbed about it and I learned on our visit down there afterwards, that this practice has not been indulged in in over a year.

They seem to be on their way, and I think in fairness, we should give them every opportunity to perform on this contract.

Now in order to protect ourselves and to protect the Government, we have arranged through the cooperation of the Navy and the contractor to have a 1-year slip in which we then will give $247 million, the amount which the gentleman from New York wants to cut out, to purchase long-lead items. But this in no way authorizes seven new destroyers.

If you will read the report on pages 15 to 18, you will see the exchange of correspondence and there is spelled out in full detail the arrangements that have been made. The money expended on these long-lead items in the event the options are not taken up a year from now, will not be lost since much of this equipment will be usable on other shipbuilding programs.

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

(Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HÉBERT. In other words, if the option is not picked up by the Navy or by the Government or by the Departmet of Defense, these long lead items in great part can be used in other vessels that are now under construction or will be under construction, so the Goverment loses nothing in the long lead items because they can be utilized in future construction.

At the same time we maintain our option; at the same time we give this yard an opportunity to perform; and I have every hope that it will perform.

I do not defend the LHA contract at all, but that is not before us today. I do not defend its past performance; it is terrible in my book; and that caused the committee to go into the proposition. Of further interest to the House is that, as a result of going into this contract, the committee included in this bill a provision which prohibits future multiyear contracts. The provision strikes at the very basis of this particular trouble in which we find ourselves. The committee vote, in support of this provision on multiyear procurement was as I recall a unanimous voice vote. The committee has been concerned with this contrasting problem but deleting $247 million is not the way to solve it. I certainly urge rejection of the amendmnt.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious from the statement made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) and the testimony adduced at the hearings that Litton Industries will not be able to perform under this contract, and that the House would be wise in not expending any more money for

the purpose of allowing Litton to build the remainder of the ships. Actually I think that any contracts for any remaining ships should be put out for rebid to give other yards in this country an opportunity to finish the job. I know there are other yards, including the Bath Iron Works in Maine, that would be equipped to finish the contract and do it on time.

Litton's history of schedule delays, cost overruns, and manpower shortages provide eloquent testimony in support of the gentleman's amendment. Secretary Laird has admitted the Pascagoula yard is significantly behind on the LHA contract; a GAO study has concluded that a significant delay in the production of the LHA ships would "have a material effect on the DD–963 contract." Authorizing more money for Litton under this destroyer contract is like pouring money into an empty hull. We have an obligation to the taxpayers of this country to demand more in terms of cost control and onschedule delivery than Litton can provide.

Mr. PIKE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PIKE. My distinguished chairman has stated that he heard or he was advised that the first keel had in fact been land on the DD–963 contract 6 months ahead of time. I simply say I do not know what he has heard. There is absolutely nothing in the record which indicates that. In fact, the testimony of the Navy in this regard is:

> The major problem is that the latest delay in LHA results in LHA construction being superimposed on the scheduled DD–963 construction. It is feasible to expand the facilities of the shipyard to accommodate construction of both programs simultaneously. The concurrent manpower expansion necessary is a more difficult problem. Without knowing the success Litton will have in solving this problem, predictions of DD–963 delivery schedules are only guesses.

If we are being asked to authorize money for ships 17 through 23 where they can only guess as to the delivery of ships 1 and 2, I think it is a very sad state of affairs.

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

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Here is how you get confused in a lot of mumbo-jumbo. The testimony which the gentleman from New York has just read, of course, is accurate. That is when it took place. This is what sparked the alertness and the investigation of the committee, which was its duty and its responsibility. I am sure if one had read the weather bulletins back in January he would have found no indication of the Hurricane Agnes, but it did occur. At the time it was accurate. It was our duty then to correct the shortcomings, which we have.

The keel has been laid. We have been informed formally that the keel has been laid, and there is not one iota of authorization in this bill for the continuation of this contract. We are not authorizing seven new destroyers. We are only authorizing the long-lead items.

If the ship construction company can produce, they will get their authorization from Congress. If they cannot produce, they do not get their authorization. It is as simple as that. The Government is protected, the committee is protected, the Defense Department is protected, and the taxpayers are protected—all through the operation.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I reiterate my remarks, that I do not think the DD–963 contract can be performed by Litton. I think the amendment is fully justified. I hope the Members will support it.

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York and others will offer a number of amendments today, some of which I will support—enough of them to make my chairman unhappy, I am sure—but this is not one I intend to support.

There is no talk by the gentleman from New York about whether the Navy needs the destroyers or not. Our Navy is in a rather sad shape at the present time as far as the age of our ships and the number of our ships. We have gone from a 900-plus Navy down to a 600-ship Navy, and we are going to be going down to about a 542-ship Navy, and the ships have got to be replaced.

The money authorized today, that which the gentleman from New York would strike, the $247 million, as has been pointed out, but which should be reemphasized, is for long-lead time items for needed destoyers. We are going to need the destroyers.

This is not to say the seven ships ought to go to the present shipyard that is building them, the Litton shipyard. If they get themselves straightened out, they ought to have the contract. If not, the contract should go some place else. I think it will go some place else in that event. But the $247 million are needed to keep the program going.

We talk about delays, but the delay is going to be that many more years down the road if we adopt this amendment, so I would urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT: Title I, page 2, line 10, under "MISSILES": Delete $888,400,000." Insert in its place, "$538,400,000".

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the Safeguard missile system. I am not trying to cut out the system. We are still going to be spending, with the cut of $350 million, on deployment a total of $443 million on the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system in 1973.

I have a package of amendments. Unfortunately, I cannot offer them all simultaneously, but they total $1.489 billion. One might ask the general question, why do we need to cut $1.4 billion-plus out of the defense bill? I think the answer is relatively simple. We are spending ourselves to death. We need to reorient national priorities. I think if we take the President's budget document and analyze what the United States has spent for national defense over the past 10 years, we will find 95 percent of all the individual income taxes collected have been directly cookie-jarred into national defense—that is $762 billion out of $772 billion collected.

In addition to that, of course, we have a major source of income from corporate taxes, but the corporate income taxes are needed to pay for what we call the past war debt. This year $12 billion for veterans' benefits will be paid as compared to $6 billion when I came to the Congress. There is $22.5 billion interest on past war debts, a debt that has accelerated while I have been in Congress from something like $280 billion to now $480 billion, all concurrent with the war. All of our national debts have been concurrent with war. All of the interest for the national debt is concurrent with and is needed to pay for past war debts.

All of our corporate income tax is needed to pay for the interest on the debt plus the veterans benefits which we are obligated to pay. Therein lies the need to reorient some of our national priorities.

One can say that we are spending 50 percent in the domestic sector, or perhaps a little more, and 50 percent or less on defense, but we all have to recognize this money in the domestic sector is being spent directly in the trust fund "cookie jar" for social security, unemployment insurance, highway trust funds and things of that nature.

The amendment I am now offering is the amendment for the primary reduction in the procurement title, $350 million out of a total of $486 million for procurement. I mention again we have $305 million left for research and development plus $8 million left for construction.

You know, we bury our errors every year in national defense. Sometimes we get a Jack Anderson or a Bernie Nossiter or somebody to talk about some of the errors we have made, and they are pretty well explained. The gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) tried to explain something that is going on in the LHA program which promises to be scandalous. There is no way to avoid that. I just personally do not believe it has much to do with the construction of the DD–963.

I believe we have to recognize that we have probably spent for the Safeguard system, to make it a very substantial bargaining chip at SALT, an extra $2 billion. Nobody has mentioned how much we have wasted at the Malmstrom site, now being abated, which will be dismantled over the next several months. Nobody has mentioned how much we have wasted on research and development.

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

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, nobody has mentioned how much we have wasted on the full 12 site deployment program, which is clearly banned by the SALT agreement.

I am sure there is nobody in this room who doubts that the SALT Treaty is going to be approved, and also the law which has to be enacted by this House and by the other body respecting the limitation on offensive weapons.

So far as the Safeguard system is concerned, our whole effort in building the program around Malmstrom and Grand Forks was to guarantee that we would have a retaliatory force that would be invulnerable to a first strike by the Soviet Union. So therein lies the reason why we were stampeding ahead to build at this billion dollar rate.

We have to recognize that as a result of the SALT agreements and our ability to monitor from very high altitude there will be no ability on behalf of the Soviet Union to effectively make a first strike. Therefore, we have no reason to protect the Minuteman missile sites.

I believe we should go ahead and perhaps complete them, but why, I say, at this scandalously high rate of acceleration, in view of the fact that we have probably wasted in excess of $2 billion making this a bargaining chip? We can go ahead to proceed at the $403 million rate rather than the $700 million-plus rate and still complete Grand Forks, and study whether or not we need a Minuteman site at what we call the National Command Center, which now is Washington.

I always thought that our National Command Center was in a rock hole at Colorado Springs, but now it is Washington.

I know we have hard sited the Pentagon and hard sited the CIA. I say that if the National Command Center in the White House, why, the President is only there about one-third of the time, and we ought to be spending at least two-thirds of this money at Key Biscayne or at San Clemente.

I do not mean to be facetious, but we are really stampeding ahead trying to meet the Soviet Union because they have the Golosh system around Moscow. I believe the record shows that as the result of the deployment of the mechanical and rather obsolete Golosh system around Moscow, according to some of our experts, including Secretary Laird, Moscow is less secure today than it was before the deployment of the Golosh system.

Now, if we want to make Washington less secure, all we have to do is go ahead and stampede forward and put the 100 ABM sites around the city. That means, instead of just targeting two or three ICBM's for the Capital, we will be targeting about 102 or 103.

My God! I hope that ABM system works. Otherwise we are really in worse shape, because if we have only a 75-percent effectiveness rate out of it, we have multiplied the missiles that will be knocking out the Capital by several thousand percent. So I think we can really slow down in this program.

The President has said as he signed the SALT agreements that we want to stop the arms race. Secretary Laird has said, let us stop the arms race, but we have to accelerate these other programs and be ready in 5 or 10 years when the 5-year agreement on offensive missiles expires.

I do not think we ought to accelerate under the SALT umbrella. That is the fundamental question that has to be decided by this Congress. I will ask for a record vote on this amendment. I think we have to either take the President at his word that he wants to deescalate the arms race, or else we are going to be spending all our money for these quality accelerations under the terms of the agreement. I think we can well afford to cut out at least $350 million from this item without degrading our defense one iota, but merely looking forward to not having quite so expensive bargaining chips as we have had in the past.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from California.

I thought you were doing pretty well until you mentioned Bob McNamara. Then you lost me.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of reductions made by SALT, the bill reduces the Safeguard ABM authorization $582 million below the original request.

The amendment of the gentleman from California would delete an additional $350 million from the Safeguard program.

The gentleman's amendment would result in eventually raising the cost of the system. The components of the Safeguard's complex system are procured over a period of years but the amendment would cut so deeply that it would interrupt the pipeline and force a reduction in the production process.

The site at Grand Forks, N. Dak., is 90 percent completed. Dr. Kissinger has told us very clearly that this was one of the big incentives in getting the Russians to agree to sign an arms limitation agreement. To fail to complete the deployment now would be sheer folly. It would either mean that eventual completion of the system would be more expensive or it would mean failure to complete the system which would take away the incentive for the Russians to continue further arms negotiations.

Some of the materials on order for Malmstrom, Whiteman, and Warren, the discontinued sites, can be used at the Washington, D.C., site. But the gentleman's amendment would cut so deep that it would prevent continued orderly procurement of materials and probably eventually raise the cost of that site.

I earnestly urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California withdraws his point of order.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers: Messrs. LEGGETT, ARENDS, PIKE, and BRAY.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 258, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—116

Abzug	Forsythe	O'Hara
Adams	Fraser	O'Neill
Addabbo	Gaydos	Pike
Anderson, Calif.	Giaimo	Podell
Ashley	Gibbons	Pryor, Ark.
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Rangel
Badillo	Gude	Rees
Barrett	Halpern	Reid
Begich	Hanna	Reuss
Bergland	Hansen, Wash.	Riegle
Biester	Harrington	Robison, N.Y.
Bingham	Hathaway	Rodino
Boland	Hechler, W. Va.	Roncalio
Bolling	Heinz	Rooney, Pa.
Brademas	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Hicks, Wash.	Roush
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Roy
Burton	Jacobs	Roybal
Carey, N.Y.	Karth	Ryan
Carney	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Celler	Koch	Sarbanes
Clay	Kyros	Selberling
Collins, Ill.	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Conte	Link	Stanton, James V.
Conyers	Long, Md.	Stokes
Corman	Lujan	Symington
Curlin	McCloskey	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	McCormack	Udall
Denholm	Madden	Ullman
Diggs	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Dingell	Mazzoli	Vanik
Donohue	Meeds	Waldie
Dow	Metcalfe	Whalen
Drinan	Mikva	Wolff
Eckhardt	Mink	Yates
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell	Yatron
Eilberg	Moorhead	Zwach
Evans, Colo.	Nedzi	
Foley	Nix	
	Obey	

NOES—258

Abbitt	Clausen, Don H.	Frey
Anderson, Ill.	Clawson, Del	Fuqua
Andrews, Ala.	Cleveland	Galifianakis
Andrews, N. Dak.	Collier	Garmatz
Annunzio	Collins, Tex.	Gettys
Archer	Colmer	Goldwater
Arends	Conable	Gonzalez
Ashbrook	Conover	Goodling
Aspinall	Cotter	Grasso
Baker	Coughlin	Green, Oreg.
Belcher	Crane	Gross
Bell	Daniel, Va.	Grover
Bennett	Daniels, N.J.	Haley
Betts	Danielson	Hamilton
Bevill	Davis, Wis.	Hammer-schmidt
Biaggi	de la Garza	Hanley
Blackburn	Delaney	Hansen, Idaho
Bow	Dellenback	Harsha
Brasco	Dennis	Harvey
Bray	Derwinski	Hastings
Brooks	Devine	Hays
Brotzman	Dorn	Hébert
Brown, Mich.	Downing	Henderson
Brown, Ohio	Dulski	Hicks, Mass.
Broyhill, N.C.	Duncan	Hillis
Broyhill, Va.	du Pont	Hogan
Buchanan	Dwyer	Horton
Burleson, Tex.	Edmondson	Hosmer
Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, Ala.	Hull
Byrnes, Wis.	Eshleman	Hunt
Byron	Evins, Tenn.	Hutchinson
Cabell	Fascell	Ichord
Camp	Fish	Jarman
Carlson	Fisher	Johnson, Calif.
Carter	Flood	Johnson, Pa.
Casey, Tex.	Flowers	Jones, Ala.
Cederberg	Flynt	Jones, N.C.
Chamberlain	Fountain	Jones, Tenn.
Chappell	Frelinghuysen	Kazen
Clancy	Frenzel	Keating

Keith	Patten	Spence
Kemp	Pelly	Staggers
King	Pepper	Stanton,
Kluczynski	Perkins	J. William
Kuykendall	Pettis	Steed
Landgrebe	Peyser	Steele
Landrum	Pickle	Steiger, Ariz.
Latta	Pirnie	Steiger, Wis.
Lennon	Poage	Stephens
Lent	Poff	Stratton
Lloyd	Powell	Stubblefield
Long, La.	Preyer, N.C.	Sullivan
McClory	Price, Ill.	Talcott
McClure	Price, Tex.	Taylor
McCollister	Pucinski	Teague, Calif.
McEwen	Purcell	Teague, Tex.
McFall	Quie	Terry
McKay	Quillen	Thompson, Ga.
McKevitt	Railsback	Thomson, Wis.
McMillan	Randall	Thone
Mahon	Rhodes	Vander Jagt
Mailliard	Roberts	Veysey
Mallary	Robinson, Va.	Vigorito
Martin	Roe	Waggonner
Mathias, Calif.	Rogers	Wampler
Mathis, Ga.	Rooney, N.Y.	Ware
Mayne	Rostenkowski	Whalley
Melcher	Rousselot	White
Michel	Runnels	Whitehurst
Miller, Calif.	Ruppe	Whitten
Miller, Ohio	Ruth	Widnall
Mills, Ark.	Sandman	Wiggins
Mills, Md.	Satterfield	Williams
Minish	Saylor	Wilson, Bob
Mizell	Scherle	Wilson,
Monagan	Schmitz	Charles H.
Montgomery	Sebelius	Winn
Morgan	Shipley	Wright
Murphy, Ill.	Shoup	Wyatt
Murphy, N.Y.	Shriver	Wydler
Myers	Sikes	Wylie
Natcher	Sisk	Wyman
Nelsen	Skubitz	Young, Fla.
Nichols	Slack	Young, Tex.
O'Konski	Smith, Calif.	Zablocki
Passman	Smith, N.Y.	Zion
Patman	Snyder	

NOT VOTING—58

Abernethy	Erlenborn	McCulloch
Abourezk	Esch	McDade
Alexander	Findley	McDonald,
Anderson,	Ford, Gerald R.	Mich.
Tenn.	Ford,	McKinney
Baring	William D.	Macdonald,
Blanton	Fulton	Mass.
Blatnik	Gallagher	Mann
Boggs	Gray	Minshall
Brinkley	Griffin	Mollohan
Broomfield	Griffiths	Mosher
Burke, Fla.	Gubser	Moss
Caffery	Hagan	Rarick
Chisholm	Hall	Scheuer
Clark	Hawkins	Schneebeli
Culver	Heckler, Mass.	Schwengel
Davis, Ga.	Hollifield	Scott
Davis, S.C.	Howard	Springer
Dent	Jonas	Stuckey
Dickinson	Kee	Tiernan
Dowdy	Kyl	

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT: Title I, page 2, line 14, under "NAVAL VESSELS": Delete "$3,201,300,000" and insert in its place "$2,902,300,000"

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the Members are not cooperating very well. Really, if we are going to pick up the $5.2 billion we spent out of the deficit the other day, that I helped contribute to, for revenue sharing, we are going to have to pick up the money someplace. This year we have a deficit of more than $34 billion, even with the revised statement put out by the President the other day. For fiscal year 1973 it is $38 billion, assuming we spend the money we authorized and appropriated here the other day. This is going to be almost the last chance to save any substantial amount of money.

This particular amendment is one of the items in my $1.44 billion package. And those of the Members here who are for economy in Government and cutting down on the national debt and cutting down on the deficit ought to pay a little bit of attention.

On the carrier—we decided that issue last year, when the Navy said on the CVAN–70—which is the nuclear carrier—and we all like these carriers. I think these nuclear carriers are really wonderful vehicles. The Navy said if we did not buy the carrier last year for $750 million, it was going to cost us $1 billion this year. This House, and our committee, chose not to put the $750 million in on advance procurement money, and the Senate likewise took the same action. As a result, we did not start the CVAN–70—and notice, it is CVAN–70 and not CVAN–72.

The *Essex* class during World War II used to cost $1.5 million, and the *Enterprise* class cost $200 million-plus, and the ones we are finishing now in the *Nimitz* class are going to cost a half billion, but this carrier is $1 billion.

The amount we have in this bill, that my amendment relates to, is $299 million. It is kind of an illusory amount, because this is probably only about one-quarter of what this carrier is going to totally cost when it is all done. We give these contracts to the Newport News yard, and they are the only shipyard in the country that can build these. They are the best shipyard in the country, and I admit that, representing one of the best public naval shipyards in the country. There is only one place that can build the carrier. They will have a work force of 6,800 men, and $1 billion worth of airplanes on it, and it is going to have to be defended by a $1 billion support force, which means we are going to have $3 billion all tied to these vulnerable carrier decks.

The carrier is vulnerable. Witness the fact that when we are in jeopardy overseas, we keep as many airplanes as we can in the sky. Everything takes off from the carrier deck. Why? Because we do not want to trap those airplanes in the carrier's depths. But understand we can park a carrier out in the Gulf of Tonkin and the carrier very effectively raids out there with their new laser smart bomb capability. But we really cannot plan on this kind of warfare for the indefinite future.

I believe with the 34,000 men we have in the Pacific, as part of the 7th Fleet, we have enough capability out there. Everybody admits the Mediterranean Fleet is really too small for a carrier force. We have two carriers. The total 6th Fleet depends on the survivability of those two carrier decks.

In the event that a war were to break out, either one ASROC or one SUBROC—one tactical nuclear weapon—would be sufficient to put our $3 billion carrier task force out of action.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEGGETT was allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. LEGGETT. These missiles were carried from the fantail of our old "tin cans," or could be carried in our new nuclear submarines. They have been there for better than 10 years, and they can take out the carrier decks.

I assume that the Soviets are going to have a laser. That is not banned by the SALT agreements. If anyone has a laser he has the capability for a "smart bomb" and has the capacity to take out a command center of a carrier with only one bomb.

We do not have good capability to defend against even the Styx missile, which either can be nuclear or nonnuclear.

I say if we are interested in moving to a modern Navy we should do so. I believe that we ought to be moving to the patrol hydrofoil missile ships. We are building two. We ought to be building 20. I rode a hydrofoil the other day, and I talked with a young lieutenant, who told me that he could take out any fleet in the world with only few bombs if he had those hydrofoil ships.

We have to recognize that we have an old Navy working for old-style ships, keeping a big budget for old ships, competing with the new, young people trying to spend the money for a new, viable Navy.

I am not going to ask for a record vote on this amendment, but if the Members want to save some money they will vote for it. If the vote sounds close I will ask for a standing vote. I believe it is an opportunity to save $299 million, and we can reprogram this into some more productive line of activity.

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

Mr. Chairman, it would be hard to pick the most ill-advised amendment to put on this bill. But if I were going to pick one I would pick this one, I believe, as possibly the most ill-advised amendment, and this is because the one place where the United States has clear and real superiority over the Russians at the present time is in the field of carriers and we must maintain that advantage.

It would be foolish for us to build an old-fashioned carrier. We certainly need new carriers at this point, because our carrier fleet is becoming antique and overage. This particular nuclear carrier has the advantage of being in the long run cheaper, because it delivers so much more.

Actually, a nuclear carrier today is about twice as effective, as far as striking power is concerned, as some of our older carriers. It provides air superiority, which is needed, and it can get to where it is needed at the time it is needed. It does not have to worry about having a followup oil situation. So when it is needed it can go where we need carriers, into the area immediately, and it does not have to worry about using up its oil too fast or whether it has enough oil to make the trip.

It has adequate space for a large berthing of personnel. It saves so much space from not having to carry its own oil, because it does not need oil, that this fact gives it a much greater striking force. Many more planes can be on it. The fuel situation for the planes can be taken

care of because of the space made available on it but not present on an oil-burning carrier.

This carrier has been constructed so that it is the safest vessel ever built. It is so strong, as a matter of fact, that it can withstand a near hit of a nuclear nature. Some people say that one could knock out a carrier, and I guess one could, with a well placed adequate nuclear weapon. One could also knock out this city of Washington with one such weapon or could knock out New York City with one such weapon.

The difference, however, is that the carrier target is not there continuously at the same place. In other words, New York City is going to stay where it is. So is Washington, D.C. The carrier, though, by the device of navigation, can be put in a spot that no enemy can know precisely where it is.

Besides that, we have a supporting force with this, to protect it.

The really important aspect of this, which I should like to reemphasize, is the fact that this really is the most credible war deterrent we have. This new carrier gives us an additional strength and credibility in the war for peace, if we want to call it that, as we are trying to cool things throughout the world.

It is the one thing we have which is greatly superior to that of the Russians, adds greatly to our capabilities and is a great thrust toward maintaining peace in the world.

Mr. DOWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNING. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement. I think he is completely right. This amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The gentleman says that the proposed carrier is vulnerable to attack. Of course, it is, but no weapon system, no base, sea or land, is invulnerable. I say to you that this moving sea base is less vulnerable than any other major weapons system yet devised. We have waited long enough for this carrier. It is essential to maintain our national defense and each year of delay increases the cost by millions of dollars.

We are gradually losing our military bases on foreign soil. We can no longer depend on these bases as a part of our overall defense system. With an adequate number of nuclear carriers strategically stationed at various points in the world, we will not have to depend on these foreign bases.

The *Enterprise* has proven beyond doubt, the need for nuclear carriers. That great ship was commissioned in 1961 and is now 11 years old. The *Nimitz* funded in 1969 will be delivered in 1973. The *Eisenhower*, funded in 1970, will be ready in 1975. The CVN–70, included in this authorization, will not be available to the fleet until 1980.

We must get on with the job right now if we are to have two nuclear carriers in the Pacific and two in the Atlantic by 1980.

I am completely convinced that nuclear aircraft carriers are vital to our national defense and I hope the amendment will be soundly defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I must emphatically protest the construction of this aircraft carrier, the CVN–70.

This carrier is going to cost $1 billion. Think of that. I suspect it is the first vessel ever built in the world that cost $1 billion. Consider how much good that money could do if it were spent to help the kids in our cities.

I had a group of youngsters from Poughkeepsie down talking to me today, and they wanted to know is there more money for the Youth Corps. Also, $1 billion could provide tremendous benefits for older people in this country and countless others who are suffering and in need.

Further than that, let us take note that we have about 15 aircraft carriers already, Mr. Chairman. These aircraft carriers cost billions of dollars just to run, to say nothing of construction. They are draining our resources day after day and night after night.

This new aircraft carrier is a big one. Like most aircraft carriers, as we found in World War II, these vessels are vulnerable. They are easy targets. Nobody can say a Russian rocket, if we are ever at war with Russia, could not hit and destroy this $1 billion in a few seconds.

The Russians have no fighter aircraft carriers. Why, indeed, do we need to have 15 aircraft carriers, if you please, and another one built at a cost of $1 billion, when any potential enemy has none whatsoever?

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this aircraft carrier is intended to carry out the nefarious and cruel work of empire-building that we are conducting out in Vietnam. This aircraft carrier is designed for more Vietnams. I do not think it is directed against Russia or China, because they do not have aircraft carriers. It is not that kind of a war we would be waging with them if, God forbid, we ever wage such wars. But this carrier is to carry out more Vietnams on the beachheads of poor, downtrodden, poverty-stricken nations in other parts of the world who refuse to do our bidding.

Mr. Chairman, I often read about the fliers out there on the aircraft carriers off Vietnam. It is very tragic to read about them, because a newspaper or press man will speak to the pilots on the aircraft carriers and say, "What do you think about this work you are doing? Do you ever wonder about the women and children down below you in Vietnam who are being destroyed and burned and hurt by your bombing?" They say, "Well, no, we do not think about that. We just have a job to do."

This aircraft carrier puts another juggernaut in the hands of our young men to dull their finer sensibilities, to corrupt their morality, and to provide mechanisms whereby they can go ahead and carry out a policy that this House and this Government should be ashamed to authorize, in a world where there should be some humanity in our relations with other countries, particularly the poor and poverty stricken and downtrodden nations like the people in Vietnam.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have certain reservations about this bill as I have had, and so indicated, in previous years. However, I voted for the bill in committee and it is my intention to vote for its passage by the House.

Apart from the reservations that I feel, and which are by now well known, I would like to make a few remarks about one aspect of the bill which has my unqualified and complete support.

I am referreing to the decision of the committee to continue certain aircraft production lines which would otherwise close down in the near future. The committee added authority that these lines are kept open while at the same time obtaining for our forces aircraft that are well supported from the standpoint of need.

As the committee report indicates, there was thought in the committee of adding $30 million to insure the continued production of the F–111 on very much the same basis as authority was added for the C–130, the A–7, and the F–5. This action was not taken by the committee on the basis that there is still some time within which appropriate arrangements can be made for the continued production of the F–111.

Failure to insure the continued availability of this aircraft would be, to my mind, a very serious matter indeed. As the report indicates, the F–111 is, in its most literal sense, a unique fighter-bomber. The Air Force itself concedes that its deep penetration capability is not even approached by any aircraft in the world. Many other uses for this aircraft are being studied at this time within the Air Force although, paradoxically the Air Force appears to be making no very specific plans to continue production of the aircraft.

Like in the case of nuclear submarines a number of years ago, the situation with respect to the F–111 presents an occasion where it is clearly incumbent upon the Congress to exercise its own responsibility by insuring that this magnificently performing fighter-bomber continues to be available to our forces.

In support of my views in this respect, I insert as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD the three pertinent pages of the committee report dealing with the high advisability of keeping certain existing aircraft production lines open, and including references in this respect to the F–111.

Aircraft production lines: C–130, A–7, F–5B

During the hearings on the bill, a number of members raised questions concerning continuing in operation some aircraft production lines scheduled to be stopped in the relatively near future. The Committee was troubled by the short-sighted economy of closing down production lines in cases where continued future requirements could be foreseen. Four aircraft with valid additional requirements beyond the numbers presently planned were identified: the C–130, the A–7,

and F–5B and the F–111. The replacement of normal attrition losses alone over the years would create requirements not allowed for in present programs, the Committee found. Air Force Secretary Seamans testified that the Air Force recognized that a production line is a national asset and that once a production line is stopped it is very difficult and very costly to restart. He further testified that each of the aircraft programs mentioned above was discussed in detail within OSD and the Air Force, and each one of them on its merits, in the final analysis, was not included in the budget because it was felt that they would not have sufficiently high priority with respect to the other items in the aircraft budget.

Subsequent information furnished to the Committee indicates that "the FY 73 Budget as submitted to the Congress will result in two major aircraft production lines, the C–130 and A–7D, closing in December 1973 and the F–111 line one year later in December 1974. The F–5B line will complete production early in 1973.

Further, the Committee was told that to restart the C–130 line after closure would cost between $125 and $175 million. To restart the F–111 production line would cost between $150 and $200 million; to restart the A–7D production line would cost between $38 and $40 million; to restart the F–5B production line would cost approximately $15 million.

The Committee, therefore, had indicated its intention to consider additional funds for such production lines during its markup of the bill.

Subsequent to completion of the Committee's hearings, the Chairman of the Committee received a communication dated April 27, 1972, from the Secretary of Defense indicating that the Senate Armed Services Committee had likewise deleted procurement authorization for the AWACS but had added $83 million in RDT&E, Air Force, for AWACS. The net reduction of $226.9 million was termed acceptable by the Secretary.

His letter continued:

"During the course of my testimony before your Committee, a concern was expressed that production for the A–7, C–130, and F–5B aircraft would be terminated after the FY 1972 buys. It was emphasized that in the event of additional requirements for these aircraft, it would be extremely costly to restart the lines that as a matter of prudence small quantities of these aircraft could be procured to sustain a production base at reasonable costs. Additionally, it was pointed out that there is a current requirement for the aircraft, but as a consequence of priority considerations, they could not be included within the budget totals. The current invasion of South Vietnam has increased aircraft losses and emphasized the need for continued production, particularly in the case of the C–130 and the F–5B. In fact, the F–5B aircraft are needed for training for the South Vietnamese Air Force.

"Following my appearance before your Committee, I concluded that as a prudent measure we should release the $5.8 million of A–7 advance procurement funds added by the Congress to the FY 1972 DoD budget request. It is now recommended that a portion of the authorization which would otherwise have been required for the FY 1973 AWACS Program be applied to the procurement of 24 A–7s, 12 C–130s and 7 F–5Bs. An amount of $50 million would be required for the C–130s, $12 million for the F–5Bs, and $90 million for the A–7s. The latter amount is to cover the amount of aircraft procurement plus squadron equipage. The total of $152 million can be partially offset by an amount of $60 million in savings from prior year A–7 programs. These savings in the Fiscal Year 1971 and prior Aircraft Procurement, Air Force appropriation could be transferred to the FY 1973 account. Thus authorization for new appropriation in the net amount of $92 million would be required.

"This request has been cleared with the Office of Management and Budget.

"Sincerely,

"MELVIN R. LAIRD."

The Committee, therefore, has approved the $92 million to extend the life of the production lines for the C–130, A–7D and F–5B until December 1974.

F–111

The bill contains $160.3 million, the amount requested, for the procurement of 12 additional F–111 aircraft.

The Committee, as indicated above, initially considered adding another $30 million to the bill to keep the production line for the F–111 aircraft open beyond its presently scheduled termination. The Committee, as Members of the House will recall, in last year's legislation added authorization for the continued procurement of the F–111 and the Committee's judgment on the need for this unique, outstanding aircraft was confirmed by the subsequent action of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and was concurred in by the Department of Defense.

The Committee feels that its judgment was further confirmed by the fact that the Department itself requested funds this year for the procurement of another 12 aircraft.

The F–111 is a long-range, twin-engine, all-weather, attack aircraft which provides a capability existing in no other aircraft in our inventory or anywhere else in the world.

The Committee would like to make crystal clear that it supports the continued production of the F–111 and recognizes that requirements will exist beyond the presently programed buy.

It will be noticed, however, that the additional authorizations provided for the C–130, the A–7D and the F–5B aircraft will continue their production lines to the same point in time as that now contemplated for the F–111; namely, until December 1974. Investigation by the Committee disclosed that the purchase of long-leadtime items for the F–111 consistent with the extension of its production lines beyond the end of 1974 will not be necessary until February or March of 1973.

The Committee directs that the Department of Defense restudy the requirement for the F–111 with a view to taking steps as necessary to assure appropriate follow-on procurement, whether by reprograming or other means.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 2, line 7, strike "$3,101,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,618,100,000."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman and the members of the committee know, I have been a longtime critic of the F–14 program and I rise again today as I have in the past to propose that the procurement funds for the F–14 be deleted and that is what this amendment would do.

I must say I offer this amendment with some diffidence today because I do not see how the money proposed here is ever going to be spent, if I read correctly the report and the remarks of the chairman in the RECORD yesterday. The committee proposes to authorize $407 million for procurement of F–14A aircraft on the condition that this sum will provide at least 48 such aircraft.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the $407 million which is mentioned at the bottom of page 27 of the committee report for the procurement of 48 F–14A aircraft will in fact probably not be spent because it is inconceivable that the condition laid down by the committee that this money must produce at least 48 aircraft could be met. That figures out at an average unit cost of $8.5 million. The committee report indicates that the cost per unit may well run as high as $16.5 million, according to the December report, and it is known that the contractor is requesting at least an additional $2 million per aircraft.

In his remarks in the general debate yesterday, the chairman repeated the statement in the report that the authorization on the premise that "not more than $407.8 million shall be available only for the procurement of not less than 48 F–14 aircraft." And then the chairman went on to say. "This means that the contractor must deliver on the basis of the terms in the existing contract without a $2 million increase in unit price as he has requested."

If that means what it says, then I do not believe that my amendment is very necessary because I do not think the funds will be spent.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) has answered his own question. It means exactly what it says and the amendment is not necessary.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why, if we have the opportunity to cut out $407 million in funds because the money is not going to be spent, and since we are all interested in making a reduction at this time, why do we not do it.

Mr. HÉBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, we are giving the contractor the opportunity to perform on his contract, and the committee is insisting that he bite the bullet and perform under the contract. We are holding his feet to the fire. I believe that language is quite clear, I know the language is very clear and in my unsophisticated way I understand it. The gentleman has read it correctly, the gentleman has observed correctly and the gentleman has argued the fact that we do not need his amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I ask the chairman of the committee this question: If in fact the contractor says he cannot perform on the contract, what will then be the situation? Will the committee come back with a proposed new authorization for a higher unit price for the F–14?

The CHAIRMAN. We do not have that problem at all.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then that would terminate the production or procurement of the F–14 planes; is that correct?

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, on that understanding, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, line 8, strike out "$2,508,600,000" and insert "$2,348,300,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a simple one. It would simply take out of this bill $160,300,000 for a continuation of the production of McNamara's "Flying Edsel," otherwise known as the F–111, the plane that does not seem to be able to stay in the air.

You will probably hear someone who has ridden in one on a flight or two try to defend this appropriation for the production of a dozen more of these planes that were grounded again last week. From one source I hear that was the eighth time all of them have been grounded. Another source says it is the 22d time they have been grounded.

The story of the F–111 is a long and sordid one. I could not begin in 5 minutes to retrace the history but it began back in the early sixties under the administration of one, Lyndon Johnson—and come hell or high water, the contract for the F–111 had to go to Texas. We have had nothing but trouble with it ever since.

At one time, perhaps 3 or 4 years ago—the late Mendel Rivers, chairman of the Armed Services Committee told the House, and I happened to have had the pleasure of questioning him about the F–111—that its day had come and gone; that the committee was going to wind down the F–111 program, and quit buying them.

But somewhere, somehow, somebody got busy and the F–111 has been resurrected. Somehow or other it was brought to life again. I cannot forget the days when Fred Korth and McNamara were busy getting the F–111 contract—not to Boeing—at millions upon millions of dollars of saving. Oh, no, the contract could not be awarded to Boeing. It had to go to General Dynamics at Fort Worth, Tex.

When the General Accounting Office sought to find out the basis for the figures that went into the evaluation of the contract—when they went to McNamara, he said he was carrying the figures in his head.

That is testimony under oath before the McClellan committee in the Senate in its investigation of the sordid history of the F–111 contract.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's criticism might be a little bit intemperate.

Mr. GROSS. In what way is it intemperate?

Mr. LEGGETT. Let me ask you this—the F–111 as I recall was the 111–B and the 111–A and through about the 111–K.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and the contract went to General Dynamics on the basis that it would be a dual purpose plane—land-based and carrier-based.

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that, and he knows that General Dynamics could not cut the weight sufficiently to land on carrier decks. And the costs of production became astronomical.

The Navy never bought a single copy of this plane.

Mr. LEGGETT. That is right. Then, of course, the Navy took the contract out of the Fort Worth plant, which is not in my district, and moved it up to New York. Then you got involved in this debacle that was just explained on the floor here between the chairman and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM)—where now we have $400 million in this bill for all 48 airplanes and the contractor says he cannot complete it—the plane is too heavy. It has an engine with less than 1-to-1 thrust and it is a kind of bum airplane.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you want to make 12 more of these planes? Why do not we get out of the business of making military aircraft that are constantly being grounded?

Mr. LEGGETT. As an alternative to making 12 more planes, would the gentleman want to commit us now to spend $70 million each for 277?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly would like to have in service a plane that will stay in the air. These planes will not stay in the air, and the gentleman knows it.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is a very real and pressing need for more lightning and less thunder as applied to the F–111. We have heard it bandied around and kicked around here for years. More misinformation has been applied toward the F–111 than probably toward any other aircraft that was ever built. We hear talk about accidents. Let us look at the record very briefly.

As to the recent F–111 accidents, I will say that the F–111 has had eight accidents in the last 2½ years—only eight. From Air Force figures that I have here I see that our best known fighter bomber had had 81 aircraft lost in accidents. I see also that another aircraft has had 42 major accidents.

If we are going to start eliminating airplanes just because they have accidents, then let us forget about the U.S. Air Force. They all have accidents.

I have similarly dramatic figures for the Navy aircraft. And I will merely note at this time that as against the eight F–111 accidents in the last 2 years the Navy had 63 with one of its major aircraft, 64 with another, and 48 with a third.

Incidentally, to my friend from Iowa I might say that as of last Monday all F–111's were in the air back flying again. The F–111 has had accidents, and the F–111 may continue to have accidents, and the same statement can be made about all of our high-performance combat aircraft. That is the name of the game. It happens, unfortunately.

The big difference that I find between F–111 accidents and the accidents of our other high-performance aircraft is that we all get to know both immediately and with great fanfare when an F–111 has an accident, but we never seem to hear very much at all about the accidents to other important aircraft. Perhaps now is the time and this is the place for a very brief review of accidents to our combat aircraft and the subsequent groundings or nongroundings of the important part of our defense structure.

Another important Air Force fighter bomber that I have referred to suffered 42 accidents in the past 2½ years. The F–111 suffered eight. By any comparison, hours flown in the air, or any other, the F–111 is the safest airplane of its type that has ever been built, and the records show that.

In the Navy one of our newest fighter bombers has suffered 64 accidents since July 1, 1970, until today. Another important naval aircraft has suffered 41 accidents, and another, 48, and still another, 22, but we have heard very, very little, if anything, about these accidents.

Why are not efforts being made here to strike out money for continuation of these programs? Why pick on the safest airplane of its type that has ever been built—the F–111—and I have the records here to confirm that fact.

In any event, as important as it is in itself, it is not the safety record itself that I am trying to emphasize here as much as the fact that nobody knows about the other aircraft accidents and everybody seems to know about the F–111 accidents.

Lest I be misunderstood, I want to point out most emphatically that I am not attempting to support one aircraft by exploiting the shortcomings or deficiencies of another aircraft, but let us get our facts straight, let us put the whole matter in a fair and proper context, and let us remember that, as one old and experienced combat pilot put it:

The only way to stop accidents in high-performance combat aircraft is to stop flying them.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FISHER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a listing of some eight of the principal airplanes now flying, including the F–111, giving the record of their accident incidents which have occurred during the past 2 or 3 years:

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

[Jan. 1, 1970, through June 1, 1972 (2½ years)]

	1970	1971	1972 (June 1)	Total
Air Force:				
F–4	41	26	14	81
F–100	27	13	2	42
F–101	3	7	3	13
F–102	3	6	3	12
F–105	8	5	5	18
F–106	6	7	0	13
F–111	1	3	4	8
A–7	1	3	2	6
Total				193

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS—Continued

[July 1, 1970 through June 1, 1972 (2 years)]

	July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971	July 1, 1971 to June 1, 1972	Total
Navy:			
F-4	39	24	63
A-7	30	34	64
F-8	29	12	41
A-6	14	8	22
A-4	25	23	48
Total			238

Notes: Air Force accident records are kept on a calendar year basis; Navy records are kept on a fiscal year basis.

Mr. Chairman, the F–111 is a fighter bomber whose performance is well known in the flying world, and any man who has ever flown one and who is familiar with its operation will tell the Members, as they have told this committee for years, that it is undoubtedly the greatest plane of its kind that ever has been built. The old B–52's could be classified as being an endangered species. They have been going a long time, and they have performed magnificently, but their days are numbered. The successor, the B–1, will not be along until the end of the decade. The F–111 is the only plane of its capacity to fill this interim demand, fill this vacuum during a critical time in our history and in the operation of our Defense Department, during the years between now and the time the B–1 is in action; and we do not know for sure, judging by the opposition we hear, what may happen.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Texas for his remarks. He has made a very good point. In fact, the FB–111, the advanced bomber version of the F–111, is already flying out of Plattsburg Air Force Base in upstate New York, and has not been subject to any of the accidents in recent days that the gentleman from Iowa has referred to. This plane is our interim bomber force. It would be a serious mistake to cut it out.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if it is such a good airplane, why is the committee asking for only 12 copies of it?

Mr. FISHER. We had 12 in the program last year, and 12 additional this year. I hope the gentleman will support us when we attempt to put in 12 next year.

Mr. GROSS. I will be right here, I hope—trying to knock them out.

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have about as much business down here in the well taking on the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), as I would have taking on the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) but the situation is the gentleman from Iowa is just wrong in this case.

I have some knowledge of Boeing Aircraft Co., I think, and I agree with the gentleman 100 percent, that the Boeing Co. should have built this airplane. It would have been built a lot cheaper and I think it would have been maybe a little better airplane. But I came to the Congress with that fixed view that the F–111 was a lousy airplane. I was on a subcommittee that investigated the airplane some years ago. Every time the Air Force has appeared before our committee I have taken the occasion to question General Ryan, or whoever happened to be representing the Air Force, about the airplane. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) is exactly right when he says one cannot talk to a pilot who files this airplane who will not say that it is the best airplane in the world. General Ryan tells us it is the best airplane in the world for the purpose for which it was designed.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) asked the question why is the Air Force not buying more? I will tell the gentleman it is because they are so hung up on the B–1 that they are afraid to come and ask for any more money for the F–111, because they are afraid it might jeopardize the B–1. It would probably not hurt to jeopardize the B–1 a little. What we are trying to do by putting in money for the F–111 is to keep the line open, thus, in the event anything happens to the B–1, if we do not go into production of the B–1, we will have at least an airplane line in production which could be changed to produce FB–111 if necessary.

The F–111 is a marvelous airplane. It is not a fighter. It is an attack airplane and the FB–111 serves as an interim bomber. I think the amendment of the gentleman should be rejected.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) is a man whom I have respected for a long time as being for a strong defense in this country, as his record shows. I suppose he was referring to the fact that I am one of those who have checked out in this aircraft, some time ago. With 2,000 to 3,000 jet hours in single-engine, twin-engine, and prop-driven aircraft, I would not be up here pumping for an aircraft that I did not feel was vital to the defense of this country. There is no other aircraft in our inventory which has the capability of this aircraft today.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Because of my great admiration for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE), I am more than pleased that in his testing of the F–111 he did not lose his life as a number of others have in these planes that will not stay in the air.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to continue with my defense of this aircraft, which I consider to be a very fine flying machine.

This bill contains $160.3 million, the amount requested for the procurement of an additional 12 F–111 aircraft. If we stop this production line on this aircraft, which is the only one capable of reaching the interior of Russia in our inventory today, just to restart the production line would cost between $150 million and $200 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 15495, the bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for military procurement, research and development, certain construction, and for other purposes.

I am sure the Committee on Armed Services worked hard on this bill and presented to the House a measure that provides an adequate defense so far as fiscal year 1973 is concerned. It is a good bill and a strong bill.

I made particular note of the fact that, at the request of the Department of Defense, authority was added to the bill toward the end of its consideration for C–130, A–7, and F–5 aircraft. All of these aircraft are urgently needed in our inventory, and very importantly the lines that produce them must be kept going by this authority in order that their production can proceed in an orderly and fiscally responsible fashion.

The committee in its report on page 30 was told that to restart the C–130 line after closure would cost between $125 million and $175 million. To restart the F–111 production line, as I said, would cost between $150 million and $200 million.

The document that made the request that these aircraft be added to the bill had in it, until the last moment, a request for authority for $30 million for long-lead items for the F–111. In other words the long-lead items for this great aircraft would have joined the three aircraft that were added to the bill.

I am not aware of the exact circumstances that dictated the withdrawal of this $30 million at the last moment by the Department of Defense, and I regret that this was done. This is a regret that I know is shared by many other Members of the Congress because we have found in the F–111 the greatest deep-penetration aircraft in the inventories of any nation in the world. Its record is superb and its performance leaves virtually nothing to be desired.

It is my earnest hope that some action can be taken in the next several months to assure that the F–111 line is also kept going in the same fashion as the lines of the other important aircraft that have been added to the bill. We can find no better insurance policy than low-level production of the F–111 as a hedge against a future that none of us can predict.

Now we get into the facts here, I say to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) on the grounding of the F–111's.

Two F–111's were recently lost in accidents on June 15 and June 18. The accidents were totally unrelated. The first, an F–111F, occurred during a routine training flight after the aircraft had been airborne for some time. The second, an F–111A, occurred shortly after takeoff

and ground witnesses stated the airplane appeared to be on fire prior to crew ejection. Both accidents are under investigation and conclusions cannot be drawn at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PRICE of Texas was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Now the safety record. The accidents of the F–111 are such that it has a safety record which continues to be unmatched when compared with all other Century series Air Force aircraft. The two airplanes with the next best safety records are the F–106 and the A–7. At 150,000 hours, the F–106 suffered 40 accidents while the A–7 experienced 51 accidents. This compares with the F–111 at 180,000 flight hours with 26 accidents. All other contemporary aircraft, such as the F–4, the F–105, the F–102, and the F–101 have safety records which are significantly worse.

Recent records show there was an order to suspend the training flights on the Tactical Air Command F–111 fleet as a precautionary measure, and corrective measures have been taken. This is standard practice. For example, the A–7 fleet was grounded twice in the 6 months during the last year while these accidents were being investigated. The F–111 domestic TAC fleet is again flying, and the SAC F–111's in the United States and the TAC F–111's in Europe have not been suspended in their flying.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the record of aircraft accidents in comparison to the F–4, the F–100, the F–101, F–102, the F–105, the F–111, and the A–7. All of them have many more accidents than the F–111.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to congratulate the gentleman on an excellent presentation. I think he has made a fine contribution to the understanding of the House of the performance record of this airplane. The personal experience which he has brought to the attention of the House and the flight experience he has had in this airplane are indeed significant. I am sure his experience and that of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), who is also an experienced pilot, will carry a great deal of weight in the House when we evaluate this particular item in the budget.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to say in conclusion, recently at the invitation of the Secretary of the Air Force I flew the XR–71 at 80,000 feet at a speed of 2,200 miles an hour to evaluate its capabilities. It is a great airplane. I would not be up here pumping the F–111 if we did not need it for our defense, because we do not have any other aircraft at the present time with the ability to penetrate into Russia should it come to a confrontation with them in the future.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

This is not the first time such an amendment has been offered on the floor of this House. It will not be the first time for such an amendment to be resoundingly defeated, as this one deserves to be and I earnestly trust that it will be.

The gentleman from Iowa acknowledged in his remarks that he has had a sort of personal vendetta against this aircraft since long before the first one was built. Conversely, I have a natural interest in the aircraft—a recognizable and probably understandable parochial interest—since it is built in my district. Because of this fact, I have gained considerable familiarity with the F–111 program.

Setting aside personal vendettas and parochial interests, I should think the House would be interested in three basic factors regarding this remarkable aircraft. These factors are safety, capability, and cost. It is to them, therefore, that I shall address my remarks.

SAFETY

First, Mr. Chairman, the F–111 is demonstrably the safest modern aircraft in the military inventory. This fact no doubt would come as a surprise to many whose only familiarity with military aircraft is through the newspapers. Every accident of the F–111, because of the controversy that attended the initial contract award in 1962, has been front page news.

But let us briefly compare accident rates. During the past 2½ years, there have been some 450 accidents in Air Force and Navy craft. Only eight of these involved the F–111. News accounts have blown these eight far out of proportion. We have hardly heard about the others.

During this period when the F–111 has experienced eight accidents, there were 81 accidents in Air Force F–4's and 63 in Navy F–4's, 64 in A–7's, 42 in F–100's, 48 in A–4's and 41 in F–8's. Only eight, as I say, involved F–111's.

For a more precise comparison, let us talk in terms of the number of accidents per hours flown. Here again the F–111 has a highly superior safety record.

During 180,000 hours of flight there have been only 26 accidents in F–111's. At 150,000 hours of flight the A–7 experienced 51 accidents and F–106 suffered 40. These two aircraft, against which I intend no criticism, are in fact the next best to the F–111 among all the 13 aircraft in the Century series in regard to their safety records.

All of this adds up indisputably to the fact that the F–111 is, on balance, the safest airplane in the military inventory.

CAPABILITY

In regard to capability, it must be pointed out that the F–111 is the only low-level, all-weather plane in the inventory which is capable of penetrating the Soviet defenses.

It is the only plane we have which is capable of continuing bombing missions at night and in very bad weather. This is true because of the unique terrain avoidance system which is built into the F–111. It can fly in under the enemy radar at night or in inclement weather, and not be detected. We have no other aircraft which can perform this mission.

The committee report on page 31, in reference to this performance characteristic, declares that:

> The F–111 provides a capability existing in no other aircraft in our inventory or anywhere else in the world.

This additional comment from the report of our Armed Services Committee is worth noting:

> The Committee would like to make crystal clear that it supports the continued production of the F–111 and recognizes that requirements will exist beyond the presently programed buy.

It is apparent that the Soviet Union is impressed with the performance characteristics of the F–111. This is evident in the fact that the Russians have mentioned this specific plane on several occasions in the SALT talks, in their efforts to gain some agreement from us that it would not be deployed in Europe.

The aircraft is deployed in England and those who operate it are highly impressed with its capability. Every pilot who has flown the aircraft is enthusiastic about its performance.

COST

In connection with cost, Mr. Chairman, relatively little would be saved in the overall proportions of this bill if the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa were adopted.

The bill provides only some $160 million for the procurement of 12 additional aircraft this year. It is clear that the purpose of the committee in building this number is to keep the production line alive and active, as further amplifed in the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) that the committee will expect to come back next year and ask for sufficient appropriations for 12 more of this aircraft.

This is the cheapest way I can imagine for us to have an aircraft for long-range penetration in these critical years while the old subsonic B–52's are being phased out and before the B–1 becomes operational.

Nobody expects us to have B–1's in operational numbers before 1980 at the earliest. Meanwhile, if we are to maintain a viable defense throughout the remainder of this decade obviously we need to continue producing F–111's.

For each of these reasons and for all of them together, I ask that we vote no on the amendment.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman will recall that the Government of Australia a couple of years ago bought, I believe it was, 32 of the F–111's.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. FISHER. I had the occasion to talk with the Australian Ambassador when he was on Capitol Hill last week. He brought the subject up. I did not. But he made the statement that the Australians and the Australian Air Force are highly pleased and greatly elated over the performance of the F–111's and

they are mighty glad that they bought them.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Texas for that comment and I think it reflects the feelings of those who have had some familiarity with the plane, with its performance, its capability and with its safety record.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON: Page 2, line 12, strike out the period and insert the following ": *Provided*, That a sum not to exceed $2,983,500,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the procurement of missiles for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force during fiscal year 1973"

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is part of a continuing problem I have had as a newer member of the committee, and maybe something that the House has become inured to over the years.

The sum that I am talking of here is the sum of $468.9 million. Even that figure is supposed to be secret. The sum involves moneys that apparently in general have not been made known to the Armed Services Committee, but which are included in this year's authorization bill. It follows a practice that has only been narrowly expanded—a practice which has been followed for years—that only the chairman and the ranking minority member of the General Services Committee are apprised of the use of substantial sums of money and the fact that despite the extensive classified briefings and secret meetings of the committee the majority of the committee was not allowed to know what the money was for.

My purpose in offering this amendment is to apprise the House of the fact that we have a total of approximately $830 million of the $21.5 billion that members of the Armed Services Committee know nothing about. Some of the members of the Armed Services Committee, including the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) and myself have asked for and been refused information, and that strikes me as not being productive of a well-informed branch of the Government.

I do not know what the money is for. I cannot comment on the mischief that may be turned loose by our inability to know or what we may find ourselves committed to as a result of the expenditure of these funds.

It seems to me, if there is going to be any credibility attached to the legislative process that we are a part of—if we are going to be asked to act both in good faith and in a well-informed fashion—we should have the benefit in sessions that are closed to the public, if there is a sensitive matter before us, to be told as a committee, what this money is for.

I think the history of this country in the last 20 years is rife with examples of moneys being appropriated, particularly to the CIA which end up causing us a lot more grief than the momentary benefit of keeping it secret.

It is for this reason that I come here this afternoon offering this and other amendments which will total approximately $830 million to apprise Members of the House who are concerned about this problem of the fact that the Committee on Armed Services, Republicans and Democrats alike, do not know what this money is for and have been refused information about it.

I think the time has come, if we are going to be responsible at all in carrying out our obligation to the public and to ourselves that we be given enough information to know it is a worthwhile expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the particular sum be stricken from the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1973 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $1,997,332,200, of which amount not more than $174,658,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the military sciences budget activity;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $2,661,533,250, of which amount not more than $131,022,400 is authorized to be appropriated for the military sciences budget activity;

For the Air Force, $3,168,940,150, of which amount not more than $124,338,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the military sciences budget activity; and

For the Defense Agencies, $494,082,650.

SEC. 202. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1973 for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto, $50,000,000.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading.) Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: On page 3, line 4, after "Air Force" strike out "$3,168,940,150" and insert "$2,723,940,150 none of which shall be authorized for the B–1 program and".

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes $445 million which is the total amount in this bill authorized for the further development of the B–1 bomber.

Two years ago in our committee report, we said that prototypes of the B–1 bomber were going to cost about $450 million each. Today, only 2 years later, we are told that prototypes of the B–1 bomber are going to cost $873 million each.

We are going to build three prototypes of that B–1 bomber and the R. & D. program for these three prototypes is currently estimated at $2,618,000,000.

Now, obviously, the cost in the last 2 years has escalated like crazy and we are only just beginning. The program is only 2 years old. There was $100 million in the budget for it 2 years ago. There was $370 million in the budget for it last year. There is $445 million in the budget for this year.

All that you are talking about here is the beginning of the cost of building the bomber. This does not include the cost of missiles which are going to be put on the bomber. The missiles are going to cost about $7 million per bomber.

That is only the beginning on the missiles because that cost does not include the warhead on the missiles that go on the bomber, so we have not really begun to talk about what this program is going to cost.

The Air Force alleges that although it is going to cost $873 million each to build the three prototypes, they can build the production models for $35 million each—less than 5 percent of what the prototypes are going to cost. I frankly find that prediction to be incredible. Even if it were credible, and even forgetting the missiles that you are going to put on the bombers, and even forgetting the warheads that you are going to put on the missiles that you are going to put on the bombers—none of which are in this cost here—if we build the 241 of these aircraft that we say we are going to build, and if all of their predictions, which have been so wrong in the past, are true, you are talking about a program with a cost of $11,113,000,000.

I do not know really how far down the road we have got to go in the capability of blowing other nations to smithereens. Obviously we have got the power to blow the Soviets to smithereens. All we are talking about here is how fine a powder we deem it to be necessary to grind the other peoples of this earth into, and we are talking about also, of course, about how fine a powder we ourselves are willing to be ground into if we continue this kind of inflation of an arms race.

Do you really believe that we could build 241 bombers without the Russians wanting to build more bombers? They are going to say, "Well, we have got to have this for a bargaining chip." What did we get out of our bargaining chips? We got a SALT agreement which has resulted in a request for a higher authorization bill than we had last year.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, mainly because I think it is time that the United States developed a new long-range strategic bomber. This is one

weapon system which is not exactly the original idea of the Air Force or the Department of Defense. For 15 years, to my knowledge, the Congress through the House Armed Services Committee has been talking about a follow-on long-range bomber. Everyone who has been a member of the committee for any length of time recognizes the word "AMSA," the advanced manned strategic aircraft, and it is about time that we built it.

The most advanced modification of the B–52 will, at the time this aircraft comes into being, be over 20 years old. The gentleman who preceded me said we would cause the Russians to build more bombers. I think he should be aware of the fact that they are already developing more modern bombers than we are. They could well be ahead of us in the development of a strategic aircraft. I think it would be foolhardy on the part of this House to stop the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft. It is a weapon of conventional war, as well as being useful in the event that we do have a nuclear attack.

I urge my colleagues in the House to soundly reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement in opposition to this amendment.

The gentleman from New York yesterday, when we were in general debate on the subject, mentioned the B–70 as one of the reasons why we should, perhaps, not proceed with the B–1 program. I would just like to say had we proceeded with the B–70 in the early sixties we, perhaps, would not have to be doing this at this time. In my opinion, the Secretary of Defense in the early sixties is the one who made the great mistake in not proceeding with the manned bomber at that time.

IMPACT OF B–1 FUNDING REDUCTION

Mr. Chairman, this year's B–1 funding request of $444.5 million is required to insure that this vital development program will move forward in a sound and efficient businesslike manner. The program as currently structured will provide the best product at the lowest cost to the Government and the taxpayer.

It is important that we recognize that this year's funding requirement of $444.5 million is $286 million less than the original plan which called for $750.5 million this year. In other words, the compromise for B–1 funding this year has already been made.

A further reduction at this stage on top of the reductions that have already been made would have a devastating effect upon the orderly progress of the program and would be penny wise and dollar foolish. Fiscal year 1973 is a near peak funding year in the development program. Hiring is generally complete at both the prime contractors and their subcontractors. Design is being translated into hardware, and near-term hardware is now undergoing design verification testing, with substantial effort being expended on actual flying details and components. Air vehicle subsystems are well into qualification testing.

On a nationwide level, by the end of this calendar year alone, more than 25,000 people will be gainfully employed on the program if we include the air vehicle and engine prime contractors and their vast network of subcontractors and suppliers. This in turn is now creating or supporting more than 43,000 additional nonaerospace jobs—the butcher and baker—nationwide.

The disruptive effects of the orderly progression of the program, whether at the prime contractor or at the multitude of the subcontractors, is difficult to even imagine. A reduction in this year's funding could jeopardize over 33,000 new aerospace and nonaerospace jobs that are now being added to the Nation's work force at a time of need in calendar year 1972 alone. This is the work force that could become tax users instead of taxpayers capable of supporting our domestic peacetime priorities.

Even more serious, the B–1 first flight, IOC and buildup of the SAC force structure could be delayed by at least 1 year. This will result in a reduction and subsequent reactivation of SAC bases, manpower and support equipment associated with the strategic heavy bomber inventory. The cost increases attendant to the disruptive effects, the stretchout and inflationary effects could exceed many tens of millions later in the program.

In summary, the B–1 development program is growing to maturity in fiscal year 1973. It is staffed and moving in an exemplary manner toward the development of the much needed quantum improvement in the SAC bomber force. A reduction in funding would result in near disastrous program consequences and would burden our already high unemployment roles. To cut back the Nation's expanding economy and a growing work force would be like trying to stuff the eagle back into its egg. Starting and stopping, cutbacks, indecisiveness, and stretchouts not only increase the ultimate costs, but prove wasteful of the Nation's resources and risk product obsolescence with the resulting jeopardy to our national security.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from California, all the effort and money we put into the B–70 was not exactly wasted. Much of the development of commercial aircraft since that day and supersonic aircraft for our military has been the result of the effort we put into the B–70.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to appear to be a know-it-all as I am not a member of this committee. However, I do feel that experience in this field allows me to speak on this subject.

During the fiscal year 1973 the budget includes $445 million to continue engineering development of the B–1 intercontinental bomber, intended to replace the aging B–52 fleet. The B–1 is being designed to improve capabilities over the B–52 through faster reaction, increased resistance to nuclear effects, shorter escape times, longer range, greater payload, higher speeds at both high and low altitudes, reduced infrared signatures, decreased radar cross sections and greatly increased electronic countermeasure capabilities. These increased capabilities should enhance prelaunch survivability and penetration capabilities of the manned bomber force for the post-1980 time period.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman whether he can make a statement as to what he has in mind to replace or to use between the period of the B–52 and the time in which this bomber will be in production.

The development program includes the design of the aircraft as well as fabrication, and then there will be testing of three flight vehicles and one fatigue airframe. We do not develop these aircraft overnight. They have to be designed. New materials have to be created.

Of course, the first flight of the B–1 is planned for April 1974. This will be followed by a full year of testing before a production decision is made. The program is on schedule and within the cost estimates.

The Committee on Armed Services continues to strongly support the need for manned strategic aircraft and the modernization of our existing capabilities. The last B–52 bomber was produced in 1962, 10 years ago. If the B–1 is produced and introduced into the Air Force inventory, it will be another decade before we have this follow-on bomber in significant numbers. At that time the newest B–52H will be 20 years old.

I would like to ask the gentleman who introduced the amendment, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) what he has in mind in this interim period, between now and the time this aircraft could be in production and in place.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the gentleman, I listened to all of the eloquent arguments they made on behalf of the FB–111 and the F–111 a while back, and I would swear I heard people say the FB–111 had the low attack capability, and all these powers, and I was terribly impressed by all the arguments people made on the subject of the FB–111. It was a very compelling argument. I voted for continuation of that line. That is, indeed, one of the routes we can go.

I think if all of us who happen to have been in the service and have done some action stand up as experts, we are going to have nothing but experts around here.

My own feeling, frankly, is that tactical aircraft with bombs that can hit things are far more effective than either the B–52's which have been spraying them all over Vietnam without hitting anything for 5 years——

Mr. PRICE of Texas. South Vietnam.

Mr. PIKE. Or the B–1's, which are

going to be standing off at a range of 200 miles and firing the SRAM missiles.

I happen to believe very strongly that the way to have an effective Air Force is to have an Air Force that can hit something. This is something we have not seen with the strategic bombers of today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. That is very true. The B–52 cannot, as a rule, go over North Vietnam at the present time because of the Sam missile. It can knock them down like flies. They are hitting along the edges.

But this aircraft is designed to deliver nuclear weapons. We can put a nuclear weapon on a B–52 now, and go within 200 miles of the target, but it would be shot down before it got there.

We must look 10 years ahead. We cannot all of a sudden crank out bombers overnight. The gentleman knows that, and I know that.

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

Mr. Chairman, President Nixon recently returned from an historic mission to Russia.

Since his return there has been great debate and discussion whether the United States was sold down the river and thus jeopardizing the security of this Nation and her allies, or whether in fact the SALT agreements were significant steps toward peace. We cannot resolve this question here today. We do not possess the crystal ball that will tell us whether this was good or bad. The future is unpredictable and our judgment is not absolute. This question can only be answered through time, and through the record that history makes. We have an opportunity, however, to shape the destiny of this history that is being written. We have an opportunity to determine the eventual outcome of this historic agreement. In my opinion, these SALT agreements will be recorded as a significant first step in man's quest for peace only if we are willing to make the sacrifice to maintain a strong national defense; and only if we are willing to continue development of modern weapons prior to the second round of talks. Neither security nor peace can be found in hiding from reality. We would be naive if we came under the illusion that the Russians will not continue the development of military hardware not covered by the SALT agreements. We would be kidding ourselves if we assumed the false notion that the SALT agreements are an absolute solution for all the ills of the world. Only by maintaining a strong defense will we maintain our bargaining position among the world powers.

Those who scoff at balance-of-power diplomacy should recognize that the only alternative to a balance of power is an imbalance of power, and history shows that nothing so drastically accentuates the danger of war as an imbalance. We must constantly remind ourselves that among the great powers only the strong will survive, and as we look to the future it is essential that our potential adversaries retain the respect for American strength. This reality is sufficient reason to continue the development of modern weapons such as the B–1 bomber, which is now in question.

The pros and cons of the usefulness and timeliness of the bomber in today's modern warfare I will leave to the experts. Suffice it to say, that in an all-out atomic war, it would be difficult to claim that any weapon system is not vulnerable. However, too often we have found ourselves in the past, and perhaps in the future, involved in limited wars such as Korea and Vietnam. Under the Nixon doctrine perhaps these skirmishes are a thing of the past. However, I would hate to leave this question to mere speculation. Being prepared however, is far better than relying upon hopes, wishes, and mere speculation. It is a fact that the B–52, which will be 15 to 20 years old has been playing a vital role in Southeast Asia. The destructive capabilities of this giant of the air has had a significant impact on the ability of the South Vietnamese to continue in their quest for self-determination and peaceful existence. The bomber has proven itself time and time again. The B–52 however is old. It is worn out and it is behind the times as far as modern weaponry. A new bomber is desperately needed if we are to have this continued capability. The B–1 bomber is a replacement for the B–52.

I represent an area of southern California where the B–1 bomber is being built and have thus followed its development with great concern. I support the manned bomber concept, and I am firmly convinced the Department of Defense is taking the proper steps to acquire a replacement for the B–52. It has now been 2 years since the contract for engineering development of the B–1 was awarded. In any major program the initial years are by far the most important. Those first years are the foundation for the program, and the success or failure in meeting performance goals, schedules and cost targets invariably can be attributed to early ear performances.

The first 2 years for the B–1 can be held up as a model for future defense programs. Schedules are being met, milestones reached and passed, and most importantly, the program is within the cost. The B–1 today is no longer a paper airplane on a draftsman's table. It is being cast in aluminum, titanium, and steel. Major tests are being done on full-size flight aircraft hardware, and the results have been outstanding in some of the most critical structural areas on the new aircraft.

One further note, with the cutbacks in Federal spending and the subsequent unemployment, I remind Congress that the B–1 bomber provides nearly 70,000 jobs nationally just in this R. & D. stage. If we were to turn away from our position as a world leader, if we were to lay down our world responsibilities, if we were to isolate ourselves from the turbulent arena of world affairs then we can be very certain the vacuum we left would rapidly be filled by others. We could also be certain that such a world would be less safe for America, less safe for democracy, and less safe for mankind.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not planned to speak on this amendment until the gentleman from California who preceded me made comment about the SALT agreement. That made me think that I should take the time to emphasize that if the SALT agreement is ratified we should take a careful look at what we have given up and what we have left that we can do under the agreement to strengthen our defense.

With the foregoing as a preface let me emphasize that the very heart of this procurement bill before us today, and without any question the most important part of it, is title II—which contains authorizations for research and development.

Secretary Laird and Admiral Moorer came before the House Armed Services Committee to explain the limitation agreement. We are indebted to our staff because they have summarized those hearings in booklet form. Any Member can get from the staff table what we call a sanitized version of Secretary Laird's presentation. Those Members who may have doubts or misgivings about whether we have given away too much to the Russians and whether we any longer enjoy what is called sufficiency should take a look at the Secretary's testimony at page 12098.19 of that record. While portions have been deleted there is enough left to make the point.

One of the members of the committee suggested we are at a disadvantage because the Russians can go ahead with MIRV and some other qualitative improvements which means we will be placed at a disadvantage. Here is the answer of the Secretary:

> The reason that we are not at a disadvantage is that the United States at the present time has, I believe, a technological lead over the Soviet Union, perhaps about two years in the case of MIRV's, for example, and it is important for us to keep that lead.

Those were the words of Secretary Laird.

And then over on the next page is another reference where one of our other members asked:

> In other words, we are going to have to be two years ahead, or some degree ahead of them all the way down the pike or we are going to be in danger?

Then the Secretary came back, and made reference to what was referred to yesterday as phase II. First we are going to try to get the present agreement ratified but we are even now in the bargaining process on further negotiations beyond the present agreement. These will go on during the 5-year period of the current agreement. Listen to the words of Secretary Laird on page 12098.20 of the unclassified report of the hearings when he said:

> If we stand still during this 5-year period, not only is the safety and security of the United States open to question, but so are the opportunities for a follow-on success in the Strategic Arms Talks, which are now going to start—as soon as the Moscow Agreements are ratified we open discussions with the Soviet Union on the follow-on arrangements for offensive weapons.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, it is important that we defeat this amendment and any other that would reduce research and development. Continuation of R. & D. at an accelerated pace is vital to our defense posture. We are ahead and we must say ahead. Once lead time is lost there is no way it can be regained. I urge that we vote down this amendment and any other amendments that would reduce funding for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. PIKE, BRAY, PRICE of Illinois, and LEGGETT.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 94, noes 279, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—94

Abzug	Forsythe	Obey
Addabbo	Fraser	O'Hara
Aspin	Gaydos	Pike
Badillo	Gibbons	Podell
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Rangel
Begich	Green, Pa.	Rees
Bergland	Harrington	Reid
Biaggi	Hathaway	Reuss
Bingham	Hawkins	Riegle
Bolling	Hechler, W. Va.	Robison, N.Y.
Brademas	Heinz	Rodino
Brasco	Helstoski	Rooney, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	Rosenthal
Burlison, Mo.	Jacobs	Roy
Burton	Karth	Roybal
Carey, N.Y.	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Celler	Koch	Sarbanes
Clay	Kyros	Scheuer
Collins, Ill.	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Corman	McClory	Stokes
Culver	McCormack	Symington
Dellums	Macdonald, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Mazzoli	Tiernan
Dow	Metcalfe	Udall
Drinan	Mikva	Ullman
Eckhardt	Minish	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Vigorito
Eilberg	Mitchell	Waldie
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead	Whalen
Fascell	Nedzi	Wolff
Ford, William D.	Nix	Yates
		Yatron

NOES—279

Abbitt	Brown, Ohio	Coughlin
Adams	Broyhill, N.C.	Crane
Anderson, Calif.	Buchanan	Curlin
Andrews, Ala.	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Va.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Byrne, Pa.	Daniels, N.J.
Annunzio	Byrnes, Wis.	Danielson
Archer	Byron	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Cabell	Davis, Wis.
Ashbrook	Camp	de la Garza
Ashley	Carlson	Delaney
Aspinall	Carney	Dellenback
Baker	Carter	Denholm
Belcher	Casey, Tex.	Dennis
Bell	Cederberg	Derwinski
Bennett	Chamberlain	Devine
Betts	Chappell	Dingell
Bevill	Clancy	Donohue
Biester	Clausen, Don H.	Dorn
Blackburn	Clawson, Del	Dulski
Boland	Cleveland	Duncan
Bow	Collier	du Pont
Bray	Collins, Tex.	Edmondson
Brinkley	Colmer	Edwards, Ala.
Brooks	Conable	Eshleman
Brotzman	Conover	Fish
Brown, Mich.	Conte	Fisher
	Cotter	Flood
		Flowers
Flynt	McCollister	St Germain
Foley	McEwen	Sandman
Fountain	McKay	Saylor
Frelinghuysen	McKevitt	Scherle
Frenzel	McMillan	Schmitz
Frey	Madden	Scott
Fuqua	Mahon	Sebelius
Galifianakis	Mailliard	Shipley
Garmatz	Mallary	Shoup
Gettys	Mann	Shriver
Giaimo	Martin	Sikes
Goldwater	Mathias, Calif.	Sisk
Gonzalez	Mathis, Ga.	Skubitz
Goodling	Matsunaga	Slack
Grasso	Mayne	Smith, Calif.
Gross	Meeds	Smith, Iowa
Grover	Melcher	Smith, N.Y.
Gubser	Michel	Snyder
Gude	Miller, Calif.	Spence
Haley	Miller, Ohio	Springer
Hall	Mills, Ark.	Staggers
Hamilton	Mills, Md.	Stanton, J. William
Hammer-schmidt	Minshall	Stanton, James V.
Hanley	Mizell	Steed
Hanna	Monagan	Steele
Hansen, Idaho	Montgomery	Steiger, Ariz.
Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Steiger, Wis.
Harsha	Murphy, Ill.	Stratton
Harvey	Murphy, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Hastings	Myers	Stuckey
Hébert	Natcher	Sullivan
Henderson	Nelsen	Talcott
Hicks, Mass.	Nichols	Taylor
Hicks, Wash.	O'Konski	Teague, Calif.
Hillis	O'Neill	Teague, Tex.
Hogan	Patman	Terry
Horton	Patten	Thompson, Ga.
Hosmer	Pelly	Thomson, Wis.
Hull	Pepper	Thone
Hunt	Perkins	Van Deerlin
Hutchinson	Pettis	Vander Jagt
Ichord	Peyser	Veysey
Jarman	Pickle	Waggonner
Johnson, Calif.	Pirnie	Wampler
Johnson, Pa.	Poage	Ware
Jonas	Powell	Whalley
Jones, Ala.	Preyer, N.C.	White
Jones, N.C.	Price, Ill.	Whitehurst
Jones, Tenn.	Price, Tex.	Whitten
Kazen	Purcell	Williams
Keating	Quie	Wilson, Bob
Keith	Quillen	Wilson, Charles H.
Kemp	Railsback	Winn
King	Randall	Wright
Kluczynski	Rarick	Wyatt
Kuykendall	Rhodes	Wydler
Landgrebe	Roberts	Wylie
Landrum	Robinson, Va.	Wyman
Latta	Roe	Young, Fla.
Leggett	Rogers	Young, Tex.
Lennon	Roncalio	Zablocki
Link	Rooney, N.Y.	Zion
Lloyd	Rostenkowski	Zwach
Long, La.	Roush	
Lujan	Rousselot	
McCloskey	Runnels	
McClure	Ruppe	
	Ruth	

NOT VOTING—59

Abernethy	Downing	McCulloch
Abourezk	Dwyer	McDade
Alexander	Erlenborn	McDonald, Mich.
Anderson, Ill.	Esch	McFall
Anderson, Tenn.	Evins, Tenn.	McKinney
Baring	Findley	Mollohan
Blanton	Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher
Blatnik	Fulton	Moss
Boggs	Gallagher	Passman
Broomfield	Gray	Poff
Broyhill, Va.	Griffin	Pryor, Ark.
Burke, Fla.	Griffiths	Pucinski
Caffery	Hagan	Satterfield
Chisholm	Halpern	Schneebeli
Clark	Hays	Schwengel
Conyers	Heckler, Mass.	Stephens
Davis, S.C.	Holifield	Widnall
Dent	Howard	Wiggins
Dickinson	Kee	
Dowdy	Kyl	
	Lent	

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT: Page 3, line 7: Delete "$1,997,332,200." Insert in its place, "$1,140,332,200."

Page 3, lines 10 and 11: Delete "2,661,533,250;" insert in its place $1,961,533,250."

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we have opportunities to effect economies this afternoon in our national budget, but we are fortunate we still have just a few opportunities left. I would say again the amendment we are offering here, while rather obscure in terminology, is relatively simple. If the Members will refer to the report which accompanies the bill, on page 95 we talk about the $1.489 billion in cuts. Items 1 and 2 are concerned with this amendment.

Primarily it refers to the hard site ABM development program. In order to save time, I have combined that with a cut in the ULMS program, which is the Trident program, which is the 22 nuclear submarines program. Very simply, both these programs, I feel, are antagonistic to the SALT agreement. We have been limited under the SALT agreements with respect to the antiballistic missile program, to 100 missiles at Grand Forks, which is almost completed, and another site at the National Command Center, and nothing else. Why, then, do we need to spend the $140 million that I referred to in item 1, known as the hard site defense system?

This is one of those little obscure small items we have in the $8 billion research budget that goes in without even a line item, and all of a sudden a few years later, it balloons totally out of proportion. Fortunately, the SALT agreement and the antiballistic missile limitation are going to keep this particular item from ballooning out of proportion. It is never going to be able to be spent, so I ask, why spend the $140 million for this hard site defense program at all?

We are limited to the 100 missiles at Grand Forks to protect the 60 Minuteman field, and 100 missiles at the National Command Center. I say there is no reason whatsoever to get involved in this program.

This program originally started out as an Air Force program. The Air Force did not really rely or was not able to rely on and put its faith in the Army to protect their missile sites, so they decided they would develop their own program for defending their Minuteman sites.

I was briefed on this program the year before last, and the Air Force indicated it would cost-total-on this non-nuclear defense program known as hard site, $1 billion to $3 billion, depending on whether they developed new missiles or used some improved Hawks in the inventory. They got into an inter-service battle between the Army and the Air Force. The Army took over the program and translated it from a nonnuclear to a nuclear program.

They planned to spend in this program, we ascertained in the research and development committee, a total of $25 billion on the hard site program alone, in addition to the $12 or $16 billion that would normally be spent under the full-blown Safeguard missile program.

Restated, we would be spending about $41 billion for the hard site and ABM defense in order to protect about $11 billion worth of missiles.

This is a lot of numbers we are talking about, but the sense is obvious. We are

obviously accelerating in this program under the SALT umbrella.

I do not believe this kind of research is required. I do not believe this kind of research is good.

The second part of the amendment addresses itself to ULMS. That is the Trident: the new submarine.

Members might wonder why we are accelerating the ULMS submarine system.

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

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do intend to accelerate the argument on this.

The ULMS program involves the construction of a 24-tube submarine that is much, much larger than our existing Polaris-Poseidons. It has a range of perhaps two times the range of the existing Polaris-Poseidons.

But the President, after the submission of the budget on this item, which was in excess of some $800 million, went to Moscow, and he brought back a strategic arms limitation agreement, and the agreement said that we can deploy in the water 710 submerged missile tubes. We have deployed in the water today 656 missile tubes.

The program was that we would allow for the conversion of our 54 obsolete heavy megatonnage Titans to sea-based water.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I will yield to the gentleman in a minute, after I make this next point.

I just do not believe it makes an awful lot of sense to accelerate from $120 million spent on the ULMS system last year to the $977 million level of development this year when we are looking toward making this Trident-ULMS system a bargaining chip for 1977.

If we are spending $977 million this year, one can bet his tintype we will be spending over a billion dollars next year, and a billion dollars the following year, until we have spent, by 1977 probably $5 billion or $6 billion. Then we will have a treaty canceling it.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I wonder if the gentleman would explain why he has coupled these two amendments together. That is to say, I voted for his first amendment. I voted for the Pike amendment. I am opposed to the ABM thing. I believe one of them is enough. I believe two is either too many or too few.

I have long felt that the ABM is simply inadequate. The Trident, on the other hand, the ULMS, strikes me as being a very important part of the whole strategic deterrent, or secondary strike force, and I favor that.

The gentleman makes it impossible for me to support his amendment by coupling the two things together.

Mr. LEGGETT. I understand that. I appreciate the gentleman's point. I am sure three or four others in the House share his view.

But I believe by and large either one is for the Arms Limitation Agreement, or perhaps for acceleration under it. I believe that this limitation would preclude acceleration under the agreement. I do not believe we need this particular system this rapidly.

My amendment does not strike out the ULMS. It leaves $277 million in the program.

I think, if you want to save money, the place to save it this year in the defense bill is in the ULMS-Trident system. We can save $700 million in the second part of my amendment and $140 million in the first part. The total amendment involves $840 million. They both relate to items barred by the agreements that are going to be ratified by this House and the Senate. Why we need to accelerate like this in the development of barred systems is very, very, very confusing to me.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

In the first place, as the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) just pointed out, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) is mixing oranges and apples. He has two different things in here, and it is very confusing for the Members to know exactly what they are confronted with. Some people, like the gentleman from Maryland, may be interested in the ULMS but not interested in the ABM.

Second, the gentleman from California apparently has not read the committee report very carefully. He said he is moving to strike out $700 million in research and development funds for the Trident submarine, but on page 22 of the report the R.D.T. & E. money is only $555.4 million. So the gentleman's amendment is not really relevant to this particular title in that particular amount.

Finally, although we have had many opponents of the Trident submarine, or the ULMS submarine as it was originally known, this is the first time I have ever heard of anybody suggesting that we should strike out the research and development money for this new system.

The gentleman from California is being holier than the Pope, because even the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in the other body (Mr. PROXMIRE) has said he does not disapprove of research and development funds in an effort to improve our submarine force; he is opposed to the advanced procurement items.

But those procurement funds were contained in title I of the bill, and we are already beyond that title, and the gentleman from California offered no opposition to advanced leadtime procurement for Trident at that time.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. He is not only taking out more money than is actually in the R.D.T. & E. program for the Trident, but also he made the statement that this program was barred by the SALT agreement. The gentleman in the well and the gentleman from California have voted for that. Do you recall any information that was contained in that agreement that said it was barred?

Mr. STRATTON. No. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who is a real expert in the nuclear field, is absolutely right. Far from being barred, this improvement in our underwater Polaris submarine fleet is one of the areas in which we have specific authority to advance under the Moscow agreements.

I would point out to members of the committee that under the SALT agreement the Soviets could have as many as 62 Polaris submarines, compared to a top limit of 44 for us. So it behooves us, it seems to me, if we are going to continue to maintain a balance of forces with the Soviets, we ought to continue research and development to improve our own deterrent submarine force.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Members of the House, I think this brings into sharp focus exactly what we are confronted with in the irresponsibility of some of these amendments being offered and the time of the House being taken up.

As an example, the gentleman from California wanted to strike out the so-called hard site program. Mind you how irresponsible this is—$857 million. He said he is going to save $857 million. There is only $140 million in the bill, but he wants to strike out $857 million.

Mr. LEGGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I will after I get to the next one.

There is something that has added to the irresponsibility. In the ULMS program, the so-called Trident program, he wants to strike out $700 million when there is only $554 million in it.

Now, certainly, I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a point of personal privilege?

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not know where the personal privilege comes in, but I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) has control of the time.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from New York would yield to me to clarify the record at this point.

Mr. STRATTON. I would decline to yield to the gentleman until the gentleman from Louisiana has concluded his statement.

Mr. LEGGETT. Will the gentleman from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. STRATTON. I have control of the time.

Mr. HÉBERT. This is a further demonstration of the futility of trying to legislate in this manner.

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

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

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York in his opposition to cutting the funds from the Trident and ULMS system.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the proposed ULMS/Trident program. Trident will eventually replace our present Polaris/Poseidon missile firing submarines. Our sea-based deterrent has the best prospects of all strategic offensive systems for long-term survivability and, therefore, for preserving the strategic balance of power and with it peace in the world.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the $926 million authorization for the ULMS/Trident program contained in H.R. 15495 and to reject the proposed amendment, which by cutting funds would severely delay and damage our efforts to preserve the strength and survivability of our sea-based deterrent forces.

While the majority of the Members of this body support the Polaris/Poseidon improvement program, there are some Members who do not support the schedule proposed for ULMS by the administration. They allege that the relative superiority and invulnerability of our existing submarines, sufficiency of existing weapons in destructive capability against the Soviet Union, lack of need for replacement of existing submarines, and the unpredictable nature of the future threats to our systems preclude the necessity of proceeding on the schedule proposed by President Nixon. They also argue that the administration's program increases schedule risk and precludes examination of alternatives.

I am pleased that even many of these Members have expressed their views on the importance of maintaining a highly survivable sea-based strategic deterrent force, for the reasons cited. Their major question seems to be "Why build ULMS submarines now?" rather than "Why ULMS?"

THE BROAD ISSUE

The basic objective of our strategic policy is to preserve the sufficiency of our deterrent, to make nuclear attack unattractive. That sufficiency is placed in serious doubt by Soviet momentum in building up their already powerful strategic forces, particularly their sea-based forces. This momentum promises to be only partially arrested by the recently concluded SALT agreements. I believe it is imperative that this country have a credible and logical means of insuring that the Soviets do not gain a position of nuclear superiority. The Trident program is part of that credible and logical means.

This new system should be capable of either replacing in part or augmenting existing systems and should be least vulnerable to the broadest spectrum of credible future threats to its survivability and operability. I believe that of the great number of options we have, the best action to take now to preserve nuclear sufficiency is an acceleration of the Trident submarine program.

The Trident program provides for a new, longer range Trident I missile which can be used in existing Poseidon submarines as well as a new Trident submarine. It also provides the option for a follow-on larger and even longer range Trident II missile for later use in the Trident submarine.

In the late 1970's the Trident I missile will provide for a great enlargement of the operating area of all of our SSBN's. When sufficient Trident submarines are available in the 1980's to warrant it, deployment of a Trident II missile will permit a further expansion of the operating area of the Trident submarines to a major part of the world's oceans. The effort behind this program is directed toward a system with a high level of survivability throughout the remainder of this century. There is no known or postulated credible antisubmarine warfare threat that is not considerably blunted by a greatly expanded operating area.

Both the Trident I and the potential Trident II missiles will permit cost effective operating of our Trident submarines from the continental United States which can lead to, among other benefits, a major improvement in the command and control of our SSBN's.

The Trident submarines could replace our older SSBN's in the early 1980's—the first 10 start reaching 20 years of age in 1979 and lack adaptability for cost effective retrofit from Polaris to Poseidon and to needed quieting modifications. With a schedule acceleration the Trident submarines can provide an option to augment our strategic forces.

The proposed acceleration of the Trident submarine program would commence design, development and construction of the Trident submarine now rather than waiting another year or two and would provide the first operational Trident submarine in late 1978, approximately 3 years earlier than in the previous development schedule. This acceleration does not compress the overall program into a "crash" basis, but simply provides for commencement, earlier than originally planned, of a logical, orderly phase of the program—that is, the submarine development.

OBSOLESCENCE BY AGE AND TECHNOLOGY

Our present SSBN's were all deployed in the 7-year period between 1960 and 1967. Some are nearly a dozen years old today. At the peak of the Polaris building program 12 submarines appeared in 1 year. These first submarines represented an accelerated effort to attain a sea-based deterrent rapidly. Smaller attack submarines under construction were literally cut in half to allow insertion of a missile compartment to provide for earliest introduction. Subsequent classes improved in quieting, depth capability, and habitability, but the basic ship technology was otherwise not greatly changed.

Because of our lead in nuclear submarines, the U.S. Navy has been able for some years to maintain a position of superiority in sea-based deterrent systems in the absence of an extensive antisubmarine warfare challenge and Soviet accomplishments in that field. The Polaris/Poseidon program has unquestionably been successful. But the oldest Polaris submarines now show the effects of age. From the nature of their continuous operations, with two different crews rotating to keep the submarines on station, wear and tear on SSBN's exceeds that of most other ships. While it may be probable that these SSBN's will provide safe and economic operation for 25 to 30 years, and our maintenance efforts are geared to provide as long a life as possible, such life is not guaranteed. Our oldest SSBN's displayed many problems at the point of their first shipyard overhaul. It should be borne in mind that the specifications in effect at the time these ships were designed assumed a nominal ship life of 20 years.

There are absolute limits as to improvements which can be made in the present ships. Growth potential provides only for modest improvements in quieting, sonar, or missiles. It is not economically realistic to convert the first 10 SSBN's to Poseidon, for example, and introduction of the Trident I missile in the remaining 31 ships would use all of their missile growth potential. Only a few noise reduction improvements are feasible in the existing ships. Significant noise reduction of a nature to assume maintaining a lead against anticipated acoustic technology requires the radically different and quiet propulsion plant planned for the Trident submarines; this cannot be backfitted in existing SSBN's.

In short, the existing Polaris/Poseidon SSBN's do not have an indefinite life, and do not represent current technical capability in areas important to future sea-based strategic forces.

THE STRATEGIC BALANCE—TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

I have noted that some Members have expressed their belief that stable nuclear deterrence requires that neither side gain the ability to inflict considerably greater urban/industrial damage on the other. They cited the existing imbalance with increasing introduction of MIRV and SRAM and U.S. bombers as offsetting the numerical missile superiority of the Soviet land-based missiles. Some have also cited the U.S. Poseidon lead in MIRV, submarine platform superiority, geographical considerations, U.S. ASW superiority, and superior U.S. missile range as factors which tilted the sea-based balance towards the United States until at least 1980 even if the Soviet SSN–X–8 were MIRVed and installed in all Yankee submarines.

First, we know the SSN–X–8 missile has been tested. While we do not know whether this larger missile can be used in a Yankee submarine, the Soviet Union should be able to modify such a platform to carry the missile without greatly reducing the high speed capability of the Yankee, which assists it against antisubmarine warfare threats. Furthermore, the long range would permit a submarine to target the United States from closer to its home waters and permit the Soviets to patrol millions of square miles of ocean area while targeting geographically one-half of the United States. If they desire, they need not, with this mis-

sile, come into waters where we logically can concentrate ASW efforts. As range aspects of the missile are examined, it becomes obvious that any geographical advantages the United States might now hold would shrink.

The Soviet Union, in the same examination, presents a more difficult problem with its greater land mass and surrounding countries, which act as buffers. When equipped with the new missile they need not, if they choose, have long transit periods which decrease the percentage of time when "on target." It is reasonable and logical that it will be employed in new SSBN's and possibly backfitted into older Yankee's. This new missile and other technically feasible programs will give their submarines the capability to strike us from points only a few days from Soviet bases. These developments increase the threat to our land-based strategic forces and increase the reliance we must place on our less vulnerable sea-based strategic deterrent.

Poseidon MIRV does provide the United States with a numerical advantage at perhaps a very opportune time. Successful development and deployment perhaps in itself have caused the Soviets to consider deployment of an effective ABM economically prohibitive and have undoubtedly been instrumental in leading to the recent SALT agreements. At this point, however, it should be acknowledged that in the absence of an ABM, superiority does not necessarily go hand in hand with numbers of warheads when considering relative effectiveness in inflicting urban/industrial damage. The superior numbers and overwhelmingly superior payloads of Soviet land-based missiles create a disparity in damage effectiveness due to the larger warhead yields.

TRIDENT SIZE AND DESIGN STUDIES

It has been said that Trident may be a risk of premature commitment to an ill-advised design and suggestions are made that the Department of Defense and the Congress should conduct an in-depth review of alternative new submarine designs.

The Department of Defense has conducted such a review, and has reviewed other alternatives related to our strategic forces, in its development of the recommended Trident program. At this point, well over 100 design variations have been studied. These include ships with various numbers of missile tubes, various maximum speeds and depths, a number of hull shapes and arrangements, and options for decreasing observables by means of which the submarine might become vulnerable. A number of these candidates have been examined in detail by the Navy, by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and by scientific groups within and without the Navy. The selection of the current design was made by the Secretary of Defense after consideration of the Trident candidates as well as a number of options for modernizing our present SSBN's.

The displacement of the submarine is, to a very large extent, determined by the total missile tube volume since it is necessary for the submarine to support the weight of the tubes with missiles and with an equal weight of water when the missiles have been launched. As the missile volume is decreased, dependence on the advanced technology to achieve the range and payload goals increases, and the technological risk and development cost increases. The size of the proposed Trident design is actually the result of a compromise between these factors.

There is also incorporated in the design a propulsion plant of such power and with improved quieting features to provide reasonable safety and some improvement in assurance of countering threats of the future which might be forecast during the operational life of the Trident submarine.

COST OF TRIDENT

We have all heard reports referring to a $30 billion acquisition expenditure for Trident. However, examination of the cost projections included indicates that these costs provide for a force of 31 Poseidon submarines with Trident I missiles and 30 Trident submarines with the larger Trident II missiles. No commitment has as yet been made to the acquisition of this number of Trident and converted Poseidon submarines. Current projections are for 10 Trident submarines equipped with Trident II missiles in combination with a force of 15 to 16 Poseidon submarines equipped with Trident I missiles. Such a mix would cost approximately $15 billion.

It has also been suggested that a $100 million expenditure by the Soviets for their 42d Yankee submarine is propelling us into a $30 billion expenditure. This is not so. Our very deliberate approach is based more upon the appearance of a new, large, and increasing Soviet SLBM force, in conjunction with an expanding program of technological development or deployment in all fields of strategic systems. Moreover, the $100 million expenditure for a Soviet submarine complete with missiles may not be a valid cost. For example, our costs for a duplicate SSBN-640 class, commissioned in 1967, would be estimated at between $220 to $230 million, without missiles, today.

It should be noted further that even assuming the $100 million cost for the Y-class Soviet SSBN, it is not this cost alone which is of concern. Rather, it is the total cost of Soviet strategic forces—past, present, and projected—including R. & D. and investment, and what this investment represents in developing and deployed systems, that is of concern to us. One opposition group does not note, for example, the disparity in expenditures—favoring the Soviets—between United States and Soviet Union strategic forces which has existed for some time.

MOBILITY

In considering the propulsion power or speed required for Trident, an important factor is the need for mobility—the ability to use the open ocean.

While a long range missile can increase the operating area theoretically available, the area patrolled is limited by the patrol radius; that is, average speed and time on patrol. If the patrol radius is short the submarine is localized almost as effectively as if there were geographical limits on the patrol area. Personnel endurance determines to a large extent the limits to which the patrol time can be extended; therefore, further increases must come from increased speed. The improvements that are needed and planned for Trident cannot be backfitted into the present size SSBN because of the physical limitation of these older hulls. To be survivable the submarine must be free to use the environment to best advantage. This can only be done if mobility has been built into the platform.

SEA-BASED FORCE SURVIVABILITY

The problem of prelaunch survivability has undergone an evolutionary process. It is conceivable that some counteraction would be possible against our SSBN's had the United States continued to rely on its early missile technology. Increasing the range of the submarine launched Polaris missiles, that is, A-1, A-2, A-3, brought about considerable growth in sea room available to our SSBN's. The effect was an extensive dilution of whatever ASW capability the Soviets possess. Since it is axiomatic that detection techniques will continue to improve, and increased effort cannot be dismissed, the United States has continued to develop its technology, both in missiles and in SSBN engineering capabilities. The planned ranges in the Trident I provide more dilution of Soviet ASW and the projected Trident II would provide a vast increase in available operating areas.

Dilution of Soviet ASW effort is not accomplished by increased operating area alone. Improved quieting techniques have been incorporated in each new class employed since the initial deployment of the earliest SSBN's, and some quieting improvements have been backfitted in the earlier classes. However, the significant improved quieting features planned for Trident can only be provided on new design submarines.

The United States is now well into an era in which the advantages of the sea-based deterrent, in terms of long term survivability and the attendant stabilizing effect which accrues therefrom is generally accepted. However, we must recognize that the Soviets will continue to place major effort on trying to neutralize or counter our sea-based deterrent.

The Soviets continue to improve and expand their antisubmarine capability. They are building improved nuclear attack submarines—one of their best ASW weapons. Also, we know the Soviets are attempting to establish an area antisubmarine surveillance system. This is presumably aimed at locating our Polaris/Poseidon submarines. While we know of no definite threat to our existing Polaris/Poseidon submarine, the Soviets have made great strides in naval capability which may, in the future, pose a threat to these submarines. Development of such systems as the Moskva class helicopter equipped ASW ships, submarine and surface ship sonars, and improvements in their naval air arm indicate increasing

efforts in all aspects of ASW technology.

While we are not able to predict the exact form of future ASW threat, there is a limit to the number of possible observables, and the physical laws which govern them are fairly well known. Our ability to make improvements in existing ships is limited by the space available and the cost to completely redo some features of these ships to incorporate design changes. Continued research in programs such as SSBN defense identify the areas which offer the greatest potential for exploitation and conversely the areas requiring attention to insure that the detectability of the submarine is minimized. Significant reductions in observables, however, will be needed for survivability as processing and sensor technology advances.

The increased SLBM ranges and the engineering improvements have both contributed significantly to the long-term survivability of the U.S. sea-based deterrent. The Soviets have recognized this by their extensive Yankee SSBN building programs which now include 25 in operation with work underway on the 42d ship of this class. Although the SALT agreements limit the Soviets to 62 modern ballistic missile submarines their present construction rate could allow them to reach that limit by 1975 and thereby provide them with a substantial lead over the United States by that time.

SOVIET ACTION ASSESSMENTS

The case for Poseidon with its MIRV capability was made on the basis of a Soviet ABM threat. The fact that the threat has not developed does not mean that MIRV was not necessary. Rather the MIRV development made evident the enormous problem which would confront even an extensive ABM deployment. In a similar way, improvements in missile capability and in SSBN platform performance would demonstrate the massive effort required to achieve a significant degree of ASW effectiveness.

The implication is clear. Technological improvements to our sea-based deterrent forces could serve to forestall the Soviet threat. The administration's proposed Trident program supports this pattern of forestalling the threat.

The combination of providing the Trident submarine with a very large patrol area, coupled with a quieter submarine with characteristics which provide a higher measure of survivability, can place the ASW counter to Trident in a category which is economically prohibitive. Such a condition of survivability is stabilizing in that a counter is not invited.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TIME

It is extremely important that this country have at a reasonably early date a credible and logical means of moving forward with effective measures to preserve its deterrent sufficiency in light of the following facts:

Soviet land-based ICBM's outnumber ours by nearly 500.

Soviet strategic momentum includes programs for new or modified missiles and solid propellant missiles.

Soviets already have greater payload, megatonnage, and equivalent megatonnage in their strategic missile forces.

Soviets have developed a new sea-based missile which is larger than our Poseidon and with a greater range capability.

Soviets are rapidly closing the technology gap in antisubmarine warfare.

Minor imbalance is not the concern. What is of concern is the fact that a crossover point to a major imbalance could occur in the mid-1970's.

OTHER IMPORTANT FACTORS

Five to seven years to design, develop and deploy new SSBN in an orderly manner.

With a building rate of three ships per year, it would be the end of 1981 before 10 Trident submarines would be operational.

Cannot regain lost leadtime if we fail to make a positive decision now and find ourselves in an even greater dilemma later.

Important to quickly reduce the leadtime required to exercise an option for deployment.

Delivery dates can be modified in future years as needed, including the initial delivery date.

SALT AGREEMENTS

Acceleration of the Trident program in no way conflicts with the recently signed Strategic Arms Limitation Agreements with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the controlled modernization of our strategic deterrent forces is essential if we are to make further progress in the next round of strategic arms talks with the Russians. The Trident program is the keystone to such modernization, and as such deserves full support.

SUMMARY

In essence, it all boils down to a simple matter: Should this Nation, in light of the strategic reality today, proceed with development of the next generation strategic missile system now, thereby providing for continued effectiveness of our deterrent forces for the future, or should it follow a "wait and see" approach, postponing such a decision to some indefinite time in the future? This year the Nixon administration has deemed it absolutely essential to make the "hard decision" on Trident. I submit that the Trident acceleration is a carefully considered, well developed program which is essential at this time, and I urge my colleagues to support the full authorization for an accelerated program.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we have a clerical error on this amendment. I think it is an important amendment and one that should not have a clerical error involved in it. Unfortunately my staff work was rather hurried this morning, and we do have a difficult time getting minority staff assistance on the committee since we really have a bipartisan-type committee. But in my amendment, the first part of the amendment, I would ask unanimous consent that the figures be revised not to show the $800 million-plus reduction, but to show only a $140 million reduction.

And the second item, where we ask for a reduction of $700 million, I would reiterate that while $555 million appears in the bill under the ULMS R.D.T. & E. for the ULMS, which were reported to our committee, that were requested, that are not included in other procurement, they must be in the R.D.T. & E. Therefore my amendment is in good form so that the $700 million-plus and the $840 million can be effectively stricken from the bill under my unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from California is entirely wrong when he says that there is an amount for R.D.T. & E.

Mr. LEGGETT. As I understand the additions, it has advance procurement of some $300 million-plus for submarines.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. They are not R.D.T. & E. funds.

Mr. LEGGETT. As I understand, these are R.D.T. & E. funds and I would challenge the gentleman from Illinois on that because I have discussed this with counsel for the committee.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. They are procurement funds.

Mr. LEGGETT. I have been advised that these are not procurement funds; these are for R.D.T. & E. for the advanced submarine.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I would suggest that the gentleman check his addition with the same people who gave him the original figures.

Mr. LEGGETT. The addition was done by my personal staff but the other advice was given by the committee staff.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON: On page 3, line 7, delete "$1,997,332,000" and substitute "$1,937,332,300".

And on page 3, lines 10 and 11, delete "$2,661,533,250" and substitute "$2,641,533,250".

And on page 3, line 14, delete "$3,168,940,150" and substitute "$3,138,940,150".

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the ink is hardly dry on what I think has to be historically the most important achievement of the Nixon administration, and one that I support without reservation and one which I think will be

judged as a significant turning point in this country's foreign relations since the end of World War II. I am referring to the SALT agreements.

Yet the Secretary of Defense appeared before the various congressional committees and asked us to take it upon ourselves to commit ourselves, before we even acted on this year's spending proposals, to spend something in the vicinity of $1.3 billion toward an additional weapons system or the acceleration of existing systems to insure the superiority of our current capacity and bargaining position with respect to Russia.

My point in coming here this afternoon is not to attempt in any way to argue about the merits of any one of the systems that have been benefited by the increment provided in this bill.

I am, however, asking that the $110 million, which is the total requested by the administration through the Secretary of Defense, immediately after the SALT agreement, be struck from the bill at this time. I make the request really to enable us to demonstrate to an increasingly skeptical world and to demonstrate to an increasingly skeptical population in this country that we have a degree of trust and confidence in the agreements reached in Moscow.

I do not think our experience in Southeast Asia has won us a continuation of that trust and confidence.

I think it is a serious disservice both to the present generation of this country and to the world as a whole to show such a lack of confidence in the agreement that we rush—thoughtlessly—to spend money on alternate systems.

I ask that we strike from the bill those moneys which were asked for after the SALT talks were completed and that we give the agreements a period of time in which to settle and in that way attempt to build a system of mutual confidence and trust, and that we demonstrate a degree of patience and I suppose restraint when it comes to appropriating any more funds.

I sat through most of the committee hearings on this bill listening to $2 billion plus being sought for procurement appropriations and I got the distinct impression from administration witnesses such as John Foster and the Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird and others that they were satisfied that the money they were asking previous to the SALT agreement was a sufficient deterrent to meet any challenge that we had in the fiscal year ahead.

I see no reason, frankly, in view of the fact that we negotiated the first step toward arms control to feel less than satisfied with the earlier assessment by the administration.

I think it would be tragic, and certainly shortsighted, with the very brief time that has elapsed since the agreement to develop an accelerated arms activity which could lead very much to the breakdown of the very purpose of this agreement.

Last but not least, let me address myself to the bewildered taxpayer that we are all going to be confronted by in November of this year, who I think by the President's own remarks has been given a sense of expectation that somehow he might be paying less rather than more for his defense bill.

The illogic of suggesting at this point in time that, as a result of arms limitation, the taxpayer may somehow expect to have a higher defense bill in the immediate future defies my ability to provide an adequate explanation.

I criticize the frame of mind which wants to continue unabated a policy and attitude which I think has had a profound negative effect on this country for the last generation. We are once again being asked to forgo giving full support to the agreement which has for its purpose to determine whether or not we can trust the Russians, or perhaps as the Soviets view it—they can trust us—before we start on the next phase of arming ourselves to the point where we will have lost even the momentary benefits of this agreement.

Let me speak now to the specific items which have been increased.

This amendment would cut the $20-million add-on for the submarine-launched cruise missile—SLCM. The Pentagon's request represents the so-called bargaining chip approach run wild. This system, originally abandoned many years ago, is far inferior to our present Polaris/Poseidon submarines. It is conceived as a means to stress Soviet air defenses, but since the effectiveness of the Polaris/Poseidon system has been guaranteed by SALT limits on ABM, this costly program is unneeded.

I would also cut the $60 million of additional funds for site defense research and development. This new ABM system will be very costly to develop and, because of the ABM treaty, could be deployed only at one ICBM site protecting a small portion of our deterrent. When the Soviets acquire MIRV, as Secretary Laird predicts they will in 18 to 24 months, such a site defense system could be easily overcome by 10 to 20 SS-9's. In any case, it should be obvious that the SALT agreements have not made it necessary to accelerate spending on ABM technology. In cutting $60 million from site defense there would still be $80 million left to continue research.

The purpose of the extra $20 million requested by the Pentagon to develop improved reentry vehicles for ICBM's is somewhat baffling. It could involve work toward either improved missile accuracy or better ABM penetration. The President, however, has banned developments toward improved accuracy, and the limit on ABM makes additional improved penetration systems less needed than before SALT. There is no logical reason to support these funds.

There is an additional $10 million for command, control, and communications that my amendment would cut. I see nothing in the SALT accords that increases the demands placed on our command, control, and communications facilities and, therefore, there is no reason for the Pentagon to try to wring still more funds out of Congress for these purposes as a result of SALT.

The cuts I propose are small and will not in any way jeopardize the bargaining position of the United States in SALT II. These cuts do not impair our security, as the programs involved are already funded at a high level and are, in some cases, ineffective and wasteful. The Armed Services Committee has not given them the scrutiny they deserve. And, it may be noted, there is no printed record of the committee's brief examination of the Pentagon's SALT add-ons available so that other Members of Congress may try to acquaint themselves with the details.

I would hope that my colleagues will support this small but symbolically important effort to show that the Congress will not tolerate use of the vital SALT agreements as an excuse for more military spending.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes to the very heart of the SALT agreements, and the hoped-for follow-on agreements.

It would cut $110 million from R. & D. to maintain our technological lead in the field of nuclear armaments.

I think that any objective analysis of the recent treaty and the executive agreement signed by the President leads to the conclusion that the United States was exceedingly generous in the agreements and in the treaty. The Soviets, by the agreements, are permitted 1,618 ICBM's. We are permitted 1,054.

In the field of submarine missiles the Soviets are permitted 740 missiles. We are limited to 656 with the agreement of course, for substitution.

It is true that the United States has more warheads, but the Soviets have a 2-to-1 advantage in megatons. The Soviets thus have numerical superiority, while we are left with our technological lead which, by the best estimate, appears to be 2 years. I think that the treaty and the interim agreement are in the interest of the ultimate security of the United States and of world peace, particularly when you consider the ongoing of the Soviets that would have given the Soviets superiority within the 5-year term of the agreement. We do not have such programs in being.

I agree with the President: No one lost and no one gained in the treaty and in the agreement, but future generations will rue the day, I say, Mr. Chairman, that the administration entered into the agreements and this body ratified the agreements, if we do not maintain our technological superiority. If we do not continue our technological advancement, the interim agreement will be the vehicle through which the Soviet Union will be permitted to attain strategic superiority.

I also agree with Secretary Laird that if we are not determined to maintain our technological lead, the frozen-in supremacy of the Soviets in numbers should call for the scrapping of the agreement and of the treaty.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has been generous in the interim agreement limiting offensive weapons. Now is the time to be strong with this body expressing a determination to maintain our technological lead. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

At the request of the Department of Defense the committee made reductions totaling $692.4 million in the authorization bill based on the initial SALT agreements. These reductions are partially offset by an additional $110 million in research and development.

The net reduction of $582.4 million is arrived at by reducing Army missiles procurement by $265 million; by reducing the Army R. & D. effort related to Safeguard by $34 million; and by reducing military construction for Safeguard by $393.4 million.

I think it is important that the committee understand the reason that this $110 million which the gentleman from Massachusetts seeks to strike from the bill is in the bill. It is definitely a result of the negotiations at Moscow in connection with the SALT agreement. Both sides understand the situation. Both sides understand that there are certain defense measures and programs that they are developing, and that they think at the present time, and until further understandings are reached in the future, are necessary to continue. The $110 million was definitely requested by the administration.

The reason for it: The SALT agreement itself limits the quantity of our strategic missile system. It will be necessary to improve the quality of this system, and this is vice versa with both sides. To accomplish this objective, the Secretary of Defense requested add-on totaling the $110 million in research and development. These add-ons are for this purpose: $60 million for Minuteman site defense to improve the radars in the Minuteman field. The objective is to develop a radar which is both reliable and less expensive than the Safeguard radars.

Another add-on was $20 million for submarine-launched cruise missiles. This is an area where we have no capability whereas the Russians have considerable capability. Also the cruise missiles are not limited under the SALT agreement.

Another add-on was to improve the accuracy and penetration capability of our reentry vehicles for our ICBM's and Poseidon missiles, $20 million.

The last increase is for $10 million to improve the reliability and capability of our Communications Command and Control Network related to our strategic systems.

The SALT agreement is supported by the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis that additional effort will be made in research and development on these systems or programs mentioned.

It is a vice versa situation. The other side is doing the same thing in areas comparable to these. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

I would like to state that again the question is whether or not we abide by the spirit of the SALT agreements or whether or not we accelerate under the SALT umbrella. I think that is essentially the issue.

There have been some statements made that we are going to exceed the Soviets under the agreement in warheads, but not megatonnage. I asked Dr. Foster about this, and his answer appears on page 22443 in the RECORD of June 26, 1972.

By the end of this year, the Soviets will have 2,600 warheads as opposed to 5,600 warheads of the United States. In megatonnage we will have 4.6 million versus 4 million megatons for the Soviet Union. So by the end of this year, with the agreement we will still exceed the Soviet Union in megatonnage and will have a 2 to 1 warhead capability superiority over them.

I think I can best use the balance of my time in reading some remarks I had inserted in the RECORD yesterday, by the columnist Art Hoppe:

THE GREAT ROCK RACE

(By Art Hoppe)

June 25, 1984—As church bells chimed and people throughout the world danced in the streets, the United Nations today realized an age-old dream of mankind by ratifying a Universal Disarmament Pact.

Under terms of the widely hailed treaty, all Nations agreed to destroy immediately every single weapon in their arsenals—from missiles to billy clubs, from jet bombers to bows and arrows.

"At last man now enters a golden age of permanent peace," a jubilant President told the U.S. people in a nationwide telecast. "At last we can divert our $200 billion defense budget to better the lot of every American. For man will war no more. "After all," he said with a smile, "The only thing man can now hurl at his brother is a handy rock."

June 26, 1984—Defense Secretary Melvin Ludd appeared before a joint Congressional committee today to ask for $1.5 billion research funds to develop a "prototype rock."

Ludd pointed out that rocks, being indigenous to every nation's environment, were not banned by the treaty. "We can be sure," and the Chinese are secretly at work on an advanced rock that could make America a second-rate power."

April 8, 1985—The Army today unveiled its new M–16 anti-personnel rock designed to fragment on impact.

Developed at a cost of $43.6 billion, it will replace the now-obsolete 125-pound M–15 rock, which failed in extensive tests to get off the ground. Some of the obsolete M–15s will be mothballed for emergencies, the Army said, while the remainder will be sold to "our friendly neighbors in Latin America" for 3 cents on the dollar.

The Army purchased one million of the new H–16 rocks for $1.39 each. The rest of the $43.6 billion went for new M–16 mobile rock haulers with white sidewall tires, new individual M–16 rock carriers with chromium handles.

November 3, 1985—Secretary Ludd asked Congress today for $64.5 million to develop an Anti-Rock Rock, (ARR) plus another $82.7 billion to construct an Anti-Rock Early Defense Line (ARED).

He cited CIA reports that the Chinese were working on an Inter-Continental Ballistic Rock launched by a giant Chinese firecracker.

He said the proposed ARED, a mile-high net along the Canadian border, would intercept most Chinese ICBR's, while the new ARRs, sent aloft by mile-long rubber bands, would shoot down the rest.

November 7, 1985—A worried President today signed the Universal Draft Law requiring all Americans over age five to work on the Nation's rockpiles.

"Our freedom will never be secure," he said, "until we have the world's largest rockpile stockpile."

July 4, 1986—The people of the world, fed up with working day and night on their national rockpile stockpiles, revolted today.

Chanting the stirring slogan, "We need rocks like holes in our heads," they marched on the U.N. and demanded an entirely new treaty. This one banned not weapons, but all Generals in general and all Defense Secretaries in particular.

And so church bells are chiming and people throughout the world are dancing in the streets tonight—confident that they have at last found the key to a golden age of permanent peace.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that we have completely burlesqued the SALT agreements out of all proportion by having the Secretary of Defense come to Congress and ask for acceleration of the items the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is now trying to strike out with this amendment. They are totally unwise. The White House apparently concurred, in mildly censuring the Department of Defense, and I hope all here will join those of us who are going to be supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have been listening now for about 40 minutes to a discussion in regard to the merits of whether we will or whether we will not remove from this authorization $110 million earmarked for research and development.

The red herring has been thrown out that this will in many ways usurp or obstruct the present SALT talks.

Nothing is further from the truth than the fact that this would stop or usurp or in any way damage the SALT talks.

The same gentlemen who have been up here making all the remarks and trying to strike down this defense project, which is a matter of finding a better way of defending our country, are the same gentlemen who have steadfastly defended 50,000 grants to 69 universities which are studying the ecology of the blackbird and the sweat glands of the Gibraltar ape.

What a strange coincidence we have in this House today.

The only thing this committee seeks to do in the propagation of this bill is to support the way of life of the American people, to obtain better ways of defense, to make sure that everything we stand for and want can be perpetuated, and preserved for our Nation.

It is a matter of research and development on those items which are not affected by the direct talks in Moscow.

Do not be lulled to sleep by the so-called SALT talks. The Russians have not changed their ideology. They still maintain their same belief that they will some day rule the world.

It behooves you and me, as members of this committee, to stand fast and to find out bigger and better ways that we may combat the ways they have, by better research and development.

That is exactly what this $110 million will do, which my friend from Massachusetts seeks to destroy.

The other gentleman from California who so eloquently read his remarks from the RECORD, I believe must have run out of gas today. Someone made the remark awhile ago, "When does he stop?" I said, "He will stop when he comes to the point

where he has nothing more to project, and then he will start reading from the RECORD."

This goes on every year when this bill comes up, but I never hear this gentleman read one word into that RECORD which would strike any portion of the appropriation or the authorization for a submarine building base at Vallejo, Calif.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield back the balance of my time. Let us get on with the bill. We have other work to do. Let us get on with it.

Let us vote down this amendment without any equivocation.

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

Mr. Chairman, apparently the gentleman from California does not read the paper very carefully, because if he did he would find out how completely out of tune he is with what the thinking of the American people happens to be at this particular time.

I am not a great one to believe in polls, but I was rather attracted this morning by the Harris poll, just made, relative to the President's summit trip. I believe this reflects exactly what is going on in this country today as to the thinking of the American people:

By a massive 82 to 11 percent the American people viewed with approval President Nixon's summit trip to the Soviet Union, and by an almost identical 80 to 12 percent margin, the public gives its stamp of approval on the agreement to limit the manufacture of nuclear defensive (ABM) missiles.

In fact, all of the agreements reached at the summit meetings in Moscow receive at least 80 percent or better endorsement from the American people in a special Harris Survey among 1,401 households conducted June 7–12.

I would simply say that while we do not have to believe every poll, to be completely and wholly accurate, this is a clear indication of the thinking of the American people today.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. I agree with you. It is completely accurate; 80 percent of the American people certainly support the President in going over to Moscow and making these agreements, and I hope 80 percent of the Congress will ratify the agreement. But I also think 80 percent of the American people will expect, as a result of this agreement, that we will be making some kind of reduction in defense expenditures and will not be accelerating under the SALT umbrella. That is exactly what the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) does. It applauds the President for what he has done and says, let us not do anything inconsistent therewith.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to vote down overwhelmingly the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 301. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, and ending June 30, 1973, each component of the Armed Forces is authorized a maximum end strength for active duty personnel as follows:

(1) The Army, 841,190;
(2) The Navy, 601,672;
(3) The Marine Corps, 197,965;
(4) The Air Force, 717,210;

except when the President of the United States determines that the application of these ceilings will seriously jeopardize the national security interests of the United States and informs the Congress of the basis for such determination.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this title 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON: On page 4, line 6, strike "841,190" and insert "794,167".

On page 4, line 7, strike "601,672" and insert "526,524".

On page 4, line 8, strike "197,965" and insert "187,242".

On page 4, line 9, strike "717,210" and insert "535,458".

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I suppose borne by the success by my efforts today I should make this briefer than 5 minutes, but let me, if I can, have one more go at it.

I read with interest the speech given in the late fall of last year by the chairman on the Senate Committee on Armed Services, JOHN STENNIS, certainly no apostate of doing without a strong military effort. He pleaded the same philosophy that characterized his December speech when in January or February of this year he raised two serious questions about whether or not spending between 55 and 60 percent of our total annual military effort for both active and retired personnel does not mean that we are pricing ourselves out of the market on adequate defense.

I had at the same time some comments made to me by the head of the Selective Service System, Mr. Tarr, last year in testifying before my committee where he had some serious reservations as to whether we could sustain a purely volunteer army, which would exceed 2 million people.

This amendment of mine to lower troop strength levels aims at those concerns. It does not have any magic attached to the numbers in it, but it is just raising for the Congress and the public again the question as to whether or not we need 2.3 million-plus men in 3,000 locations.

I want to say that I read in the Washington Post today an article about one of our adversaries, the Premier of North Korea, suggesting that it might be desirable to begin a bilateral reduction of our men and theirs. If this man can make such a suggestion, I wonder at our inability to even raise the question of lowering our force levels.

I think the time has come as the Senate majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD) has indicated to reexamine the basis of some of our troop presences in various parts of the world; and I would certainly cite as an example of this the presence of 300,000-plus men in Western Europe more than a quarter century after the conclusion of World War II. I would also cite the numbers game being played on the American public in Southeast Asia where the last troop withdrawal there consisted of only 6,600 men many of whom were transferred to Thailand, Guam, or onto the large number of ships off the coast of Southeast Asia, creating in effect an additional 150,000 to 175,000 U.S. military personnel in Southeast Asia. And than I look at the number of other foreign policy obligations inherited from our efforts during the Dulles era which seem to have persisted into the sixties and even into the seventies and on these outmoded commitments make me wonder whether on talking about weapons systems as we did in the early part of this bill or in talking about the Active Force level contained in this bill this body should not begin to reexamine whether an adequate defense costs 60 percent of our money in terms of troop personnel floating all over the world, and whether in fact an analysis of this would not result in an effective decrease in troop strength levels.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect this amendment will pass, but I would hope that the Congress and this country and the Armed Services Committee would do something more than simply OK the DOD's manpower ceiling without examining the rationale for that level.

My amendment cuts our troop strength levels to 2,043,391,000 men. I offer this amendment for a variety of reasons which I should like now to explain.

Our ratio of support to combat troops is the largest in the world.

Our standing Army is one of the largest in the world.

Our costs are the highest in the world.

How can we cut this unwieldly and unnecessary size?

Obviously we cannot cut the core strength of the Armed Forces.

This core strength consists of the following numbers of personnel:

Service	Number in major mission and support	Number in combat skills
Army	461,064	208,784
Navy	282,556	66,130
Marine Corps	107,131	55,549
Air Force	232,643	36,351
Total	1,083,394	366,814

According to the Department of Defense, these figures include trainees, transient, and so forth.

Out of the remainder, I am proposing to cut out the personnel included in what DoD calls "productivity factors" and what is in reality planned personnel excess. These personnel do not contribute to combat effectiveness, provide no support for combat forces, and are not even on leave, liberty, sick, taking care of personal functions or included in other necessary manpower losses.

The noncore personnel amount to the following—and these are the numbers I am proposing to cut:

In the Army: 47,023.
In the Navy: 75,148.
In the Marine Corps: 10,723.
In the Air Force: 181,752.

Over the past few years, the armed services have developed very elaborate and exact personnel accounting systems. For this they are to be commended. They now know the exact amount of time it takes to perform the functions of the armed services. They know how much personnel time is consumed in performing personal functions such as eating, taking care of paperwork and other personal matters. They know how much time is lost due to personnel in transit, sick, injured, AWOL, and in confinement. All of these legitimate factors are added together to make up a large part of the personnel authorization request which is included in this bill.

The legitimate personnel authorization for the armed services is:

For the Army: 822,909.
For the Navy: 526,036.
For the Marine Corps: 187,668.
For the Air Force: 545,258.

These were not the levels requested. There was another factor added in. The Department of Defense calls it a "productivity factor." What this means is, when experience and the personnel accounting systems show that 100 man hours are required to do a job, 111 to 140 man-hours will be allotted to it depending on the service. In other words, 111 to 140 people will be assigned to do the job of 100.

To put it more concretely, it takes 94 men to maintain a squadron of 12 F–4's. Additional men are added to allow for personal functions, sickness, leave, and so on. Then, an additional 10 to 38 people are added for the productivity factor. Unfortunately, there is only work space for 94. The others, if they try to work on the aircraft only get in the way.

Therefore, they do nothing which contributes to national security. There is nothing they can do. They can only get bored, frustrated, disillusioned, and in trouble. In Vietnam they might get stoned on marihuana.

This is one reason why the U.S. Air Force had 132 men per aircraft while the Israeli Air Force, with similar equipment and an enviable combat record, has but 23.

This is one reason why personnel costs are by far the largest portion of our defense budget.

This is one reason why Lt. Gen. George L. Forsythe, Special Assistant for the Modern Volunteer Army, noted this March:

> According to Opinion Research, 88 percent of enlistment candidates list interesting and challenging work as the most important aspect of a job, and less than one-half believe the Army offers such work.

If this amendment is accepted, we can have a leaner, tougher, better equipped armed force with higher morale and at less cost to the taxpayers. Not one person who contributed to national security will be cut. Not one unit will be cut. Not one fighting man will be cut. Not one program will be cut. All that will be cut is waste, and we cannot afford not to cut every element of waste in anything as vital as our national defense.

Last year the House voted to extend the draft for 2 years and implicit in that vote was the idea that a volunteer army would be established in July 1973. The current troop strength level is a rationalization for extending the draft those additional 2 years. If we lower the troop levels there will be no more need for a draft. In addition, even with the artificially high troop levels in this year's bill, the Defense Department is still having difficulty in making sense of the draft.

In order to be able to draft 25,800 people in fiscal year 1972, the armed forces have had to do a lot of work.

In order to draft 25,800 people, they have had to release over 140,000 military personnel before their service was up.

In order to draft 25,800 people, they have had to deny reenlistments to many who, in good faith, have planned to pursue a military career. They have juggled the mental, educational and physical standards in order to deny formerly qualified volunteers the chance to enter the armed forces. They are still liable to be drafted, though.

I will not offer an amendment today to end the draft only because such an amendment is not germane to this bill. It is logically and morally germane but the rules of the House are such that logic often does not prevail.

However, if the amendment before you does pass and we do reduce our troop levels to the 2,043,000,000 men, I am suggesting we will not need a draft and the DOD will no longer be able to maintain the draft.

The question of our troop level strength is one which the Congress should face more often. It is one which should be discussed fully in the committee, rather than the nodding acquiescence which has characterized the committee's acceptance of the Defense Department's request in this and other areas. It is a question which embodies the entire discussion of national priorities and foreign policy. The $3.5 billion which could be saved by passing this amendment could create a comprehensive day-care system, or a catastrophic health insurance program. It could allow the mentally retarded and mentally ill in State institutions to be covered by medicaid, and leave $2.5 billion to help control drugs or revitalize our cities. The list could go on forever.

Let us act today to make our Army stronger, better and yes, indeed, smaller. Let us use these funds for the urgent domestic problems we are facing. We require a good defense. We do not need an unwieldly and grossly inflated defense system which denies us a decent life in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—RESERVE FORCES

SEC. 401. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, and ending June 30, 1973, the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces will be programed to attain an average strength of not less than the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 402,333;
(2) The Army Reserve, 261,300;
(3) The Naval Reserve, 129,000;
(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 45,016;
(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 87,614;
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 51,296;
(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 11,800.

SEC. 402. The average strength prescribed by section 401 of this title for the Selected Reserve of any Reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such Reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to title IV? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. (a) Military construction for the Safeguard antiballistic missile system is authorized for the Department of the Army as follows:

Grand Forks Safeguard site, North Dakota, military family housing, 218 units, $6,000,000.

(b) Section 403(a) of Public Law 92–156 (85 Stat. 423, 426) is hereby repealed.

(c) Authorization contained in this section shall be subject to the authorizations and limitations of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1973, in the same manner as if such authorizations had been included in that Act.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: Page 6, lines 3 and 4, strike out lines 3 and 4 and re-letter the following paragraph accordingly.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, it will please the membership to know that this is the last amendment I am going to offer today, and it may please them even more that I am not going to ask for a record vote on this amendment.

The point I want to make, however, is how very silly we have gotten with our ABM system money.

What these particular two lines in this bill do is to repeal a law which this Congress passed last year. The law that this Congress passed last year said that we are not going to build an ABM site to defend Washington, D.C. That is what the Congress said.

So we agreed that we were going to build one at Grand Forks and one at Malmstrom and one somewhere else and one somewhere else. But we were not going to build one at Washington, D.C.

The reason we are not going to build one at Washington, D.C., was because the whole theory of our ABM system was to protect our deterrent force—that is, our missiles. We were going to defend our missiles. This is how the ABM got sold to the American people.

Well, what happened? They went over to SALT and made an agreement. The only reason we are building this ABM site or talking about building this ABM site in Washington, D.C., is because it is the only site that the Russians will let us build. This is not the ABM site that we wanted. This is the ABM site that the Russians said we could build. They said we could build this site because they already had one, and I expect theirs is not going to work very well, and they know it is not, so they do not mind very much if we have one too, to defend Washington, D.C.

This is not a site which defends any missiles. This is not a site which defends the President because the President is not here better than half the time. It might defend the politicians.

But to those of you who think it is going to protect or provide some protection for you, I just suggest that this is going to be a pretty sporty course, this ABM system. Because they say they are not sure how they are going to design it yet. But they are going to design it to defend against the Cruise missiles. The Cruise missiles are going to come in at about 300 feet off the ground and we are going to knock them down with nuclear weapons. That is the system we are talking about.

We are going to use the Sprint missile to shoot down the Cruise missiles which are cruising 300 feet off the ground.

If I were a Russian, I would lob some decoys in there and let America blow itself up. Because this is about the amount of sense there is in using an ABM site in Washington, D.C., to fire Sprint missiles against low flying Cruise missiles.

I think that we ought to stick with the language of the law as it exists today which just says that we are not even going to try to build this ABM system to defend the politicians. If we cannot defend the people back home, let us not pretend that we can defend Washington, D.C., particularly by firing nuclear weapons at incoming missiles that are flying 300 feet above the ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PIKE) there were—ayes 37, noes 54.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. PIKE, HUNT, LEGGETT, and FISHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 128, noes 261, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—128

Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Calif.
Annunzio
Aspin
Badillo
Barrett
Begich
Bergland
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Burke, Mass.
Burton
Carey, N.Y.
Carney
Celler
Chisholm
Clay
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Culver
Daniels, N.J.
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Drinan
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frenzel
Gaydos
Giaimo
Gibbons
Grasso
Green, Pa.
Gross
Gude
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks, Wash.
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Koch
Kyros
Leggett
Link
Long, Md.
Lujan
McCloskey
McCormack
Macdonald, Mass.
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mikva
Mink
Mitchell
Moorhead
Nedzi
Obey
O'Neill
Pike
Podell
Pucinski
Quie
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Seiberling
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stanton, James V.
Stokes
Sullivan
Symington
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waldie
Whalen
Widnall
Wolff
Yates
Yatron

NOES—261

Abbitt
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Baker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Blackburn
Bow
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Cabell
Camp
Carlson
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conable
Conover
Conte
Coughlin
Crane
Curlin
Daniel, Va.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Forsythe
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gettys
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Gubser
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hillis
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kazen
Keating
Keith
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lent
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McClure
McCollister
McCulloch
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKevitt
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallary
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Melcher
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Mills, Md.
Minish
Minshall
Mizell
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Konski
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Roe
Rogers
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Ruth
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schmitz
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Wampler
Ware
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—43

Abernethy
Abourezk
Anderson, Tenn.
Baring
Blanton
Boggs
Broomfield
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Caffery
Clark
Collins, Ill.
Davis, S.C.
Dent
Dickinson
Dowdy
Erlenborn
Esch
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagan
Haley
Holifield
Kee
Kyl
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McKinney
Mann
Mollohan
Mosher
Moss
O'Hara
Runnels
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Smith, Calif.
Terry

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. (a) Subsection (a)(1) of section 401 of Public Law 89–367 approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Not to exceed $2,500,000,000 of the funds authorized for appropriation for use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes to support: (A) Vietnamese and other free world forces in support of Vietnamese forces, (B) local forces in Laos; and for related costs, during the fiscal year 1973 on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine. None of the funds appropriated to or for use of the Armed Forces of the United States may be used for the purpose of paying any overseas allowance, per diem allowance, or any other addition to the regular base pay of any person serving with the free world forces in South Vietnam if the amount of such payment would be greater than the amount of special pay authorized to be paid, for an equivalent period of service, to members of the Armed Forces of the United States (under section 310 of title 37, United States Code) serving in Vietnam or in any other hostile fire area, except for continuation of payments of such additions to regular base pay provided in agreements executed prior to July 1, 1970. Nothing in clause (A) of the first sentence of this paragraph shall be construed as authorizing the use of any such funds to support Vietnamese or other free world forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the Government of Cambodia or Laos: *Provided*, That nothing contained in his section shall be construed to prohibit support of actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of the United States Forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war."

(b) Effective April 1, 1972, (1) subsection (a)(1) of section 401 of Public Law 89–367, approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), as amended by section 501 of Public Law 92–156 (85 Stat. 427), is hereby amended by deleting "$2,500,000,000" and inserting "$2,700,000,000" in lieu thereof and (2) section 738(a) of Public Law 92–204 (85 Stat. 716, 734) is amended by deleting "$2,500,000,000" and inserting "$2,700,000,000" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 602. No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this Act or any other Act for the Department of Defense or any of the Armed Forces may be used at any institution of higher learning if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are being barred by the policy of such institution from the premises of the institution or if that institution of higher learning is observing a policy which directed the disestablishment of Reserve Officer Training Corps units at the institution despite the continuing desire of the Armed Forces to continue such training at the institution; except in a case where the Secretary of the service concerned certifies to the Congress in writing that a specific course of instruction is not available at any other institution of higher learning and furnishes to the Congress the reasons why such course of instruction is of vital importance to the security of the United States.

The prohibition made by this section as it applies to research and development funds shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that the expenditure is a continuation or a renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the defense effort.

The Secretaries of the military departments shall furnish to the Secretary of Defense or his designee within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 31 and June 30 thereafter the names of any institution of higher learning which the Secretaries determine on such dates are affected by the prohibitions contained in this section.

SEC. 603. Subsection (d) of section 412 of Public Law 86–149, as added by section 509 of Public Law 91–441 (84 Stat. 913), is amended to read as follows:

"(d)(1) Beginning with the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1972, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the Congress shall authorize the maximum end strength as of the end of each fiscal year for active duty personnel for each component of the Armed Forces; and no funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year beginning on or after such date to or for the use of the active duty personnel of any component of the Armed Forces unless the maximum end strength for active duty personnel of such component for such fiscal year has been authorized by law.

"(2) Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the President shall submit to the Congress a written report not later than January 31 of each fiscal year and shall include in such report justification for the strength levels recommended and an explanation of the relationship between the personnel strength levels recommended for such fiscal year and the national security policies of the United States in effect at the time."

SEC. 604. None of the funds authorized for appropriation to the Department of Defense pursuant to this or any other Act shall be obligated under a contract entered into after the date of enactment of this Act under any multiyear procurement as defined in section 1–322 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations where the cancellation ceiling for such procurement is in excess of $1,000,000.

SEC. 605. Section 412 of Public Law 86–149, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(e) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1972, to or for the use of any Armed Force of the United States for the training or education of military personnel unless the appropriation for such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date."

SEC. 606. The Secretary of the Navy shall assign to naval shipyards for construction a number of the naval vessels, for which appropriations are authorized by this Act or by the Military Procurement Authorization Act for fiscal year 1974, that he shall determine to be sufficient to maintain a Navy shipbuilding capacity adequate to the needs of national defense, in terms of preservation of an effective construction work force and the ability to respond immediately to emergent demands for naval vessel repairs. The Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1972, on the Navy's plans for maintaining the naval shipyards in the future and in carrying out the terms of this section.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON: On page 6, strike out line 10 and all that follows thereafter through line 24 on page 7.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a perennial effort on my part.

It deals with military assistance to our allies in Southeast Asia. We, in this particular bill this year, in addition to the $2.5 billion asked for by the Department of Defense and the executive branch, are authorizing an additional $200 million for fiscal year 1972. This increase is a direct result of the costs incurred by the escalation of the Vietnam war.

First of all, without getting into the merits of this money, which I will do in a moment, this is a matter that deserves to be before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and not before the Committee on Armed Services. It was treated that way until 1967, and I can see no reason why it should not be under the jurisdiction of foreign affairs.

Since the administration is apparently content to leave the request for military assistance before the Armed Services Committee, feeling quite properly that it might receive somewhat kinder treatment before my committee than before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we ought to go into the merits of the bill and raise some questions.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend to the attention of those who have not had a chance to do so the volume of hearings conducted by the Committee on Armed Services this year, particularly the statement which appears on page 10269 by the Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Mr. Warren Nutter. Mr. Nutter appeared before the committee this year in the usual closed session and described at great length the success of Vietnamization and the program we have been able to conduct which he said guaranteed that large areas of Vietnam are safe. In general, he extolled the virtues of this money being used in a proper fashion over the course of the last year.

This is an example of self-delusion of the highest order.

In offering this amendment I hope we would consider that we have already expended some $20 billion to $30 billion in this fashion in giving assistance to people who are told on an annual basis—and we are told on an annual basis, also—that they have the capacity to defend themselves and that this money is only to insure that this capacity is improved each year.

I would say the disarray which exists in Southeast Asia, wherever one looks, assisted with massive doses of American air and naval power, indicates the incredible failure of this and other policies along the same line. It is my feeling that if we persist in expecting somehow that our allies do not have the capacity or the will to fight themselves, but somehow they will be given another $2.7 billion, I feel we are throwing good money after bad and at the same time are deluding ourselves and the American people.

This matter should be before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and they should certainly have a chance to approve or reject it out of hand. I ask that the House do that this afternoon.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON: "SEC. 607. Subject to an agreement with respect to the release of all American Prisoners of War and an accounting of Americans Missing in Action, no funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended after September 1, 1972, to support the deployment of United States military personnel or the conduct of any United States military operations in or over South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos or in or over the territorial waters of any such nations."

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, we come once again to what I suppose is the most significant effort that the House has concerned itself with over the last 2 years, the question of whether we are going to act to in any way limit or end our involvement in Southeast Asia. The bill this year affords us the first chance to participate in a direct way—with the rules of the House being somewhat more restrictive than those of the Senate—to face this issue once again.

The language that you have before you—and all of you have had it delivered to your offices in the last few days—is similar to the language we had last year on a variety of occasions.

Simply stated it says in effect that if an agreement is reached involving the release of prisoners of war and an accounting of those missing in action no money under this bill will be allowed to be used for U.S. military personnel or military American presence and the American activity in Southeast Asia operations in or over North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos or in or over their territorial waters. The effective date would be September 1. In effect the amendment would prohibit ground combat, bombing, naval operations, mining—all war actions by U.S. troops.

This amendment provides a chance for the House to demonstrate to an increasingly skeptical public, and one that has long since looked to the executive branch and the judiciary for a resolution of the problems, that it has the capacity and the will, if it chooses to use it, to begin to do something about ending what has been the most serious and debilitating military arrangement in American history, and the greatest error in American foreign policy. We have seen many deaths and many have been permanently wounded, and the costs of this unfortunate military action have been astronomical.

All of us are familiar with the problems that have resulted.

All of us have been provided with the figures and are familiar with the fact that we now are reducing our presence. Yet the fact of the matter is, as I stand here today on the 27th of June, and despite all these concerns, we will still have something under 50,000 troops left in Southeast Asia or South Vietnam in a military sense. We have, at the same time, seen two additional air bases opened in Thailand over the course of the last 10 weeks with all of the increase in manpower and planes that that requires, and we have seen the presence of between 55 and 65 naval vessels off the coastline of Southeast Asia.

As I say, we have all heard the figures given us on a regular basis to this effect through the media and they show a marked diminution of our presence in South Vietnam over the last 3½ years. But we have not seen the same kind of effort to tell the American public about the marked buildup in Thailand and off the coastline of Southeast Asia of our naval vessels which brings our ability in that area to wage war from air and sea to a point that exceeds our ability in 1968.

We have also seen evidence of the fact despite the professed concern about a withdrawal jeopardizing the release of our prisoners of war, we have added more prisoners of war in the course of the last 10 or 12 weeks than the preceding 15 months before the invasion occurred or before the hostilities broke out in a more prominent way in April of this year. Expanded war brings nothing but more death and destruction and leaves us daily further from our goal.

Despite some feeling that the issue has been brought before us again and again, and that the membership is not going to change dramatically in its viewpoint, the House, which is on the verge of seeking re-election in 1972, is obligated to vote again on this war. Peace initiatives elsewhere are marred by the continuation of all hostilities in Vietnam, particularly to the levels that they have existed for the last 2 months in Southeast Asia.

Frankly, I hope this body that has been more willing to deal with form rather than substance will come to grips with assuming some responsibility for the conduct of a war which has torn apart an entire area and which has displaced hundreds of thousands of people and which has seen literally hundreds of thousands of additional people, combatants and noncombatants, killed in the course of the last 15 years, a war which has brought us throughout the world the suspicion and opprobrium of people who have historically been alined with us. I think it is time for us to do something in a positive way to face this issue once again, to give it a chance for serious consideration, and I hope the positive treatment that it deserves.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take your time to discuss this matter. It has been discussed and rediscussed—and has been digested and redigested over the last 2 years.

Anything I will say will not change your mind and I do not think anything that anybody else would say would possibly change your mind.

We have plowed this ground and replowed it. We have stated our position and restated our position, and I think further discussion would be of no avail and would be an exercise in futility.

Therefore, I ask the Members to vote the amendment down.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would state this, if I had my preference, I would offer an amendment that I had printed in the RECORD at page 99:

It is the sense of Congress that the President negotiate a reasonable termination of U.S. involvement in the undeclared war in South Viet Nam and a return of American Prisoners of War and accounting for those American defense personnel missing in action. It is the further sense of Congress that if possible the President first negotiate for a total cessation of hostilities in this war theater by all parties including return of all Prisoners of War; second, that the President negotiate for a total termination of U.S. involvement including a return of American Prisoners of War without passively or actively undermining the South Vietnamese Government looking toward a complete Vietnamization at the earliest possible date of the land, sea, and air forces; third, *that should the President be unable to successfully negotiate either of the foregoing options that it is therefore the sense of Congress that the U.S. having a continued interest in the return of American Prisoners of War and accounting for those missing in action and an interest in a stable balance of power in Southeast Asia, that the United States unilaterally and preferably over a six month period of time reduce its military active and support role in relation to the government of South Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand only sufficient to provide an equal and reciprocal counterpart to roles of support, including logistics and advisory, played by China and the Soviet Union in relation to the Communist movements in North and South Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.*

But I think we should have only one vote on Vietnam, for this reason.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts should take precedence. I hope that we could have a record vote on this amendment to indicate it is the intent of this Congress and the intent of the American people to sell this war back to the Vietnamese and to let them solve their own problems—perhaps with some of our support, but not with our military men and not with our military operation.

I do not think there is anything magic about the date. The gentleman chooses September 1. I think we should call it as we see it. I do not think we are going to succeed, but I do believe at this point in history this Congress should go on record.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my respect for this great committee. I agree with the Chairman—the ground has been ployed and we have been over this issue many, many times. But it cannot be too many times while thousands die and suffer and napalm falls on screaming children.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment now because I think it is our last opportunity to speak on the eve of

the conventions of the two great parties of this country. Both seem to be conjoined in a desire to end this war and to take the war out of politics and to take politics out of the war.

As I read the Harrington amendment, in a real sense it supports in major part the President's recent statement when he made what I consider to be a reasonable and generous offer to the North Vietnamese to end the war, based upon a cease fire.

I ask a single question—When can a cease fire begin if we do not end our massive and obliteration bombing of all of Vietnam. That is the kind of suspension of operations that the gentleman from Massachusetts is seeking by his amendment.

The kind of suspension of operations that the gentleman is seeking is the real beginning of the cease fire which the President requested.

This is our opportunity as a House to speak with reason and decision and to say that we are going to support this military procurement authorization as amended and we are going to support the President's effort in Peking and Moscow to grind down the cold war, to end hostilities all over the world. We seek to do it in such a way that we will be well armed for any eventually, but will end the imbalance and the disequilibrium of military postures which this war has forced upon us.

We are using up inventory. We are using up billions of dollars that should be obligated to sensible defense. We are using our substances in an endless pursuit and aimless quest. Our efforts are in vain because peace is not there as long as we continue massive escalation of bombing and a utilization of inhumane methods to end this senseless war.

I think this House can support, and I should like to vote for this military authorization bill if we aim the bill and all the things in it at the total defense of our country on a balanced basis around the world. There are danger points and peril points that menace our way of life and we must be prepared to forefend aggression west and east.

Vietnam is not a danger to us any longer. It is not the reason for this bill. If we support the Harrington amendment, many of us could vote for the bill and support a military authorization program which would really round out our defense against future enemies. But end the senseless use of weaponry in a ravaged country, in a land where we do not belong. I say this is in support of the Nixon program to end the war. It is in aid of Dr. Kissinger's mission around the world to end the war. If a cease-fire is what we are aiming for, then all we are saying in the amendment and what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying in the amendment is that we are going to keep our country strong. We are not going to kick the weak. Why keep booting around this hapless enemy who cannot end the war? If he goes back to his own land and ends his senseless aggression below the DMZ, he will be in worse danger in North Vietnam, where we are bombing civilians and whatever else is left to bomb in North Vietnam.

I think we should now say, "Mr. President, we are giving you a bill to arm this country. We are supporting peace in Vietnam, but please, Mr. President, begin the cease-fire by suspending military operations in North Vietnam and let us get back to the peace table."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my word to those of the chairman of the committee, who has urged defeat of this particular amendment. I would like to say to the proponents of the amendment that at this period of time in history we should let things be as they presently are. Our President—and he is President of all of us—has made recent trips to China and Russia for one single and sole purpose; namely, to see if peace cannot possibly be brought to all the nations of the world. At this particular time, I repeat, all we would be doing through adoption of this amendment would be to disrupt and discourage further action, and negotiations between nations leading toward a lasting peace throughout the world. I feel it would be a terrible mistake on the part of the House to take any such action at this time, and I urge that the amendment be roundly defeated.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am no stranger in this well when it comes to opposing this war. I have been doing so since 1967, at least a half dozen times a year. I can recall early in April of this year when I went to one of those Wednesday briefings. The Assistant Secretary of State was there, and he was asked why Hanoi was not bombed and why Haiphong was not mined. It was at the time the offensive had taken place.

His answer and reason was that the North Vietnamese had all the supplies they needed, and there was no sense in mining Haiphong or bombing Hanoi.

Within a matter of days, on April 17, to be exact, the day after Easter Sunday, the bombing started and notice was given that we were mining Haiphong Harbor. The Democrats were going to meet in caucus on that day, Wednesday, April 19th. We all received telegrams stating that William Rogers, Secretary of State, would be at the Wednesday morning briefing, and would we be there. How well I remember.

He reminded me of the briefing I went to after the Cuban crisis, the invasion that resulted from an utter failure. Adlai Stevenson was trying to apologize. At that time, the Secretary was saying that he knew the bombing of Hanoi and the mining of Haiphong Harbor was going to be of no avail. What does it all mean? It is a calculated risk. This could have been done 5 years ago.

But we are not going to bomb them into submission. We are going to have to invade the country with infantry if we are going to win this war.

This could have been done 5 years ago, but we are not going to bomb them into submission. We are going to have to invade with infantry if we are going to win this war. Believe me, we are going to have to invade with infantry, and the day we invade with infantry is the day World War III happens, and we are on the brink of a calculated risk.

What has the bombing done? What has the bombing proven? It has proven nothing to me as far as I can see. It admits failure, on our part, of our Vietnamization program. It has made a deeper involvement for us. It is buying time? Buying time for what?

Victory has been an illusion, unattainable for anyone. What has it meant to us at home here? A division among our people, some 60,000 killed, hundreds of thousands of people wounded, division in our country, our not being able to go after the priorities we want and that we need for this country.

Some sit here in the back and talk about our party disintegrating. Why is it disintegrating? Because we have not been able to go forward with the priorities that face this Nation. And over here, are these Members to go meekly along and talk how in their hearts they are opposed to war, but a twist of the wrist from the White House will make them change their minds and their sentiments?

I think this is a fair and honorable resolution. I hope the resolution is adopted, and I hope the men will have the courage to move through the aisle with a green card.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I would speak to what I believe to be a defect in the amendment itself, a gap between its intent and what it will accomplish concerning prisoners of war. The amendment states:

> Subject to an agreement with respect to the release of all American Prisoners of War and an accounting of Americans Missing in Action, no funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended after September 1, 1972, . . .

The language of the resolution which was passed by the House Foreign Affairs Committee last week which reflected the peace initiatives voiced by the President in his May 8 address to the Nation had in it:

> Subject to the return of American prisoners of war.

In Korea, we had an agreement for release, but as I recall, there were a number of men that they claimed to have released, and some of them ended up in Red China and did not ever get back. This language, "subject to an agreement concerning the release of," offers no real protection to American prisoners of war. I want to nail down that fact. We do not even require that they be released, much less returned. We just have to have some understanding at the time we cut off everything. I think that is no protection for American prisoners of war.

Now, may I speak to the amendment and its intent.

I would welcome a vote by this committee and this House in opposition to

the amendment in its substance. We can take a stand here today in support of our fighting men and in support of our Commander in Chief in his effort toward peace and in his effort to win peace with honor and permanent peace in our time. I believe in a political year, when it will take statesmanship to do so, that this would be a right stand for this committee if we would vote no on the substance of this amendment.

We can win an honorable peace. We here have opportunity to strengthen the hand of our Commander in Chief. Democrat and Republican, regardless of our differences, I urge this House to take a stand now in opposition to this amendment and its substance.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment, if it has been dubbed an "end the war" amendment—and I have heard it so designated—is clearly misnamed. This is a "continue the war" amendment, and let me tell the Members why.

This is an authorization bill. We must not lose sight of that. The pending amendment places a limitation upon the funds authorized in this bill. What is authorized? A B–1—it would not even be in inventory until at least the year 1980. An ABM system—it would not be in inventory for heaven knows how long. The ships, the missiles, the aircraft, the tracked vehicles authorized—they are for procurement in the future. Nothing I know of which is authorized in this bill will be in inventory for at least 2 years.

As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) has said so often, there is no pancake so thin it does not have two sides. I want Members to look at the other side of this amendment. Instead of an amendment to end the war, this says on the other side of the pancake that the President can continue the war provided he uses weapons and equipment which are either now in inventory or are on order from prior years' authorizations and appropriations.

Voting to limit this bill does not do a thing to end the war; it only adds to the authorization of the President of the United States to continue it.

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

Mr. Chairman, for 7 long and bloody years, this Nation has fed the fires of war in Indochina.

The price for this tragic venture has been incalculably high—in terms of lives lost and blood shed; in terms of opportunities wasted and treasure squandered; in terms of our standing in the world community and the health of our own society.

In the name of peace, we have brought only death and destruction.

In the name of democracy, we have helped only enslave the people of South Vietnam to a corrupt military dictatorship that depends on war for its survival.

For the supposed sake of honor, we have trampled on our principles.

Yet, as each day goes by, the war drags on, following the same litany of disaster that was heard time and time again during the Johnson years. I opposed that policy then and I oppose it now.

After so many years, after so many lives, you would think that this administration would have learned that military venturism is not the path to peace. You would think that it would have learned that bombing will not halt the killing. You would think that it would realize that the corrupt military dictatorship of General Thieu does not promote the self-determination of the Vietnamese people. You would think that it would learn that the only course for this Nation to take is to extricate itself entirely from the conflict.

But the President—rather than learning from the mistakes of the past—is intent on repeating them. Despite the fact that we are now in the seventh year since the first vote in the House of Representatives on appropriations for the war in Vietnam, the policy remains the same.

But there is one difference. On that day in May of 1965 only seven of us in the House voted "no" to war. Now the vast majority of the American people are with us in our quest for peace.

Time and time again the people of this Nation have demonstrated their steadfast opposition to this ghastly war—in the voting booths, in the public opinion polls, in the streets. Yet, this administration—as deaf as its so-called majority is silent—has ignored the voices of the people and has fueled the fires of war. Not only in direct opposition to the will of the people, but in direct opposition to the law of the land as well.

Section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971 (Public Law 91–156) declared it to be the policy of the United States to terminate at the earliest practicable date all U.S. military operations in Indochina and to provide for the withdrawal of all U.S. military forces at a date certain subject to the release of all American prisoners of war.

Yet the war continues, with the President following a policy that can only lead to further devastation, further slaughter, further misery.

This policy must stop.

And it is the Congress that must stop it.

For far too long this House has closed its eyes to its responsibilities to the Constitution and to the people of this land. The Congress—and only the Congress—has the power over war and peace. Yet time and time again it has abdicated its responsibilities. No more. This House cannot turn its back on ending this war any longer.

We have before us today an amendment which can bring an end to the killing, which can bring our troops home, which can reassert the responsibility of the Congress. This amendment—which I support—provides that:

Subject to an agreement with respect to the release of all American prisoners of war and an accounting of Americans missing in action, no funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended after September 1, 1972, to support the deployment of United States military personnel or the conduct of any United States military operations in or over South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos or in or over the territorial waters of any such nations.

Personally, this amendment is not as strong as I would like. I for one do not believe that this war should be allowed to go on for one more moment—let alone until September. But it is a start. It would constitute a mandate of the Congress to bring the war to an end. It would replace the vagueness which accompanied section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971, vagueness, which the President has used as a way of avoiding the policy set forth in that provision.

This House can no longer shirk its reponsibilities. No longer can it be allowed to close its eyes to a war which has drained our resources and stained our conscience. No longer can it be allowed to close its eyes to a war which has sacrificed the lives of thousands of our most precious possessions—our young men. No longer can it be allowed to close its eyes to a war which has warped our priorities, brought the twin plagues of unemployment and inflation to our economy, and created bitterness and division among our people.

It's time for the House to assume its constitutional responsibility for war and peace. It has been clear for a long time that Congress must exercise its power of the purse and cut off funds for the war—if the war is to end. Let us delay no longer.

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

My colleagues in the House know there are few Members who have supported the South Vietnam effort more than the gentleman addressing this House now. From the beginning I strongly believed we had a role in Vietnam and we had a commitment to the people of Vietnam. I supported this effort when it was obvious the alternative would have thrown Southeast Asia into Communist hands.

Had we permitted South Vietnam to fall into Communist hands, surely the old domino theory would have applied, and all of Southeast Asia would now be under Communist control.

I have made many speeches here in support of our participation in Vietnam, because during those early years I believed we had an obligation. But I just as strongly believe today that our mission, the U.S. mission, has been long ago concluded. Whatever obligations we had to the people of South Vietnam have long ago been fulfilled.

This amendment does not in any way interfere with the plans of South Vietnam to continue the struggle for her survival and her freedom. Nor does it in any way restrict America from helping South Vietnam to continue the struggle with her own resources.

But there has to be a time when we Americans cut the umbilical cord. The American people have been more than generous; they have given more than 55,000 lives, 300,000 casualties, and $100 billion in expenditures. We have been more generous in helping these people struggle for independence than any other nation in the world.

What we are saying here in this reso-

lution is that the time has come for South Vietnam to carry its own load. I believe it can carry its own load. I believe that South Vietnam, with a 1.5 million-man army, fully trained and fully equipped, with an air force of 1,300 aircraft, can carry on the defense of that country.

Our mission is concluded, and we ought to bring our troops home and get ourselves out of this tragic conflict.

I do not agree with those of my colleagues who say Vietnam was a mistake. No, it was not. The American people had an obligation to fulfill, and they fulfilled that obligation. Now the time has come for us to say, as of September 1, contingent on the release of our prisoners of war and the accounting for our missing in action, our involvement has come to an end and the South Vietnamese will have to carry the battle themselves.

Can they do this? I believe they can. There will be some setbacks. Things looked very grim a few weeks ago in South Vietnam, but the heroic South Vietnamese armies have come back. They are holding their own. This battle is going to seesaw back and forth for a long time to come, but I have confidence that in the final analysis, the South Vietnamese are going to win the struggle, because the American people have given them the time to develop their own defense capability.

America's foreign policy ought to be to help an ally until that ally is capable of helping herself. That is what we are saying here today. In our judgment September 1, 1972, marks that point when the South Vietnamese take this struggle over within their own resources.

I am perfectly willing to help them with everything we have, but they have to carry the battle. This battle could last another 20 years, and I do not believe anyone in this Chamber is going to tolerate it for that long.

If you really want to get our prisoners of war back and an accounting of our missing in action, you will support the resolution.

What we are saying to Hanoi is: if you want us to stop bombing your cities and if you want us to disengage, you can make that decrease by giving us our POW's. The next move is up to Hanoi if we accept this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harrington amendment to bring the war in Vietnam to an end. I do not agree with the argument of the chairman of the Armed Forces Committee that this issue has been debated, redebated and debated even more and that therefore, there is nothing more to debate. Mr. Chairman, as long as the war goes on, as long as our troops are being killed and wounded, as long as bombs are being dropped on hopeless civilians and installations needed for communities are being destroyed, the issue is an open, burning one. One fact is clear: We should not be in Vietnam today. We ought to gather our armed personnel and our equipment and bring them home.

This amendment can lead to peace. It is a valid, significant step toward the agreement sought by the President in his speech in which he initiated the present wave of bombing by our aircraft. It establishes a fixed date for withdrawal of our Armed Forces, subject to the return of our troops who are prisoners of war and the missing in action.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), urges that we take no action at this critical point in time. That argument has been heard as often in the years the war has been going on. Let the President do it. But the President has not done it although there have been a number of opportunities presented not only to President Nixon, but to his predecessor as well. I say let Congress take action now to initiate a peace settlement that will bring this war to an end.

I support the amendment and urge its passage.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON, my colleague from Massachusetts. The provisions of this amendment—they are subject, of course, to the freeing of all American Prisoners of War and an accounting for all Missing In Action—call for an end to the U.S. war effort throughout Indochina by September 1.

For many of us, Mr. Chairman, the debate over this amendment is a distressing déjà vu phenomenon. Time and time again, year after year, amendments kindred to this one have come before the House. Yet, all of them—with the solitary exception of the Mansfield amendment and this only after it was emasculated by its opponents—have perished on this floor. The frustration many of us feel, vexing as it is, is not limited to the legislative process alone. The administration, still loftily aloof to any counsel from Capitol Hill continues to press the war in Vietnam without even consulting us. President Nixon's unsettling decision to mine the Port of Haiphong and accelerate the bombing, for example, was made almost wholly in vacuo. We, in the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, learned of the decision only after it had been already made.

As strongly as I can, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment now before us.

Doggedly defying solution for more than 10 years, the Vietnam war will continue to take American lives and continue to drain away American capital unless the Congress acts to end it. The devastation of Vietnam, North and South alike, has not slackened since the early 1960's. Much of its terrain, if not most of it, has been pummeled past recognition—entire forests stripped clean, croplands wasted, cities left in rubble, villages blown off the face of the earth. Millions of people live in terror every day of their lives. And the United States, the Nation that entered this conflict, like a messiah, has not yet wrought the miracles nor brought the salvation that Americans had once expected. And it is plain—in fact, obvious beyond dispute—that the United States never will. The war simply will not yield to American might.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede, quite freely, that the bombing of North Vietnam and the mining of the Port of Haiphong have slowed the forces of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. But, Mr. Chairman, it will not end the war itself. North Vietnam and the Vietcong, just as they have for generations will continue to fight. And Americans will continue to die.

How much longer can we endure this?

How much longer can we sacrifice American lives and American treasure?

Mr. Chairman, I say we must get out now.

We have already done everything that could be reasonably expected of us—quite literally everything—to honor any commitment we might have had to South Vietnam.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the sad part of today's exercise is that we have been over this ground so many times before. I do not know how many more times I am going to be in the position of making the same opening remarks. Once again, this House, this Congress, and this Nation are being asked to underwrite to the tune of more billions support of the war in Southeast Asia for yet another fiscal year. As a matter of fact, all the occasion seems to serve is an opportunity for more speeches and more promises. Yet, in spite of the rhetoric on all sides, in spite of the promises from the administration, the war goes on. Troops which used to be stationed in Vietnam are now stationed in Thailand. Bombers are more active than any of our fighting divisions ever were at any point in the war. Each time a move is made to fix a date certain or to put a stop on the expenditure of moneys, we are told that to do so would be to rob the administration of vital time and diplomatic maneuvering necessary to bring the war to a conclusion. We have heard this same plea now going on 4 years. It is high time that the conduct of this war was based on past record instead of future promises. Is it little wonder that we despair of a future perfect when the only example we have before us is such a past imperfect?

The truth of the matter is there is nothing more to be said that has not been said before. The only opportunity this House will have in the foreseeable future to reassert its constitutional authority and reflect the wishes of the people is to vote today on a definite date after which no funds will be appropriated—September 1, 1972—subject only to an agreement with respect to the release of all American prisoners of war and an accounting of Americans missing in action. Continuing funds for this war for another fiscal year will not make this war more moral. Continuing funding for this immoral war for another fiscal year will not make victory ours. To continue funding this immoral, impractical war for another fiscal year will not bring our troops home and bring us any closer to solving the agonizing prisoners of war and missing in action's problem than we were a year ago.

To continue funding this immoral, impractical, agonizing war for another fiscal year, however, holds every likelihood of further dividing a nation already rent with discontent, of further delaying our full attention to the prob-

lems facing our cities and our towns, and guaranteeing the alienation of a whole generation of young men and women on whose shoulders the burden falls most heavily. What this Nation needs now are more bills like the one passed just last week, which was so appropriately termed by the Boston Globe as the first real indication of a conversion from wartime psychology to peacetime hopes. Instead of throwing more good money after bad in the conduct of war in Southeast Asia, it is high time this country concentrated spending on reconstructing mid-20th century America. When I think of the legislation before my committee alone on a whole range of vital matters running from a program of national health insurance to genuine welfare reform, a substantial improvement in the lot of our senior citizens and a reformed pension system, is it any wonder that today's authorization for more money for this war can only appear to be a sorry example of misplaced priorities? If we are going to spend money for defense, and I have never been against a strong national defense, then it is time that we at least concentrated on those areas of vital interest to this Nation such as the Middle East and Europe and get out, lock, stock, and barrel from the quagmire that is Southeast Asia. Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this committee for the Harrington amendment.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that all of us in this Chamber yearn for an end to the war in Vietnam. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is deficient in several respects. It does not provide for an ending of the war. It does not provide for a cease-fire. It does not assure the return of our prisoners of war, or men missing in action.

Mr. Chairman, an effective end-the-war amendment would include such vital elements as I have mentioned and which are included in the proposal advanced by the President.

Mr. Chairman, those who today oppose the terms set forth in the President's proposal—and in my opinion, weakening our bargaining position at the peace conference in Paris—and delaying the day when we can achieve an agreement for peace.

Mr. Chairman, I will support an end-the-war resolution which includes a supervised cease-fire, and which contains assurances—not just a bare agreement—for the return of our prisoners and men missing in action. The President supports such a move for peace. Furthermore, he is working unceasingly for peace—now—and for a full generation of peace—in the world. For these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harrington end of the war amendment. I am proud to be a cosponsor and one who helped draft the language of that amendment. It is a simple statement. It says that:

> Subject to an agreement with respect to the release of all American Prisoners of War and an accounting of Americans Missing in Action, no funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended after September 1, 1972, to support the deployment of United States military operations in or over South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos or in or over the territorial waters of any such nations.

There are no ambiguities in the legislation. It calls for doing what I believe the people of the United States want done and I hope it will receive the support of this House.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the measure pending before us and associate myself with the views expressed by our very able colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON). Although I firmly believe that we must have an adequate military capability to properly protect and defend our country, we simply have no need for the excessive defense structure and clearly unnecessary military hardware called for by this legislation. H.R. 15495 does nothing more than authorize the expenditure of funds which could be much better used in meeting our urban crisis in providing increased and improved health-care programs, educational programs, job training and placement, urgently needed housing, and the myriad of other essential domestic needs. The military procurement bill simply perpetuates our grossly distorted national priorities and further involves this country in an illegal, immoral, astronomically expensive and bloody military misadventure in Southeast Asia.

One of the particularly disturbing features of this bill is the vast sums authorized for weapons systems whose necessity is highly questionable, both fiscally and militarily. The measure seems to authorize nothing more than playthings for a group of generals and admirals and to serve the ends of various narrow special interests. For example, even though the Armed Services Committee did not approve the request to construct an additional seven DD–963 type destroyers, it has provided almost $300 million to help bail out the prime contractor, Litton Industries. It should be observed that the company is faced with a serious financial crisis because of enormous cost overruns on previous DD–963 class destroyers and a smaller number of LHA amphibious assault ships, on which Litton is 2 years behind schedule.

As another prime example of the ill-conceived programs authorized by this legislation is funds for the CVAN–70 nuclear carrier. We are being asked to authorize the expenditure of almost $300 million for long leadtime items for this vessel even though full authorization for the ship will not be requested until fiscal year 1974. The current estimate for the complete carrier is $951 million—not including the approximately 90 aircraft or four nuclear missile-equipped destroyers and attack submarine escorts. Taking into consideration a certain level of inflation and usual construction delays, it is not inconceivable that this carrier will end up costing over $1 billion. In addition to the question of economics, a vessel of this size will be highly vulnerable to a concentrated attack by sophisticated land-based aircraft or submarines and the increasing improvement in surface-to-surface missiles will further restrict carrier operations. Furthermore, the CVAN–70 will be of questionable utility and many of the jobs envisioned for it can easily be accomplished by other, far less expensive ships. Finally, as our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. LEGGETT) has aptly observed in his dissenting views, the present force of 15 attack carriers is more than sufficient to meet projected military requirements and the need for nuclear propulsion is only marginal. Certainly we should fully support Mr. LEGGETT's amendment to delete the $299 million requested for the procurement of long-leadtime items for the CVAN–70.

This legislation contains a wide variety of other highly disturbing provisions and authorizations which are too numerous to mention. However, one especially repressive provision—section 602 which prohibits the expenditure of Defense funds at colleges and universities which either bar military recruiters or have phased out ROTC programs—deserves special mention. This myopic, illconsidered and narrow provision is nothing more than an attempt to punish those schools which have decided that military training is no longer an appropriate component of their curriculums and to intimidate other schools who may be contemplating similar action. This punitive section is a blatant denial of academic freedom and does not take into consideration the many amicable agreements which have been reached over the past several years between the military services and institutions of higher learning. Not only will it deny active-duty military personnel the opportunity to secure quality educational and academic advancement at many schools but this shortsighted and petulant attitude will prevent important and strategic work directly related to our basic defense posture from being performed. The research and development conducted on college campuses has always been important and, in many instances, has provided a much needed breath of fresh air in the otherwise regimented and confining atmosphere of the Armed Forces. We must not allow this situation to end, regardless as to whether or not a school will allow its students to receive academic credit for military, air, or naval science or to listen to military recruiters.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the fact that many of the weapons systems proposed in this measure are inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the SALT agreements and the interim agreement on offensive weapons systems as well as the fact that the vast sums authorized by H.R. 15495 sink us deeper into debt and prohibit the implementation of many highly necessary and desperately required domestic programs, the legislation before us continues to involve us in this tragic war in Southeast Asia. Over the past 10 years we have spent some $150 billion at a cost of 50,000 lives and 300,000 wounded. Yet, we are now being asked to authorize an additional $2.7 billion in military assistance, not to mention the utilization of other programs authorized by this legislation in the war zone. This insane attitude and essentially regressive course must be halted. The Congress must exercise its constitutionally guaranteed prerogatives and refrain

from simply rubberstamping the requests made by the military brass and their civilian servants. The legislative branch must take the initiative in bringing a halt to this irresponsible spending and must take affirmative action to redirect the course of this Nation before we are allowed to plunge further into one military fiasco after another. The level of military personnel called for in this measure is wholly unnecessary and by bringing active duty troop ceilings more into line we can save well over $3 billion. By exercising our authority we can save additional billions by terminating useless and costly weapons systems and poorly planned, poorly implemented procurement programs. Finally, we can take the long overdue step of bringing this senseless war to an end by supporting Mr. HARRINGTON's proposed amendment to terminate funds under this measure on September 1 of this year conditional upon the release of American prisoners of war. It has been accurately noted by a number of our colleagues that even though certain administration officials claim that the Vietnamization program is successful, military expenditures for Vietnam are continuing to rise. Contrary to administration claims, an end does not appear to be in sight and troops are simply being shifted from one battle zone to another in a macabre game of military hopscotch in Southeast Asia. By discontinuing the availability of funds we can effectively end this tragic and dark chapter of American history. I urge our colleagues to fully support this important amendment.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, on May 9 I stated my support of a resolution, then under consideration by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to set a date to terminate U.S. military involvement in Indochina, subject only to obtaining the release of our prisoners of war and all available information on the missing in action.

It is still my firm intention to carry out this pledge. I will not, however, vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) because in my view it is faulty in several respects.

It is my understanding that a majority of the House Democrats on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was delegated responsibility for drafting the resolution mandated by the Democratic Caucus, insisted that the resolution make provision for the safe withdrawal from Vietnam of all U.S. military personnel. The amendment before us contains no such provision and this in my view is a fatal defect.

Furthermore, the amendment before us calls only for an agreement with respect to the release of prisoners of war as distinct from the actual exchange of prisoners, as provided for in the resolution of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is my personal view that 60 days is an unrealistic time frame for the cessation of U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the removal of all of our forces from Indochina.

It is therefore with reluctance that I must cast my vote against the pending amendment and I do so only because I am assured that the resolution directed by the Democratic Caucus will soon be before this body for consideration and vote.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because it does not require as a precondition the release of our prisoners of war.

Both the resolution of the Democratic Caucus concerning this problem and the resolution approved by a majority of the Democratic members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs required obtaining the release of our prisoners of war.

The present resolution refers simply to an agreement and not to actual release. I see no reason to go beyond the language which has been accepted by our party caucus and by the Democratic members of the committee concerned with this matter in a substantive way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. HARRINGTON, GUBSER, LEGGETT, and FISHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 152, noes 244, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—152

Abzug	Dulski	McCloskey
Adams	Eckhardt	McCormack
Addabbo	Edwards, Calif.	McKay
Alexander	Eilberg	Macdonald, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Madden
Annunzio	Fascell	Matsunaga
Aspin	Ford, William D.	Mazzoli
Badillo	Fraser	Meeds
Barrett	Frenzel	Melcher
Begich	Galifianakis	Metcalfe
Bergland	Gaydos	Mikva
Biaggi	Giaimo	Minish
Biester	Gibbons	Mink
Bingham	Grasso	Mitchell
Blatnik	Gray	Moorhead
Boland	Green, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.
Brademas	Griffiths	Natcher
Brasco	Gude	Nedzi
Burke, Mass.	Hamilton	Nix
Burton	Hanley	Obey
Carey, N.Y.	Hanna	O'Hara
Carney	Hansen, Wash.	O'Neill
Celler	Harrington	Patten
Chisholm	Harvey	Pepper
Clay	Hathaway	Perkins
Collins, Ill.	Hawkins	Podell
Conte	Hechler, W. Va.	Preyer, N.C.
Conyers	Heckler, Mass.	Pryor, Ark.
Corman	Heinz	Pucinski
Cotter	Helstoski	Rangel
Coughlin	Hicks, Mass.	Rees
Culver	Hicks, Wash.	Reid
Curlin	Howard	Reuss
Daniels, N.J.	Hungate	Riegle
Danielson	Jacobs	Rodino
Dellums	Karth	Roe
Denholm	Kastenmeier	Roncalio
Diggs	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Dingell	Kyros	Rosenthal
Donohue	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Dow	Link	Roush
Drinan	Long, Md.	Roy
Roybal	Staggers	Ullman
Ruppe	Stanton, James V.	Van Deerlin
Ryan	Steele	Vanik
St Germain	Stokes	Vigorito
Sarbanes	Sullivan	Waldie
Scheuer	Thompson, N.J.	Whalen
Seiberling	Tiernan	Wolff
Smith, Iowa	Udall	Yates
Snyder		Yatron

NOES—244

Abbitt	Goldwater	Pike
Anderson, Ill.	Gonzalez	Pirnie
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Poage
Andrews, N. Dak.	Green, Oreg.	Poff
Archer	Gross	Powell
Arends	Grover	Price, Ill.
Ashbrook	Gubser	Price, Tex.
Ashley	Haley	Purcell
Aspinall	Hall	Quie
Baker	Halpern	Quillen
Belcher	Hammer-schmidt	Railsback
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Randall
Bennett	Harsha	Rarick
Betts	Hastings	Rhodes
Bevill	Hays	Roberts
Blackburn	Hébert	Robinson, Va.
Bolling	Henderson	Robison, N.Y.
Bow	Hillis	Rogers
Bray	Hogan	Rooney, N.Y.
Brinkley	Horton	Runnels
Brooks	Hosmer	Ruth
Brotzman	Hull	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Hunt	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Saylor
Broyhill, N.C.	Ichord	Scherle
Broyhill, Va.	Jarman	Schmitz
Buchanan	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Pa.	Sebelius
Burlison, Mo.	Jonas	Shipley
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Shoup
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Shriver
Byron	Jones, Tenn.	Sikes
Cabell	Kazen	Sisk
Camp	Keating	Skubitz
Carlson	Keith	Slack
Carter	Kemp	Smith, Calif.
Casey, Tex.	King	Smith, N.Y.
Cederberg	Kluczynski	Spence
Chamberlain	Kuykendall	Springer
Chappell	Landgrebe	Stanton, J. William
Clancy	Latta	Steed
Clausen, Don H.	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del	Lent	Steiger, Wis.
Cleveland	Lloyd	Stephens
Collier	Long, La.	Stratton
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Stubblefield
Colmer	McClory	Stuckey
Conable	McClure	Symington
Conover	McCollister	Talcott
Crane	McCulloch	Taylor
Daniel, Va.	McEwen	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	McFall	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Wis.	McKevitt	Terry
de la Garza	McMillan	Thompson, Ga.
Delaney	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Dellenback	Mailliard	Thone
Dennis	Mallary	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	Mann	Veysey
Devine	Martin	Waggonner
Dorn	Mathias, Calif.	Wampler
Downing	Mathis, Ga.	Ware
Duncan	Mayne	Whalley
du Pont	Michel	White
Dwyer	Miller, Calif.	Whitehurst
Edmondson	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Edwards, Ala.	Mills, Ark.	Widnall
Eshleman	Mills, Md.	Wiggins
Evins, Tenn.	Minshall	Williams
Findley	Mizell	Wilson, Bob
Fish	Monagan	Wilson, Charles H.
Fisher	Montgomery	Winn
Flood	Murphy, N.Y.	Wright
Flowers	Myers	Wyatt
Foley	Nelsen	Wydler
Forsythe	Nichols	Wylie
Fountain	O'Konski	Wyman
Frelinghuysen	Passman	Young, Fla.
Frey	Patman	Young, Tex.
Fuqua	Pelly	Zablocki
Garmatz	Pettis	Zion
Gettys	Peyser	Zwach
	Pickle	

NOT VOTING—36

Abernethy	Caffery	Ford, Gerald R.
Abourezk	Clark	Fulton
Anderson, Tenn.	Davis, S.C.	Gallagher
Baring	Dent	Griffin
Blanton	Dickinson	Hagan
Boggs	Dowdy	Holifield
Broomfield	Erlenborn	Kee
Burke, Fla.	Esch	Kyl
	Flynt	Landrum

McDade	Mollohan	Rousselot
McDonald, Mich.	Morgan	Schneebeli
McKinney	Mosher	Schwengel
	Moss	

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MIKVA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MIKVA: At page 10 of H.R. 15495, following line 14, add the following new section:

"SEC. 606. No funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended for the bombing or the destruction of the dams, dikes or hydraulic systems of North Vietnam."

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, this last week in the Washington area and throughout the east coast we became aware of the kind of damage to life and property that floods can cause. This was a natural disaster here in the United States. There was not much that we could do about it before it happened. We are aware that millions of people painstakingly are going to have to put together their lives and their property, they have suffered incredible tragedy.

It is in the context of that natural calamity that I offer this amendment to put the Congress on record as saying that we do not wish to have an unnatural calamity of that sort in Vietnam.

I refer to the question of whether or not we ought to bomb the dikes and dams of North Vietnam. Mr. Chairman, those are not military targets. Mr. Chairman, what turns on this amendment is the well-being and the lives of the civilian population of North Vietnam.

It is estimated that millions of lives could be lost if we bombed those dikes. We could wipe out the entire food supply of North Vietnam. We could destroy their homes. We could destroy any possibility of their having a sanctuary.

Mr. Chairman, in 1967 and in 1965 the former Secretary of Defense resisted the temptation when others proposed the bombing of these dikes by saying, and I am quoting: "There may be a limit beyond which many Americans and much of the world will not permit the United States to go."

I would suggest that the Congress of the United States ought to see to it that the United States does not go beyond that limit. Some day we are going to have to reckon with ourselves, with our own opinion of ourselves and with world opinion, in relation to the things that we did or did not do in Vietnam. I should hate to see this further escalation on the conscience of this country and on the conscience of the Congress.

What the amendment provides is that no funds be spent for the purpose of bombing the dikes or dams. Those are civilian targets. There are no military targets involved in those dikes and dams. Unless we are interested in causing civilian casualties and deaths and starvation on a mass scale, we ought to adopt this amendment. If in fact it is not the policy of this country to do so, then it will be gentle surplusage on which some of us can salve our consciences after the war is over. If there are any who are thinking that we are going to engage in such an escalation of the war, then the Congress ought to prevent it. I urge the amendment be adopted.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I certainly compliment the gentleman for proposing this amendment. As I recall, both President Johnson and President Nixon have from time to time, or at one time or another, said that they would not do such a horrible thing as to bomb the dikes; am I not correct?

Mr. MIKVA. That is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. So what we are doing here, if we support this amendment, would be to establish the policy of both sides of the aisle as far as the war is concerned.

Mr. MIKVA. That is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I really think that the vote should be unanimous, because I do not think any American would want that kind of an action on his conscience.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ABZUG. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for having offered the amendment which is before us. I believe the real issue here is: when will the time come when we will assert congressional effort and influence on the policies of government?

I have been in this House for about a year and a half. I thought that today this House would assert its constitutional power to influence the policy in getting us out of Vietnam. Having failed to do that, we should at least assert our power to prevent the President from bombing the dikes.

I do not believe that any stretch of the imagination could permit these dikes to be categorized as military targets. They are the factor which makes the marshy delta region into a habitable area; without them, it would be completely flooded, and no one could live there. We are now at the time of the year when the water behind the dikes is at its highest point. As Anthony Lewis wrote in yesterday's New York Times—

No one should be in any doubt about what systematic destruction of the dikes at this time might mean. It would bring into play, justifiably for once, that much-abused word genocide.

Fifteen million people live on the Tonkin plain, one of the more densely populated areas of the word. Some would drown in floods if the dikes failed; many more would be in danger of starvation after flooding of the rice paddies.

Is this the means by which this nation intends to assure democracy for the people of Vietnam? Is this the way we intend to bring about peace?

We face the fact that most of the people in this House and in this country believe this war should be ended. I would hope Members of this House could act in support of this amendment. I think it is within the rights and responsibilities of this Congress to deal with it, so that we do not continue this cruel effort in Vietnam.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement. I cannot think of anything that would be more helpful to the Communists than to say we would not knock out those powerplants and those dams. If we want to help the Communists, all we have to do is support that amendment.

Since I want to help our troops and our country I urge my colleagues to vote "No."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to point out the fact that the amendment is really not applicable to this bill at all, because there is no money in this bill for any bombs which could be used in such bombing.

Also I want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that not until the unrestrained bombing became effective in North Vietnam did the North Vietnamese show an inclination to come to the peace table.

I suggest that this amendment is certainly not in order and should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JACOBS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: On page 11, after line 4, add:

"SEC. 607. No part of the funds authorized by this Act shall be used to purchase goods or services from a supplier which compensates any officer or employee at a rate in excess of level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, and which, in the aggregate, derives more than one-half of its gross income from the Federal Government."

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I hate to be a pessimist, but this amendment will not pass, and the reason it will not pass is that it is a conforming amendment to the amendment that was accepted by the House on June 1 of this year. Perhaps Members will recall that an amendment was offered to limit salaries paid by the Public Broadcasting Corporation to its employees. The limit was set at the legal salaries paid to Members of Congress, $42,500 a year.

Not only do I predict that this amendment, which does the same thing with regard to defense corporations who do more than 50 percent of their business with the Federal Government, will not pass, but I also predict that generally speaking the people who voted for the Public Broadcasting amendment will vote against this one, even though the Government buys from both kinds of corporations—public entertainment and information from the one and war implements from the other.

The first question which came up in the case of the public broadcasting amendment was, How can we control the salaries that a corporation pays to its employees?

My good friend from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) provided the answer to that question. He said:

No, we cannot limit what a private corporation pays its employees, but we can limit what we give in grants to that private corporation if they pay what we consider to be excessive salaries to those employees, and that is what we are attempting to do.

It has been suggested that the difference between the corporations involved is that the corporations involved here are profit corporations, and that is right. I might add that their profits, according to Government contracts, are dependent upon a percentage of their costs—in other words a no-risk taxpayer guaranteed profit.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I just wanted to ask the gentleman what makes him think that the salary of $42,500 paid to a Congressman is so excessive.

Mr. JACOBS. I offer no judgment about that here.

I can only answer the gentleman by saying I am just curious to see if the House will do the same thing with these military contractors that it did with the public broadcasting contractors.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe if the gentleman will look at the record that amendment did not pass, on the public broadcasting. The one he refers to applied only to the officers of the corporation, but not to any officials of industry.

Mr. JACOBS. That is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. The amendment referring to industry was defeated.

Mr. JACOBS. I am referring to the employees of the Public Broadcasting Corp., which directly receives income from the U.S. Government.

Now about the Lockheed Corp., which receives God knows what percentage of its income from the Federal Government, but certainly more than 50 percent. Last year the Congress voted to take the risk not only out of doing business with the Government for the Lockheed Corp., but also the risk of just plain existing. And shortly after that, less than a year later, the Lockheed Corp. voted to increase its retirement benefits for corporate executives from $40,000 a year to $65,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I give my wholehearted support to the passage of H.R. 15495, the military procurement, research and development and personnel strength authorization for fiscal year 1973. At this juncture in world affairs there is no more important bill for the Congress to consider, at least no more important from the standpoint of preserving this country in the forefront of the nations of the world from a defense standpoint.

The bill has been carefully studied, worked over in most meticulous fashion and deserves the support of every Member of the House.

While my interest of course extends to every aspect of the bill I would like to draw particular attention to pages 29, 30, 31, and 44 of the fine committee report that accompanies this legislation.

In those pages the matter of certain urgent aircraft procurement is dealt with in a manner that will be rewarding for all Members to read. Included in this important part of the report are a number of important references to the F–111 fighter bomber which is being procured in very small numbers to fill out a fourth wing of these magnificent aircraft.

The F–111 line will continue to run until the latter part of calendar year 1974 but I think it a matter for our most serious consideration that this line should be continued beyond that time. The F–111 has proved itself in every respect. It has won bombing competitions against very much more experienced crews in other types of aircraft in our own inventory and, in at least one instance, the aircraft and the crews of Great Britain.

The price of this aircraft is known and that in itself is an unusual matter today. Its performance is known to all those responsible for our defense in the Department of the Air Force. It is my understanding, and I certainly hope that I am correct in my understanding, that plans are being formulated to continue the F–111 beyond the time that is now being thought of for its closing. I certainly lend my support to maintaining this line at its present level of production until we have a very much more certain picture of our future defense needs. The F–111 is, quite literally, a hedge against the future and against contingencies that may face us from a defense standpoint in that future.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, since February 21, 1972, when I first brought to the attention of our colleagues a most distressing situation—blacklisting by the military services of universities which had phased out their ROTC programs—I have on four other occasions inserted into the RECORD statements deploring this illogical, unsound, and punitive policy which is a threat to the academic freedom of this Nation, and to the basic strength and intelligence of our officer corps.

Many of my colleagues joined with me in expressing their indignation at this action and I have received letters of protest and outrage with respect to this policy. Yet, the Armed Services Committee has reported to this House legislation, H.R. 15495, the Military Procurement Authorization bill, before us today, which contains language in section 602 prohibiting the granting of funds to institutions of higher learning which have disestablished Reserve Officers Training Corps units or have prevented military personnel from recruiting on their campuses.

According to the latest list issued by the Pentagon to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, 14 colleges and universities would be injured by this provision. Based on estimates released by the Defense Department for fiscal 1972, this could mean a loss of $772,000 in research and development contracts to four universities in Massachusetts alone—Boston College, Boston University, Harvard University, and Tufts University. That sum is more than 4 percent of the total estimated expenditure of $18,000,000 for fiscal 1972 in research and development contracts to institutions of higher learning, and does not include other funds granted to universities under this bill.

According to figures released by the Department of Defense, the total DOD obligation to institutions of higher learning in fiscal 1971 including research and development contracts and other grants, was $248,000,000. Of that sum, 11 of the 14 universities affected by the disqualifying provision in this bill received a total of $24,305,000, or nearly 10 percent of the total DOD obligation—three of the schools which have disestablished ROTC units on their campuses received no DOD grants or contracts in fiscal 1971.

The universities which will lose sorely needed funds under this bill include some of the most distinguished institutions of higher learning in our Nation. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the propriety of allowing or disallowing recruiters or ROTC units on campuses is a policy matter which should reside in the universities themselves—universities which in a free society must remain free to make this determination and to define their own relationship with the military.

The thought of blacklisting universities because they elected to exercise their undeniable right to no longer participate in ROTC programs should be repugnant to the military and to all fair-minded individuals. This type of pressure and blacklisting introduces government pressure for military objectives in an unprecedented way into the academic life of this Nation. I deplore it.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleague, Congressman O'NEILL has stated on this subject:

The universities of this Nation cannot long remain free and independent if pressure from military quarters is to govern their behavior.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to express my opposition to section 602 of the military procurement bill which prohibits all defense grants in contracts and scholarships to universities which have forbidden ROTC on their campuses.

It is remarkable that a provision, at best a shortsighted and punitive reaction and one which does nothing to promote the welfare of the military and academic communities, should come before this floor.

The House Armed Services Committee action is a classic case of cutting off one's nose in spite of one's face, the notion being that the universities are of little or no use to Government and thus should be cut off. In truth, punishing the universities will mean tremendous losses to the United States.

Historically, the isolation of one group from another has brought misunderstanding, fear, and alienation. Isolation of military and civilian persons is a limitation on both military and civilian learning experiences which may result in officer demoralization, institutional mis-

management and alienation between academic and military persons. In these times of change, it is vital to the better management of all institutions that we, as Members of Congress, support the interchange of political questions. It would be most unfortunate when considerable misunderstanding already exists between the military and academic communities, for Members of this Congress to place additional obstacles in the way of reconciliation. Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs Roger T. Kelley made this point to Committee Chairman HÉBERT last September, but, as we can see, the section was retained.

The most serious implication of section 602, however, is the loss of vital research which has played a crucial role in the development of national security thinking. Of the contributions from the 15 schools affected by this legislation, the following projects at Harvard University, Brown and Princeton Universities are just a few of those to be terminated pending final decision by the Secretary of Defense:

A 20-year, $2 million project toward the development of electronic devices, for example, the maser amplifier, which has made possible the DEW radar line, Telstar communication, and deep-space tracking networks.

The development of antennaes and indicators used in submarines, aircraft, rockets, and land-based command and control with our Polaris/Poseidon submarine fleet.

The development of heart pacesetters and stimulators which have helped to keep millions alive.

The development of two master navigation systems used worldwide for rapid location of ships in distress and precision navigation.

The development of the automatic piloting device on the LEM module which revolutionized our landing on the moon—employing some 37 faculty members and supported by the Navy, Army, and Air Force. The same concepts of flight control have been used for drug control, inflationary problems, all types of transportation, and biomedicine.

The development of theories of continental drift, guidance systems using natural phenomenon, and world renowned studies in sonar research and polymers.

The impact of these changes are yet to be determined. Hopefully, we will never know that reality.

Finally, it seems especially peculiar that the House Armed Services Committee would retain section 602 in view of the Defense Department's opposition to it and the attempts made from 1970 through 1971 on the part of the universities and DOD to reconcile their differences.

On September 20, 1971, Assistant Secretary Kelley wrote committee chairman, HÉBERT, of recommended changes of ROTC legislation incorporated within a national education association report representing virtually all higher education institutions which would:

First. Change the name, ROTC to Officer Education Program.

Second. Specify that the curriculum be jointly developed by the school and the military.

Third. Provide equal status but not professorial rank for ROTC educators.

Assistant Secretary Kelley said of the report:

> The report adopted by the six national associations is a significant representation of the policy of almost all institutions hosting ROTC units. We feel that this has been an honest effort on the part of the universities to effect changes that they believe would strengthen ROTC and facilitate its continuance on the campus. It is our hope that this dialogue between the universities and the Congress will continue. It reflects a high degree of interest in helping to get the job done.

As late as February 11, 1972, Secretary of the Navy Chafee wrote to Congressman DRINAN, who was notified by an officer that a list of 15 prohibited schools had already been distributed:

> I share with your concern for the loss to the Navy and the nation of the excellent relationships previously experienced with these institutions.

Clearly, this section, which precludes any negotiations between the military and the university is not only oppressive but in truth, dictatorial. The armed services are opposed to it, the universities and education associations are opposed to it, and military officers are opposed to it. Nevertheless, the Armed Services Committee presents this section before us.

To be sure, if this section is enacted, the House Armed Services Committee would violate the timeworn, historic, and celebrated traditions of academic freedom. The logical extension of this high-handed intrusion into the university domain is that the Government shall, whenever it does not like what the university does, take action against them. Three centuries ago, Charles II, acting on political fears, ordered the burning of books at Oxford. Surely, this Congress does not want to go down in history as a body that followed autocratic practices.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong opposition to this bill and my support of the end-the-war amendment. When I first came to Congress, I stated that I would never vote for any military authorization or appropriation so long as our troops remained in Indochina and so long as our dollars were being spent to wreak destruction there. There are still thousands of young American ground troops there, apt to be killed even though not actively involved in the ground fighting. Every minute, tons of high explosives—napalm, antipersonnel weapons, bombs that devastate the people and the countryside—are being dropped on Indochina.

Richard Nixon promised to end this terrible war. Richard Nixon said that he had a plan. Richard Nixon did not tell us the truth.

The killing goes on.

The bombing goes on—even more than it did when Lyndon Johnson was in power.

The shattering spectacle of the most powerful nation on earth literally wiping out one of the smallest nations on earth, cratering its every square foot of land, turning its lush greenery to dead shades of gray and black, goes on.

We must withdraw immediately from Indochina, from its air and water as well as from its land. In addition, we must withdraw all military support from the puppet government of President Thieu, instead of allowing our desire to keep him in power to keep us involved in Indochina. This last aspect is a crucial one, for we cannot do right by the people of Vietnam unless we withdraw our money and our hardware as well as our men.

Even if Vietnam were no longer an issue, I could not vote in favor of the committee bill. In line with our misplaced priorities, it earmarks far too much of our budget for weapons. In addition, it violates the spirit of the SALT agreements by seeking to stuff with funding the loopholes which the Pentagon has been able to find in those agreements. I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) for his amendment to delete the $110 million provided in the bill to upgrade weapons programs not covered by the literal wording of the SALT pacts.

When the SALT agreements were signed, Mr. Nixon claimed that they represented progress in slowing the arms race; in fact, all they seem to mean is that the Defense Department must shift its ever-swelling funding to different weapons. It is time for Congress to reassert its constitutional repsonsibilities and to make the cuts in the war budget which are being presented today as amendments.

This House must exert its constitutional power to end our involvement in Vietnam, and to end it now. Today is our last opportunity to stop this madness before we leave for the Democratic Convention break. Many thousands of innocent people may die before we have another opportunity of this sort. I urge the adoption of the end-the-war amendment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I must object to many of the provisions of the $21,318,000,000 Department of Defense procurement authorization bill. Several extremely expensive programs included in this bill are totally unnecessary, particularly in light of the recent SALT agreements, and others would contribute to the continuation of our disastrous policy in Southeast Asia.

The promise of the SALT agreements was a reduction in the number of costly weapons systems which the American taxpayer would have to pay for, but this promise has been destroyed by the Secretary of Defense's recent call for increased arms expenditures. Instead of pursuing the philosophy of nuclear parity and sufficiency on which the agreements were based, Mr. Laird has proposed that we continue "full speed ahead" to build new and more costly weapons systems. That these new programs will contribute to a new weapons arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States has been the sad and costly lesson of the last two decades.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that at this moment in time we have a rare opportunity to really slow down the arms race. The recent SALT agreements were an important first step in the right direction, and perhaps now is the time to demonstrate our good faith on arms

limitations to the Russians by foregoing the procurement of this arsenal of new offensive weapons. If such a procurement freeze on offensive strategic weapons were pursued, the atmosphere at the SALT talks might be most conducive to the consumation of a really comprehensive arms limitation agreement; after all, a similar policy of restraint in the early 1960's led to the Nuclear Test Ban Agreement.

The administration's policy of building new weapons as "bargaining chips" is a dangerous and wasteful policy; its effect at the SALT bargaining table is dubious, but its cost for the American taxpayer is very real. In fact, it is quite likely that as we make new and more important technical advances in the weapons area, the Russians may well refue to reach an agreement until they possess the same technology. Thus, if the President feels that it is absolutely necessary for Congress to demonstrate its resolve, would it not be far wiser to appropriate these funds on a contingent basis?

Even if there were no arms limitations talks going on, several of the weapons systems included in this procurement authorization bill are of questionable value, and perhaps the most questionable of all is the CVAN–70 nuclear aircraft carrier. Mr. Chairman, aircraft carriers have been proven to be among the most vulnerable ships in our naval armada. In 1967, one 5-inch rocket accidentally fired from a plane on its flight deck put the USS *Forrestal* out of action for months at a cost of 134 men killed and 62 injured, 26 planes destroyed and 31 damaged, and $100,000,000 in repairs. At the present time, the Soviets have 65 submarines equipped with advanced antishipping cruise missiles similar to the type of missile which sunk the Israeli destroyer *Elath* in 1967. One expert on the subject, Gerald W. Johnson, has written:

> In recognition of their extreme vulnerability (of the U.S. carrier), over the past few years the Soviets have built and deployed long range homing missile systems equipped with 1-ton warheads based on submarines (some nuclear powered), aircraft, and surface ships. Such systems will have no trouble taking out carriers and, if necessary, their escorts as well.

To build another billion-dollar nuclear carrier under these conditions would be an act of folly.

The proposal to continue with the B–1 bomber also merits close scrutiny. Although there are certain advantages in having a mixed strategic weapons force, it must be kept in mind that our land and sea based missiles are now and will continue to be capable of inflicting unacceptable damage upon the Soviet Union. Missiles are also far more cost-effective than bombers, and they are not subject to the relatively effective air defenses which bombers must face. Thus, although the value of the B–1 is debatable, its cost would be enormous, perhaps as high as $47 billion if, as is probable, a new tanker is needed to replace the KC–135. Because the present supporting B–52 force is not deteriorating very quickly, I believe that a far more prudent course would be to consider further both the need for a strategic bomber force and the composition of that force, if needed. Perhaps a modernization of the B–52 force in the late 1970's would be more cost-effective than the development of the B–1.

Finally, I am not convinced of the need to begin a crash construction program of the Trident submarine. When the Poseidon missile program is completed in 1976, the U.S. submarine force will be able to launch 5,440 warheads. This arsenal of nuclear weapons will be capable of overwhelming even a "thick" ABM system, even though the Russians have shown no intention of building such a system, and it seems most unlikely that the Russians will be able to threaten this submarine force within the foreseeable future. In addition, one of the major advantages of the Trident, the longer range of the ULMS–I missile, could be built into the present Polaris submarine because the ULMS–I missile will be compatible with the Polaris launching tubes. Thus, although a system like the Trident may be needed in the future, progressing beyond the research and development stage would be premature at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I also cannot approve of this bill, because of the funds it contains for the perpetuation of the tragic war in Vietnam. On November 17, 1971, the President approved the Military Authorization Act for fiscal year 1972, Public Law 92–156, a law which declared it to be—

> The policy of the United States to terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations of the United States in Indochina, and to provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all United States military forces at a date certain, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government and an accounting for all Americans missing in action who have been held by or known to such Government or such forces.

Despite this law and despite the wish of the American people to terminate this war, the present administration has actually escalated the war by the greatest aerial bombardment in the history of man upon the people of Indochina. This war never has been and never will be vital to America's national interests. Yet, in order to camouflage the complete failure of this Vietnamization program, the President has decided, at a tremendous cost in American prestige throughout the world, to settle the question of who shall govern South Vietnam by physically destroying South Vietnam. In my opinion, the horrors which have resulted from this policy cannot be justified by this President's desire to "save face." Therefore, Mr. Chairman, because the courts have ruled that congressional approval of military appropriations and military authorizations is tantamount to "congressional support" for this war, I cannot vote for this bill.

I believe that this country needs a strong military and that this country must defend its vital interests abroad, but I cannot vote for a bill which contains incredibly costly weapons programs which will do little to improve our military posture and which have the potential to do much to stimulate a costly arms race and other programs which will prolong an unnecessary and divisive war. I believe that our national security consists of more than stockpiles of weapons—it also includes our national morale and the economic well being of our people. Instead of pouring billions and billions of dollars into unneeded military hardware and instead of continuing a senseless and tremendously costly war, we must turn to the difficult tasks of getting our economy on its feet again and of patching up the differences which have resulted from too many years of war. Only in this way can we really enhance our national security.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15495, the bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1973. This measure which have considered today provides for the procurement of aircraft, naval vessels, tracked vehicles, missiles, and other weapons, but equally and perhaps more important for research, development, test and evaluation of weapons for the Armed Forces.

The grand total authorized is $21.3 billion, with a breakdown substantially as follows: aircraft for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, $5.7 billion; missiles for the four services, $3.4 billion; naval vessels, $3.2 billion; tracked vehicles, $251.3 million; Navy torpedos, $194.2 million. The very important research, development, test, and evaluation for all four services total $8.3 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, quite a lot has been written and said recently about the fact that the SALT agreement constitutes a good beginning, but also an expensive beginning. I know that those who make these charges are speaking sincerely, but anyone who indicates that because of the SALT agreement or otherwise this authorization bill has been upped or increased, is speaking without any respect for the facts. Before they speak again they should look at the committee report accompanying H.R. 15495.

The truth of the matter is that the House Committee on Armed Services brought to the floor a $21.3 billion bill, which was over $1.5 billion below the amount requested by the Department of Defense. The true facts are that the Department of Defense request was for $22.8 billion, which our committee cut to $21.3 billion or a $1.5 billion reduction.

The committee accomplished changes or departures from the request of the Department of Defense by reducing research, development, test, and evaluation funds about $323 million. Another $309 million was denied for the Air Force's Airborne Warning and Control System—AWACS. The request for the Navy's DD–963 destroyer was reduced $363 million. Then, in line with the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic-missile systems and the interim agreement on offensive weapons systems, the authorization request for the Safeguard ABM system was reduced $692 million, which, of course, was based upon the presumption of constitutional approval of the treaties.

It should be interesting to note that there were some really good nondollar

modifications. Public Law 91-441 required prior authorization for personnel strength for each component of the Armed Forces as a condition precedent to the appropriation of funds for this purpose. This measure conforms to that law as we provide the strengths for the different components of the military services. Another nondollar modification is the prohibition of multiyear procurement contracts for weapons systems where the cancellation ceiling for procurement is in excess of $1 million.

The committee in the judgment of several of its members took a step in the right direction when it established the requirement for authorization prior to appropriation for the training and education of military personnel. This requirement will take effect after the close of the current calendar year. Another good move was to direct the Secretary of the Navy to assign some construction of naval vessels to naval shipyards, rather than to perform all of this work in private shipyards using the naval shipyards only for repair and construction, as at the present time. Along with other members of the committee, I was pleased to see that this bill prohibits the expenditure of any funds to institutions of higher learning where recruiting personnel of the Armed Forces are barred by policy or where the institution has required the involuntary disestablishment of ROTC.

On the subject of personnel costs, we should not forget that the efforts of the Congress to achieve all-volunteer force which was approved last year has, when coupled with inflation, meant that an ever increasing percentage of the military budget is required to meet personnel costs. In 1968 it was 42 percent of the total. In 1972 it had risen to 53 percent. In fiscal year 1973 manpower costs will account for 57 percent of the total defense budget.

Your committee has done its best to wrestle with the problem of cost escalation. We must take into account the realistic expectations with regard to inflation, and the attendant increases in wage scales. But the committee did make a careful review of the defense posture, and the committee wants every Member of the Congress to know, if they have any desire to understand present legislation, that defense spending has increased by a much more modest rate than spending for other public programs. There is no way to conceal the fact that present defense expenditures have reversed somewhat the downward trend of the last 4 years, because the new obligational authority totaling $83.4 billion is about $6.3 billion above last year's request, but the great bulk of this or approximately $4.1 billion is accounted for solely and only in the increases in the cost of military pay and pay of civilians working on military installations.

In the consideration of this bill before us today, it would be well for us to look at the comparison of United States and Soviet military capability, as well as to compare defense efforts of the two countries and the spending levels of the two countries. The first fact we should note is that the Soviets have almost four million men in uniform, and we have two and a half million. While the Soviets do not tell us much about their defense budget, we do know that the annual defense effort of the Soviet Union has been continuing to grow while ours has been shrinking. Their buildup has not come cheaply. The fact that the Soviets are willing, with an economy much smaller than ours and more backward, to support a defense effort as large as the United States, bears testimony to the importance they attach to defense.

Before I conclude these remarks, there are some observations which I believe should be recited for the record. We are in a world of change, where our own survival should always be a goal of primary national interest. I suppose even the critics of defense spending do not question this basic goal. They simply attack the size of the budget. It seems to me that these critics should take into account the unhappy fact that this legislation today is really a bill for survival, and like the bills that must be shouldered by any private business or the bills that must be paid by the head of any household, it has been increasing rather rapidly.

Critics of defense spending always seem to advance an appealing idea that we should divert enough money from the defense budget—which should be called a survival budget—to give more money to our schools, to rebuild the cities, and to provide more money for welfare programs. This kind of appeal, in my judgment, is illusory. If we are really interested in survival, our strength must be sufficient to deter any venture against us by a potential enemy. Arms expenditures almost certainly will remain high. But even if we reduce the manpower, and make our forces smaller, then they would have to be placed on better readiness and with more technological excellence. Even if we have a smaller standing force under arms, it must remain credible to a potential enemy. Who can forget back in 1962 at the time of the Cuban missile crisis that our defense was strong enough to convince our enemies? Then if there had been any doubt about the strength of our defense, the enemy would have run the risk of battle and all of our deterrents would have failed.

The dollar amount in this bill is large. This is because of wage-price inflation; the rapid technological advances requiring newer and newer military hardware all of the time; and then while not in this bill there are the high manpower costs, which are the highest ever presented in any annual Department of Defense budget.

When I suggested that the committee had done a commendable job by reducing the dollar amount in this bill by $1.5 billion, I did not mean to leave the suggestion that we cannot do better. We must improve on our weapons acquisition process. We must not rush into the production of weapons before they have been fully developed. We must avoid oversophistication of weapons. Overly complex weapons are expensive to maintain and may even be unreliable. In the future we must make an effort not to load down every weapons system with nonessential complex features, and that is why I think we should make a broader use of prototypes in furtherance of the slogan, "fly before you buy."

None of these problems have simple answers. Nuclear powered aircraft carriers are very expensive. The new generation of ballistic missile firing nuclear submarines will also be very expensive. It is no longer possible to argue whether a rich nation can afford both guns and butter no matter what quantities are needed. Even though defense costs are today taking a smaller portion of our national budget, that is no reason we should not continue to apply such restraints as to plan better, shop better, and get more value for our dollars.

We can call this a procurement bill or we may call it a survival bill. Let us never indulge in the illusion that we can enjoy cut rate defense. There is just no way to buy survival at a discount store. It is for this reason that I support this procurement bill, because it contains what is essential for national security in terms of modern weapons. I will continue to try to see that these essentials are provided, but only the essentials. No more.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) 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. 15495) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1973 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations in connection with the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1025, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 334, nays 59, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—334

Abbitt	Ashbrook	Biester
Adams	Ashley	Blackburn
Addabbo	Aspinall	Blatnik
Alexander	Baker	Boland
Anderson, Calif.	Barrett	Bow
	Begich	Brademas
Anderson, Ill.	Belcher	Bray
Andrews, Ala.	Bell	Brinkley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bennett	Brooks
	Bergland	Brotzman
Annunzio	Betts	Brown, Mich.
Archer	Bevill	Brown, Ohio
Arends	Biaggi	Broyhill, N.C.

Broyhill, Va.	Hays	Price, Ill.
Buchanan	Hébert	Price, Tex.
Burke, Mass.	Heckler, Mass.	Pryor, Ark.
Burleson, Tex.	Heinz	Pucinski
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	Purcell
Byrne, Pa.	Hicks, Mass.	Quie
Byrnes, Wis.	Hicks, Wash.	Quillen
Byron	Hillis	Railsback
Cabell	Hogan	Randall
Camp	Horton	Rarick
Carlson	Hosmer	Rhodes
Carney	Howard	Roberts
Carter	Hull	Robinson, Va.
Casey, Tex.	Hunt	Robison, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Rodino
Chamberlain	Ichord	Roe
Chappell	Jacobs	Rogers
Clancy	Jarman	Roncalio
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.
	Johnson, Pa.	Rostenkowski
Clawson, Del	Jonas	Roush
Cleveland	Jones, Ala.	Rousselot
Collier	Jones, N.C.	Roy
Collins, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Runnels
Colmer	Karth	Ruppe
Conable	Kazen	Ruth
Conover	Keating	Sandman
Conte	Keith	Satterfield
Corman	Kemp	Saylor
Cotter	King	Scherle
Coughlin	Kluczynski	Schmitz
Crane	Kuykendall	Scott
Daniel, Va.	Kyros	Sebelius
Daniels, N.J.	Landgrebe	Shipley
Danielson	Landrum	Shoup
Davis, Ga.	Latta	Shriver
Davis, Wis.	Leggett	Sikes
de la Garza	Lennon	Sisk
Delaney	Lent	Skubitz
Denholm	Lloyd	Slack
Dennis	Long, La.	Smith, Calif.
Derwinski	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Devine	Lujan	Smith, N.Y.
Dingell	McClory	Snyder
Donohue	McCloskey	Spence
Dorn	McClure	Springer
Downing	McCollister	Staggers
Dulski	McCormack	Stanton, J. William
Duncan	McCulloch	
du Pont	McEwen	Stanton, James V.
Dwyer	McFall	
Edmondson	McKay	Steed
Edwards, Ala.	McKevitt	Steele
Eilberg	McMillan	Steiger, Ariz.
Eshleman	Macdonald, Mass.	Steiger, Wis.
Evans, Colo.		Stephens
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Stratton
Fascell	Mahon	Stubblefield
Findley	Mailliard	Stuckey
Fish	Mallary	Sullivan
Fisher	Mann	Symington
Flood	Martin	Talcott
Flowers	Mathias, Calif.	Taylor
Flynt	Mathis, Ga.	Teague, Calif.
Foley	Matsunaga	Teague, Tex.
Ford, William D.	Mayne	Terry
	Mazzoli	Thompson, Ga.
Fountain	Meeds	Thomson, Wis.
Frelinghuysen	Melcher	Thone
Frenzel	Michel	Tiernan
Frey	Miller, Calif.	Udall
Fuqua	Miller, Ohio	Ullman
Galifianakis	Mills, Ark.	Van Deerlin
Garmatz	Mills, Md.	Vander Jagt
Gaydos	Minish	Veysey
Gettys	Mink	Vigorito
Giaimo	Minshall	Waggonner
Gibbons	Monagan	Wampler
Goldwater	Montgomery	Ware
Gonzalez	Moorhead	Whalley
Goodling	Morgan	White
Grasso	Murphy, Ill.	Whitehurst
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Green, Oreg.	Myers	Widnall
Griffiths	Natcher	Wiggins
Gross	Nelsen	Williams
Grover	Nichols	Wilson, Bob
Gubser	O'Konski	Wilson, Charles H.
Haley	O'Neill	
Hall	Passman	Winn
Halpern	Patman	Wright
Hamilton	Patten	Wyatt
Hammer-schmidt	Pelly	Wydler
	Pepper	Wylie
Hanley	Perkins	Wyman
Hanna	Pettis	Yatron
Hansen, Idaho	Peyser	Young, Fla.
Hansen, Wash.	Pickle	Young, Tex.
Harsha	Poage	Zablocki
Harvey	Poff	Zion
Hastings	Powell	
Hathaway	Preyer, N.C.	

NAYS—59

Abzug	Badillo	Bolling
Aspin	Bingham	Brasco
Burton	Green, Pa.	Rangel
Carey, N.Y.	Gude	Rees
Celler	Harrington	Reid
Chisholm	Hawkins	Reuss
Clay	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Collins, Ill.	Helstoski	Roybal
Conyers	Hungate	Ryan
Culver	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Curlin	Koch	Seiberling
Dellenback	Link	Stokes
Dellums	Metcalfe	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Mikva	Vanik
Dow	Mitchell	Waldie
Drinan	Nedzi	Whalen
Eckhardt	Nix	Wolff
Edwards, Calif.	Obey	Yates
Forsythe	Pike	Zwach
Fraser	Podell	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Riegle

NOT VOTING—38

Abernethy	Dowdy	McKinney
Abourezk	Erlenborn	Mizell
Anderson, Tenn.	Esch	Mollohan
	Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher
Baring	Fulton	Moss
Blanton	Gallagher	O'Hara
Boggs	Griffin	Pirnie
Broomfield	Hagan	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Holifield	St Germain
Caffery	Kee	Sarbanes
Clark	Kyl	Schneebeli
Davis, S.C.	McDade	Schwengel
Dent	McDonald, Mich.	
Dickinson		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Moss against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Clark with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Abourezk.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Sarbanes.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Gallagher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen; and

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Maj. Michael M. Mills, U.S. Air Force

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

HR. 14108. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13188) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8140) entitled "An act to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2) entitled "An act to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and to provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions, 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. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. SAXBE, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 910. An act for the relief of Dennis Keith Stanley.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 21, 1972.*

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 201 of Public Law 89-298, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on June 14, 1972, adopted Committee resolutions authorizing the following water resources development projects: Mississippi River at Moline, Ill.; and Panama City Harbor, Fla.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 22, 1972.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 2 of the Watershed Pro-

tection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are the following:

STATE, PROJECT, EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, AND APPROVAL DATE

Nebraska, Tekemah-Mud Creek, 1741, June 14, 1972.

New Hampshire, Sugar River, 1741, June 14, 1972.

South Carolina, Eighteen Mile Creek, 1741, June 14, 1972.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14108, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14108) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, within Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLER of California, DAVIS of Georgia, CABELL, BELL, and ESCH.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15259, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 15259) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1187)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15259) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 10, 19, 20, 24, 31, 37, 38, 39, and 47.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 40, 45, and 53, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$130,819,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$90,968,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,706,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,933,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$179,607,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,136,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$94,281,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,629,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 7; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 9; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 10; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 12; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 13; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 14; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 15; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number proposed in said amendment insert 16; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 7, 13, 18, 21, 26, 41, 43, 48, 54, 56, and 57.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
DAVID PRYOR,
DAVID R. OBEY,
LOUIS STOKES,
GUNN MCKAY,
GEORGE MAHON,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
ROBERT C. MCEWEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15259) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 1—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $181,500,000 to the general fund instead of $185,000,000 as proposed by the House and $183,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The

managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.—Appropriate $130,819,000 instead of $143,232,000 as proposed by the House and $126,632,000 as proposed by the Senate of which $90,968,000 shall be payable to the general fund instead of $103,070,000 as proposed by the House and $90,070,000 as proposed by the Senate, $16,706,000 to the highway fund instead of $16,750,000 as proposed by the House and $13,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, $2,933,000 to the water fund instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $13,960,000 to the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,160,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 7.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to appropriate $63,187,000 instead of $65,029,000 as proposed by the House and $63,242,600 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Managers agree that the Senate reduction in salary for the Director of the Office of Planning and Management should be reinstated. In doing so, however, the Managers also agree that the job description of this position should be reviewed by the appropriate Civil Service officials. The Managers therefore direct the Mayor-Commissioner to have this position reevaluated at the earliest possible date and adjusted accordingly.

Amendment No. 8.—Restores limitation of $7,500 for test borings and soils investigations proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9.—Provides that $2,000,000 shall be available for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10.—Provides that not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for the settlement of property damage claims not in excess of $500 each and personal injury claims not in excess of $1,000 each as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11.—Deletes provision, proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate, that not to exceed $50,000 of any appropriations available to the District of Columbia may be used to match financial contributions from the Department of Defense to the District of Columbia Office of Civil Defense for the purchase of civil defense equipment and supplies.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Amendment No. 12.—Provides cash gratuities of not to exceed $75 to each released prisoner as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $181,119,000 instead of $181,700,000 as proposed by the House and $181,513,900 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

EDUCATION

Amendment No. 14.—Appropriates $179,607,000 instead of $179,526,000 as proposed by the House and $179,907,300 as proposed by the Senate.

The Managers agree that the time for consolidation of the D.C. Teachers College and the Federal City College is overdue and suggest that merger plans be formulated by the Board of Higher Education and the District of Columbia Board of Education without further delay. The legislative history surrounding the passage of the District of Columbia Public Education Act (Public Law 89-791, dated November 7, 1966) clearly anticipates this action and recent Congressional efforts to accelerate a decision have been ineffective.

The Managers further direct that the fiscal year 1974 budget requests for these two institutions be combined as the first step toward consolidating these institutions.

Amendment No. 15.—Provides that $9,561,300 of the appropriation for education shall be for special education as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16.—Deletes provision of unvouchered allowances of $1,000 each for the Superintendent of Schools, the President of the Federal City College, the President of the Washington Technical Institute, and the President of the District of Columbia Teachers College proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17.—Deletes provision exempting teachers from the dual compensation laws proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

RECREATION

Amendment No. 18.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $13,829,000 instead of $13,860,000 as proposed by the House and $13,843,500 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20.—Delete word authorized proposed by the Senate and restore words including those under sectarian control proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate. These amendments relate to care and treatment of indigent patients in contract hospitals.

Amendment No. 21.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $207,587,000 instead of $208,709,000 as proposed by the House and $209,915,800 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 22.—Deletes residency requirement for medical assistance to the aged and the needy proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23.—Deletes authority to make training payments or stipends to the patients of the public health and vocational rehabilitation programs of the Department of Human Resources proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

Amendment No. 24.—Provides $166,700 for traffic safety education as proposed by the House instead of $182,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25.—Deletes words without reference to any other law proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $21,814,000 instead of $21,711,000 as proposed by the House and $21,372,400 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will offer a motion do concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 27.—Provides $20,136,900 shall be payable from the highway fund instead of $20,042,300 as proposed by the House and $20,950,500 as proposed by the Senate.

The Managers note with dismay that, as the fiscal year comes to a close, there is a tendency on the part of Department heads and administrators to spend any funds that might be over and above their requirements for the fiscal year. We believe that this practice, while in keeping with the letter of the law, is not in keeping with the spirit of the law. The Managers would like to stress that, where programs can be carried out within the available funding, the excess should be carried forward rather than spent just to meet the budget. An example of how this has backfired in fiscal year 1972 is the overspending in the Department of Highways and Traffic with regard to snow removal. Excess funds in this case were spent to "stockpile" materials for next year and for this reason the Senate reduced the amount it appropriated for this purpose. With the recent flood, these funds are now needed. Had the 1972 funding not been expended in this manner, part of the waste created by the flood could have been avoided.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29.—Appropriate $44,309,800 of which $13,646,100 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of $44,710,000 of which $13,846,100 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the House.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendments Nos. 30, 31, 32, and 33.—Appropriate $94,281,000 instead of $131,394,000 as proposed by the House and $81,754,100 as proposed by the Senate, of which $12,227,700 shall be payable from the highway fund, $2,200,000 from the water fund, and $1,020,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund, instead of $12,227,700 from the highway fund, $2,420,000 from the water fund, $1,760,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the House and $3,360,000 from the highway fund, $1,200,000 from the water fund, $1,020,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate.

The following projects are included in the bill as agreed to in conference:

Project title	*Amount*
District of Columbia Obligations	$1,051,600
Public Schools:	
Anacostia Senior High School addition	1,000,000
Shaw Junior High School replacement	235,000
New elementary and junior high school, Oxon Run Pkwy. SE	16,380,500
New elementary school, 31st and Erie Sts. SE	6,983,000
Dunbar Senior High school replacement	13,181,000
Federal City College:	
Renovation of Old Central Library	550,000
District of Columbia Teachers College:	
Unused space in the Miner Building	135,000
Demountable classrooms	10,000
Department of Human Resources:	
Air condition remaining buildings (patient), District of Columbia General Hospital	1,778,000
New morgue building, District of Columbia General Hospital	150,000
Department of Highways and Traffic:	
Street lighting and communication extensions	431,000
Street improvements and extensions	2,960,000
Highway planning, programming, and research	400,000
Potomac River Freeway	2,345,000
H Street NE., grade separation	302,700
South Capitol Street Bridge	2,000,000
Cover on Federal aid streets	615,000
Heater on Federal aid streets	418,000
Metro betterment	880,000

Benning Road Bridge over Anacostia River	$90,000
Connecticut Avenue Bridge over Klingle Valley	400,000
Southern Avenue SE	970,000
Chain Bridge	33,000
Northbound 14th Street Bridge deck repair	101,000
Anacostia Freeway Bridge over Oxon Run	250,000
Anacostia Freeway, Kenilworth Avenue safety improvements	169,000
Benning Road pedestrian overpass	29,000
Suitland Parkway pedestrian overpass	88,000
South Capitol Street	80,000
Bridge railing improvement program	37,000
Channelization on Federal aid streets	50,000
Emergency communications system	10,000
Department of Environmental Services:	
Advance of paving	2,950,000
Sewer separation	500,000
Service sewer extensions	1,020,000
Service extension and hydrants	1,200,000
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority:	
Capital contribution for construction—Regional Rapid Rail Transit System	33,498,000
Washington Aqueduct:	
Water treatment plant, improvements and extensions, Dalecarlia and McMillan	870,000
Plant major replacements and rehabilitation, Dalecarlia and McMillan	130,000
Total	94,280,800

Amendment No. 34.—Provides $2,629,500 shall be available for construction services instead of $4,332,000 as proposed by the House and $2,516,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35.—Deletes limitation on availability of capital outlay funds previously appropriated to 2 years from the date that the language was first inserted as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 36.—Deletes words without counter signature with reference to issuance of checks by designated disbursing officials proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37.—Restores provision relating to availability of appropriations for privately owned automobiles used for the performance of official duties proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39.—Changes section numbers.

Amendment No. 40.—Deletes provision authorizing the advance of funds to officials proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the provision relating to the installation of meters in taxicabs proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate and to change the section number. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 42.—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 43.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the provision relating to the operation and utilization of motor vehicles proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate and to change the section number. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 44.—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 45.—Deletes provision relating to the furnishing of uniforms proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46.—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 47.—Deletes provision relating to the allocation for construction services proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the provision that the limitations and legislative provisions contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961 shall be applicable during the current fiscal year, including a 10 per centum limitation for construction services, a $200,000 limitation on the confidential fund for the Chief of Police and an exception to a limitation with respect to Sanitary Engineering, proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate, and changes the section number. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

It is the opinion of the Managers that while the present bill contains many legislative items, some of which are by reference to the 1961 Appropriation Act, the 1974 budget request should be purged of all legislative language. In order for this to be possible, the Managers recognize there must be Congressional action. Since the Senate has already passed S. 2204, which eliminates much of the legislation in this year's bill, the Managers urge that the House take such action as may be necessary to act on this pending legislation. The Managers also urge both the House and Senate to act expeditiously to eliminate other legislative items that this pending legislation does not provide for and which will affect the operation of the Government of the District of Columbia in fiscal 1974.

Amendment No. 49.—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 50.—Changes section numbers.

Amendment No. 51.—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 52.—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 53.—Provides not to exceed 4½ per centum of total of all funds appropriated for personnel compensation may be used for overtime or temporary positions as proposed by the Senate instead of 5 per centum as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54.—Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to delete the words *budget classification 01* proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate, and insert an exception to the limitation in amendment numbered 53 for temporary employees provided for the Courts and Department of Corrections. The Managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 55.—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 56.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the provision restricting employment in the government of the District of Columbia proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate with an exception to certain temporary employees for the Courts and Department of Corrections. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 57.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the prohibition on the use of educational appropriations to permit, encourage, facilitate or further partisan political activities proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

It is the intent of the Managers that none of the funds appropriated for educational operations would be used in connection with partisan political activities. This restriction is to insure that the schoolchildren of the District of Columbia are not used as pawns or tools to encourage political action for or against any particular legislation. This is not intended to prevent the use of available school buildings by any community group during non-school hours.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

Federal funds

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	$280,251,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	343,306,000
House bill, fiscal year 1973	332,306,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	313,706,000
Conference agreement	[1] 316,393,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	+36,142,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	−26,913,000
House bill, fiscal year 1973	−15,913,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	+2,687,000

District of Columbia funds

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	$1,014,230,700
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	900,888,000
House bill, fiscal year 1973	875,662,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	824,882,400
Conference agreement	[1] 834,756,800
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972	−179,473,900
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	−66,131,200
House bill, fiscal year 1973	−40,905,200
Senate bill, fiscal year 1973	+9,874,400

[1] Includes amounts in amendments reported in technical disagreement.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
DAVID PRYOR,
DAVID R. OBEY,
LOUIS STOKES,
GUNN MCKAY,
GEORGE MAHON,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
ROBERT C. MCEWEN,
JOHN T. MYERS,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER S. 3715, TO AMEND AND EXTEND DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous vote of the Committee on Banking

and Currency, I was instructed to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 3715) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 15692, INTEREST RATE ON SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 15692) to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14455, COMMUNICABLE DISEASE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1026, Rept. No. 92–1181), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 1026

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. 14455) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and revise the program of assistance under that Act for the control and prevention of communicable diseases. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 14455, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3442, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 14455 as passed by the House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15081, NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1027, Rept. No. 92–1182), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 1027

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. 15081) to amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack against heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 15081, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3323, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 15081 as passed the House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15587, EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1028, Rept. No. 92–1183), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 1028

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 27(d)(4) of Rule XI to the contrary notwithstanding, 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. 15587) to provide for a six-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. 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 Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1021 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1021

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. 15390) to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. 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 Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the debt limitation legislation and there will be no hurry on it because haste makes waste, apparently, and I have enough requests from my side of the aisle to use the entire 30 minutes that will be requested.

When I move the previous question I know that there are those who are going to ask that the previous question be defeated in order that they may offer amendments concerning various tax loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1021 provides a closed rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15390, the public debt limitation legislation. No amendments shall be in order except those offered at the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and all points of order against the bill are waived. The reason for the waiver is that the initial Liberty Loan Act provided for an appropriation of the moneys involved in the payment of interest on securities that the act itself permitted the Secretary of the Treasury to issue. Since this is an amendment to the act which required a waiver initially, it also needs one.

The purpose of H.R. 15390 is merely to extend the present temporary debt limit to October 31, 1972, which otherwise would expire on June 30.

The permanent debt limit under present law is $400 billion and the temporary additional limit is $50 billion. This legislation is merely an extension; it does not increase the limit.

Enactment of the legislation will not

result in additional cost to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that H.R. 15390 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1021 does provide for 2 hours to consider the bill H.R. 15390, the public debt limitation bill. It waives points of order and it is a closed rule.

The administration originally requested an extension of the permanent and temporary debt to a total of $465 billion through February of 1973.

The majority of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means decided they would keep the permanent $400 billion ceiling and the $50 billion temporary additional, making a total of $450 billion through October 31, 1972.

So this is an extension from June 30, 1972, through October 31, 1972. We will have to have an increase prior to October 31, 1972.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means testified that he felt we needed a little additional information as to what the excessive spending might be and what the revenue would be prior to a further increase, and preferred to keep this ceiling until October 31.

The distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) indicated before the Committee on Rules that he did not think we would have any more information between now and October 31 than we presently have. But he did feel that we probably would know who the Democratic nominees for President and Vice President would be at that time and as long as the majority members of the committee had the votes there was not much the minority could do except to relax and enjoy it.

I am not convinced in my own mind why points of order are waived and the rule is closed. I do not know how many times I have presented the rule on a debt ceiling increase, but I never really have understood why we have a closed rule and why we waive points of order.

I guess I will have to present a similar rule once more before October 31—maybe I will find out by then.

I have been told that the original Liberty Loan Act had an appropriation in it, and was considered under a closed rule and waived points of order whereby—a rule subsequent thereto has to also waive points of order, and be closed.

Maybe that is so—I do not know. But in any event, there is nothing in the bill that has to do with changing the Internal Revenue Code.

If the rule is voted down and it is amended to include at least two different provisions, one I think is the accelerated depreciation and the other is the minimum 10-percent tax then, of course, it will have to do with the Internal Revenue Code.

I understand, and I have read, and I think I have heard the chairman of the committee who indicated some 52 or 54 different provisions of the Revenue Code will probably be studied and I think these two are included in those 52 or 54 provisions.

As to a closed rule, I cannot figure out why we have a closed rule as we have always had. There is nothing amending the revenue code.

The only purpose of a closed rule is simply to prohibit amendments so that it can be passed as is.

But, as I say, I have often wondered about that and maybe between now and October 31, I will be able to find out so I can give you a good answer in my swan song on presenting my last debt limit rule prior to my retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the previous question not be voted down.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says we will have to go back to a debt ceiling increase on or before October 31; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is my understanding—if the amount of the debt is over $450 billion by that time, we will have to have an increase. The administration estimates $465 billion will take it through February, 1973.

Mr. GROSS. What does that mean? We have not always met the expiration date; have we? Has there not been a time when in an extension of the debt ceiling, we have run over the expiration date?

Mr. SMITH of California. I remember at least one time. I do not know whether we have done it more than once, but I do remember once.

Mr. GROSS. In the gentleman's opinion, is this date of October 31, 1972, a built-in gimmick to provide for a lame duck session of the Congress? It is pretty obvious, it seems to me, that the Congress will not be in session on October 31 and probably not for 2 or 3 weeks before that, hopefully a month before the election. But is this a built-in gimmick to produce a lame duck session of the Congress?

Mr. SMITH of California. I could not comment on that, but I will say that prior to October 31, 1972, the debt will have to be increased above the $450 billion ceiling which is in the bill we are considering here today.

Mr. GROSS. I am unable to understand why, if there has to be an increase in the debt ceiling that there should not be a realistic increase in the debt ceiling and one that would take the ceiling up to the point of, let us say, next January or February, or late in January or February of next year.

I should think that those, including the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, who engineered the bill through here only a couple of days ago to provide for revenue sharing to the tune of over $5 billion for the year would have some idea of what it is going to take to meet a debt ceiling in the future and the requirement for a debt ceiling in the future.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman from Iowa raises a question about whether we should not have had a realistic increase in the debt ceiling. I think the gentleman would like to know that initially the administration asked for an increase. I moved for that increase in the committee, and the administration later changed their mind and said that they were satisfied with this, and would rather have this than some of the alternatives that were proposed.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California, I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Let nothing I have said be construed as indicating that I am going to vote for a debt ceiling increase either now or later.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on this debt which is now about $400 billion, the objective of the bill is to raise it to $450 billion temporarily. I testified before the Ways and Means Committee, and I asked them not to raise it because the Federal Reserve had already paid $70 billion for the purchase of U.S. Government, interest-bearing bonds, and this amount could be stricken from the debt.

Being the fiscal agents of the United States, the Federal Reserve is privileged to do that. They have taken our money and bought our bonds, but do not cancel the bonds. They have been drawing $4 billion a year interest on those bonds, and both the money that paid for them and the bonds are still outstanding. One cannot conceive of anything more inflationary than that, but the bad thing is that the bonds have been paid for by good U.S. credit and currency, that says on its face, this currency is good for all debts, public and private, and if you offer these notes, the currency that you have in your pocket, in payment of a debt, and the person to whom you owe the debt refuses to accept that money, the debt is paid. You can keep your money and the debt is paid. The money is just that good.

In this case the money has been spent for the bonds—the $70 billion—but the bonds are still outstanding.

It is customary with a lot of fine, religious denominations when they go into debt and they pay off bonds over a long period of time, and pay the interest on them, that when they pay those bonds off, they have a bond-burning. It is one of the greatest events of a decade or a generation, sometimes a century. They have liquidated their debts; they have paid them off; and they have a bond-burning.

If we would do the same thing, this debt would be reduced $70 billion, and we would not have to be here today. We would not have to extend it. Is there anything wrong with that? It has been paid for. It is paid for by the fiscal agent of the United States, the Federal Reserve, paid for with U.S. money.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman asked a tempting question. He asked whether there was anything wrong with it. Would he mind telling the House what there would be in support of and in back of our money, if we do as he suggests?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Is it not so that there would be no other backing then?

Mr. PATMAN. No; you are mistaken. It is orthodox. It is absolutely orthodox. There is no way that anyone can deny it is orthodox.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would it not be necessary to turn around and rebuy those bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. We would not have to at all.

Mr. WAGGONNER. It would be, if we had anything in support of or in back of our money.

Mr. PATMAN. I have only a limited time. These bonds are paid for once. We do not pay for bonds twice, but in this system they are paying for them two or three and four times.

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, is it not true the only effect of canceling these bonds would be to make the Federal Reserve System come to the Congress for an appropriation every year?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct in part.

Mr. GIBBONS. They do not want to come to Congress for that appropriation.

Mr. PATMAN. They spend these funds without any congressional authority. It is something that every Member should have an answer for, or should vote to have an audit of the Federal Reserve and require them to come to Congress for their funds. If we had an audit of them, this would have been disclosed several years ago.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not within the prerogative of the gentleman's committee, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, to produce such legislation if he really wants it?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then, why does the gentleman not bring that legislation to the floor, I might ask?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have the votes. Remember this, the Ways and Means Committee, the Democratic Members put the members on our committee. We just do not have the votes. The Ways and Means Committee could do it. They have concurrent jurisdiction, but they refuse to do it, too.

The truth is that the big banks of this country have built-in intimidation against every Member of the U.S. Congress and every member of the legislatures of the 50 States. The ordinary Member who has not studied this question will not dare buck the big banks of this country. They have too much power. It is built-in power. It is intimidation. The Members will not dare, in other words, to cross the banks and oppose them, because it is too dangerous. They can cause the defeat of Congressmen and all kinds of trouble and everything else. That is the reason we cannot get a vote.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, I am afraid the gentleman is going to have to speak for himself when he says the bankers of this country have built-in intimidation for every Member of this Congress. He can speak for himself.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is not quoting me correctly.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I did not know the gentleman could be intimidated.

Mr. PATMAN. I said the big bankers of this country, like Wall Street, the 50 banks that own over half the resources of this country.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman did say for every Member there is built-in intimidation; did he not?

Mr. PATMAN. It is built-in intimidation.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am surprised the gentleman can be intimidated after all these years.

Mr. PATMAN. It is intimidation against every Member of this Congress and against every member of the legislatures of the 50 States.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman should be ashamed to be intimidated.

Mr. PATMAN. All right, the gentleman can count on one hand the Members who are willing to take opposite sides from the big banks in this country.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman in the well or the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee have any information about reports circulating about this Capitol very persistently that the President intends to do precisely what the gentleman is saying and propose some time during July, after we have voted on this increase in the debt limit a substantial cut in the deficit by rearranging the bookkeeping. Does the gentleman know whether there is such a plan in the Treasury Department?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, they have in mind the national debt, and everybody will be paying interest on it. They are paying this on Government money. They are creating money, which they have a right to do. Nobody objects to that if it is done in the public interest, but this is not done in the public interest.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not know if there is any truth to it, because I do not have access obviously to the President's thinking, but there are persistent reports that the President does intend to make a spectacular announcement on this some time in July to show how he is reducing the national debt. I wonder if the distinguished Chairman has any knowledge of any such plans?

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest one time in July 1932, after the Congress adjourned, the military ran the Veterans of World War I, 20,000 of them, out of the Capital City on the theory they were lobbying, but the military did not touch the lobbyists in the Mayflower Hotel or the big hotels of this town, but they ran those poor, ragged, hungry veterans out by force and guns.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the few virtues that I see in this perennial exercise which is now before us of increasing the public debt ceiling is that it seems to be about the only time in the course of a year when this body deals even in a peripheral after-the-fact way with management of the Federal budget. It comes, of course, at the wrong end of the string, after the contracts have been made, the checks written, and the obligations assumed, so there really is not much we can do about the question but to authorize the increase in the public debt.

It does provoke some discussion about revenue and the relationship to expenditures, and I believe that is good.

I was gratified a few days ago to have the support of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), two distinguished Members of the Ways and Means Committee, two Members of the Appropriations Committee, and several other Members of this body in cosponsoring a bill which would alter the rules of the House of Representatives and require that the House adopt a comprehensive Federal budget before it could consider any appropriation bill.

This would involve, of course, the question of the public debt level. If the anticipated expenditures exceeded revenues, then the resolution would have to deal with the knotty question of what to do about the difference, to recommend higher taxes or to recommend higher public debt, or both.

Well, today we have the question after the fact, at the wrong end of the string. That I regret. I hope next year the House will alter the rules to provide for the adoption of a resolution on a Federal budget before any appropriation bills can be considered.

Meanwhile, judging by the mail I get, we do have the opportunity today to consider something that does go to the heart of the same question; that is the possibility of additional revenue at this stage in order to counterbalance a part of the debt that seems in prospect. I suggest it is not inappropriate for us to consider this question.

We have already this year adopted one bill to increase the public debt ceiling. We are in the process today of doing the same thing. The comment of the gentleman from California suggests that before the year is over we will do it again, perhaps by November 1 or thereabouts.

What could be more rational than for us to consider at this stage some measures to increase revenue? I believe it would be heartening to the American people if they got the word that here, in the midst of an election year, this body, which has the special responsibility under the Constitution to deal with the purse strings of Government, saw fit to consider revenue measures even as it was considering the question of the public debt.

So I hope the members of the Ways and Means Committee who may be pres-

ent and able to participate in the discussion here today will deal seriously with the proposal I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) will make, which will open up the possibility of considering at least two minor but I think progressive measures to increase revenue in this difficult year in which a very heavy deficit is in prospect.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

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

INTEREST RATES ON SBA DISASTER LOANS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported H.R. 15692, with amendments, which is intended to reduce the interest rate on SBA disaster loans. These are the kinds of loans that are to be made to the hundreds of thousands of people who have suffered severe damages and great losses within the past week as a result of tropical storm Agnes and the rains that followed. Many of these people have lost their homes and all of their possessions. A lifetime of effort, earnings and savings have been wiped out as businesses have been ruined and destroyed.

Today's newspaper indicates that 95 areas in five eastern States have been declared eligible for low-interest flood aid. My State of Pennsylvania was probably the hardest hit. Damages have been initially estimated at about $1 billion. Figures for the five States indicate that damages may run to $3 billion or more.

Governor Shapp of Pennsylvania met today with the Pennsylvania congressional delegation and outlined the situation in my State. It is a very dismal picture. Only 31 counties have been declared disaster areas so far by the administration, while the State is working in 61 of the 67 counties in the State. The initial indications of financial aid from the Federal Government are far from sufficient to meet the needs of the people from the current disaster. Needless to say our Governor views this with alarm and skepticism particularly when one realizes that funds have been withheld for the flood damage to parts of eastern Pennsylvania last year. Prompt collection and use of funds for last year's damage has been impossible because of the reams of paperwork and redtape; hardly a sign of good faith effort and humanitarian concern on the part of the administration.

The Governor reported that 40 to 50,000 homes in the State are under water; that many major industries have been ruined which means great industrial losses and many people unemployed; that $50 million are needed for schools which have been damaged or destroyed; approximately $550 million are needed for repair to roads and bridges. The plight of the railroads, which suffered $50 to $60 million in damages, is particularly acute since all of them are in financial trouble, even before the storm.

The plight of the homeowner and small businessman is particularly acute. He must of necessity turn to the Federal Government for assistance and the Federal Government has a responsibility and a duty to help these of its people. The bill reported by the committee this morning is designed for this purpose; it would change and reduce the interest rate on these disaster loans. Present interest is determined by the price the Treasury pays for money in the market, with the Secretary of the Treasury authorized to reduce this by as much as 2 percent. These rates change monthly; the present formula rate is 5⅛ percent after the allowed reduction.

The bill would change this formula and establish a legislative formula of 1 percent, or 3 percent with a forgiveness feature equal to 25 percent of the principle of the loan with a maximum of $2,500 to be forgiven. In addition, the program would be tightened up administratively, so as to prevent diverting the use of the funds from the intended purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this is much needed legislation. It is urgently needed and the administration has done nothing to support this effort to assist our people who have been so hard hit by the recent storm.

In fact, there are signs that it is impeding consideration of the bill. The committee chairman, my friend from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) has sought cooperation from the minority side in the House, our colleagues across the aisle without success. I sincerely hope that this delay is only temporary and that we can act before recessing at the end of this week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the previous question, when it is offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) be voted down so that I may be permitted to offer an amended rule, not a totally open rule but an amended rule, which is printed in yesterday's RECORD at page 22467, which would permit two tax reform amendments. These are known as the fiscal responsibility amendments. I should like to describe wherein they do the job.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Does the gentleman not believe it would be a good idea to vote down the previous question on this rule? Then we could bring up this $70 billion.

And we could bring up what the gentleman has in mind and we will actually be Members of Congress doing something meaningful on the floor of the House where we are elected to serve.

Mr. REUSS. Yes; I do. And the reason why I feel that way is this: The debt ceiling legislation is made necessary because back to back for the 3 fiscal years now before us we are running deficits, any way you figure them, on the order of $110 billion. For the fiscal year 1973, which starts in 3 days, while the administration estimates a deficit of $27 billion, I find the estimate of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. MILLS) that that deficit will be closer to $33 billion or $35 billion, much more in line with reality.

What a deficit of that size means is that we are going to be at least $5 billion or $6 billion into a "deficit on a deficit"—an extra deficit over the so-called full employment mythological deficit. Such fiscal irresponsibility will lead again inevitably to inflation here at home. It is already leading to tight money here at home with the increase in the prime rate that we saw only yesterday. Abroad, the dollar is once again under pressure. The main reason why it is under pressure is that foreign financial experts, looking at the absolutely unconscionable fiscal mess we are in, conclude that we are not very interested in preserving a sound dollar.

Thus today offers us a particularly good opportunity to strike a blow for fiscal responsibility, right at the start of fiscal 1973.

Now, what can you do about it? There are only two ways to lessen deficits. One is to cut spending. The other is to raise revenues.

I would have supported, and would support, a spending limitation in this bill. The administration before the Committee on Ways and Means opposed it. What I offer instead, by a modified rule, is an opportunity to vote to plug two tax loopholes which I shall describe in a minute, which, if plugged, would yield the very $5 billion or $6 billion a year which is necessary in order to get rid of the excess "deficit on a deficit."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I will yield in just 1 minute to my friend, Mr. BYRNES. I wanted to describe exactly what it is I am doing.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I make reference to your statement that the administration opposed a spending ceiling. They have asked for the spending ceiling; they have not opposed it at all.

Mr. REUSS. I am glad the gentleman has given me an opportunity to clarify my statement. The administration does support a spending ceiling. However, when Mr. Stein, the administration's witness, the chief of the Council of Economic Advisers, testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means he stated—and I am not sure the gentleman from Wisconsin was in the room at the time——

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes, I was.

Mr. REUSS. That the administration did not want a spending ceiling attached to this debt ceiling bill, and that is what I had reference to.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And he gave the reason, which I think the gentleman ought to state.

Mr. REUSS. He was interested in a clean bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The reason was a conflict in jurisdiction between committees, and this was such an important matter that they did not want to have it postponed by a jurisdictional fight between two committees, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. REUSS. In a veritable frenzy of cleanliness, the administration witness asked for a clean bill. The thought

crossed my mind that maybe the administration did not want the kind of loophole plugging amendment that I now propose.

Be that as it may, they may not want my limitation, but I am perfectly ready to accept their limitation.

Let us look at why loophole plugging is an exercise worthy of our endeavors this afternoon. Despite the 1969 minimum income tax, in 1970, the last year for which we have figures, 394 taxpayers with $100,000 or more of loophole income paid not one penny of Federal income tax.

Eighteen thousand taxpayers who are affected by the minimum income tax paid an average of 4 percent, which is about one-third of what a wage earner has to pay.

If my amended rule is adopted, and it would take a voting down of the previous question to do this, we would get a chance to vote on two loopholes, each of them worth from $2 billion to $3 billion under a plugging of the loopholes. One would tighten up the minimum tax, raise the tax from 10 percent to 20 percent, which would simply mean that someone with $100,000 worth of income would still be paying less than the average wage earner. The other loophole for which we seek plugging is the so-called asset depreciation range, which departs from the principle of useful life and instead grants an entirely mythological 20 percent extra depreciation, thus losing from the revenues $3 billion a year.

A recent McGraw-Hill survey shows that only about 10 percent of that $3 billion ever comes back in increased investment. So I would hope that the previous question would be voted down, and then that the amended rule would be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I will grant the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional minute in order that he may answer a question posed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). Is that agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. REUSS. It is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the previous question is voted down the House would not be limited to the gentleman's amendment, would it?

Mr. REUSS. It would not. I believe that under the rules the Speaker might be inclined to recognize me as the principal opponent of the closed rule. And I say right now that I would be receptive to other amendments that Members may propose having to do with fiscal responsibility. Specifically if somebody wants to offer a spending limitation amendment, I would want that to be included. And if someone, rather than plugging loopholes wants to tax the poor an additional $6 billion, he should be entitled to offer that amendment.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to offer as a part of the gentleman's amendment the text of the bill H.R. 144 which provides for a mandatory balanced budget and annual payments on the Federal debt. I cannot think of anything more fiscally responsible than that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly enamored of the amendments that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has indicated he would like to offer. I think it is inevitable that we are going to have to raise taxes but whether this is the way to raise them or not I am not at all sure and I would certainly prefer to have hearings. I do not think I would support either one of these amendments today. But I do think the gentleman has the right to offer them, even so.

Mr. Speaker, I rise against the rule not because I am interested in the gentleman's proposed amendments but because I detest these closed rules. I think they are antithetical to the real basis of representative government. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), wants to offer an amendment, and good or bad, I think that is his privilege as a Member of this House.

I think it is my privilege as a Member of this House, and I think it is your privilege as a Member of this House, and I think the people we represent are entitled to have us rise here and speak for them.

There is no reason for closing this rule. We had a gag rule here last week on another bill. I was against that and I am against this one.

I am not in favor of my friend's proposed tax amendments but I will not help them close this rule.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin could clarify this point.

As I understand the gentleman's intention, if the previous question is voted down and he has time thereby, he will be willing to yield time for the purpose of another Member offering a revenue-producing amendment; am I correct on that?

Mr. REUSS. You are entirely correct in that. I would, I believe, under the rules have an hour's time, and I will try to allot the time as fairly as the controller of the time on this rule has done. I would say I would be prepared to yield not only for a revenue-sharing amendment, but for an expenditure-limiting amendment, because I think that Members have a right to work on both sides of the equation.

Mr. FINDLEY. In other words, it is not your intention to limit consideration to only the two amendments you have in mind?

Mr. REUSS. It is not.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not envy the job of the Ways and Means Committee. I think they have probably the roughest job in this Congress.

But I would like to give you just one reason why I would like to open up this rule.

I sit on the Committee on Appropriations. That committee is affectionately known around here as the Freddie Flintheart Club. We are told day after day by Members of this House that we do not spend enough money for water pollution cleanup and we do not spend enough money for education and we do not spend enough money for health and that we do not spend enough money for a dozen other items.

Yet, a good many of the people who tell us that are the same people who on two occasions since I have been a Member of this House have supported actions which have, in fact, reduced the total revenue pot available to this Congress and to the Appropriations Committee to fund those programs that many of us have expressed concern about.

I am reminded of when I was in the legislature back in 1965 in Wisconsin. At that time the Governor of the State and a good many people in the legislature told the people of the State that we had a balanced budget without a tax increase. There were some of us in the legislature who were warning that after the election the people would find out that the budget was not so balanced after all and, in fact, we would be faced with a very large tax increase—and they were. That increase came after the election and not before.

It seems to me we are in the same position here today. I think most of the people in this House recognize that a lot of our constituents are being lulled into an unawareness of what is waiting for them right around the corner. After election, I do not think there is much doubt about it, they are going to be faced with suggestions for a national sales tax—a value-added tax—or some other kind of tax unless the fiscal situation changes remarkably from what it is today.

The amendment the gentleman from Wisconsin is offering—and I am joining with him, assuming we open up the rule—that amendment would help us by giving us an opportunity to at least reduce the shock of what is in fact waiting for the people right around the corner by eliminating at least $6 billion in special tax privileges.

I would urge you to support the opening up of the rule.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of House Resolution 1021

which would provide a closed rule for the consideration of this legislation to continue the debt ceiling.

When my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) addressed the House a minute ago, I think he said that he was not particularly enamored of the amendments that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) proposed to offer if this rule is, in fact, voted down and he is recognized and permitted to open it up.

Well, that is putting it mildly so far as I am concerned. I am not only enamored of the gentleman's amendment, but I think they would be about as ill advised and as destructive of our hopes of building a sound, stable and noninflationary economy as I can possibly think of.

All of us profess to be greatly interested in productivity and in increasing the productivity of our country so that we can do something about the fact that last year for the first time since 1893 we enjoyed a deficit in our balance of trade.

As a matter of fact, we have seen a serious decline in our historic rate of increase in productivity in the period between 1967 and 1971. We have seen the historic average increase in productivity slip and slip very badly from more than 3 percent to an average of only 1.9 percent and this has cost us very dearly because as a result of that, we have seen unit labor costs in this country increase by more than 5.5 percent annually and we have thereby been rendered that much less competitive in the world markets.

So we need to be concerned about productivity and I will point out that if we could succeed in increasing our productivity—and I am not making these figures up—this is from the National Commission on Productivity—if we could increase our productivity by only one-tenth of 1 percent a year, that would translate itself into $60 million of added production over the next decade.

If we could increase that figure to four-tenths of 1 percent, we would have more than $250 billion in additional GNP over the decade of the 1970's. What would this mean? This would mean the kind of revenues that we need to finance some of the badly needed programs for the cities and the rural areas of our country. This would mean increases in real income for all Americans, and I submit we ought to be concentrating on increasing national productivity, not coming up here and mislabeling the asset depreciation range system as a tax loophole. It is not a tax loophole at all. It is something that is clearly designed to do something about the slipping position that we have suffered in this whole area.

Let me very quickly, in the brief time I have left, point out that if you look at a table which I have before me of representative depreciation allowances and compare what we do in this country with some of our principal competitors in the western world, you will find that after the first 3 taxable years, the representative depreciation allowances in Japan, for example, enable them to recover 56.9 percent of the cost of the depreciable asset. In Western Germany it is 49.6 percent as against 33.9 percent in the United States.

Let me also very quickly before I conclude point out that we have one of the lowest rates of reinvestment as far as our GNP is concerned. We reinvest annually only 16.6 percent of our GNP in fixed assets; that is, in new machinery and equipment. Look at what they do in Japan today—34 percent, more than double the reinvestment rate of the United States; West Germany, 23 percent. When I look at figures like that, I do not have very much patience with the gentleman from Wisconsin when he stands before this House this late in the afternoon and suggests that we ought to open up this rule so that he can offer an amendment to take away one thing that may give us the chance to recover our position as far as our balance of payments is concerned and as far as productivity is concerned.

I would suggest this is a good reason to adopt the rule to cut off that kind of proposed amendment.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join in the proposal of my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS). The thrust of his proposal is to give this House a chance to vote down the closed rule and permit an amendment to strike out the asset depreciation range, which is costing the Treasury of the United States over $3 billion a year.

It has not been proven that the asset depreciation range has produced anything like the increased productivity that the preceding speaker suggested. As a matter of fact, what happens is that the asset depreciation range has increased corporate cash flow, one of those things that does not appear clearly in the financial reports. Where has this cash flow gone, and where is it going? Under the price control regulations, dividends are limited, so that the cash flow is moving into foreign investments, creating jobs in other places to produce goods for the American market. That is where a good part of it is going.

There is some talk that it might increase the possibility of corporate dividends, but I believe that when the records are brought to light, we will be amazed to discover how little dividend income pays in Federal income taxes. I think that when the records are disclosed for this period in our history, they are going to prove that a great part of the dividend income has escaped the normal taxation that most people pay on their ordinary incomes.

I support the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I hope that this House will vote down the previous question and permit this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we should understand what is proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) as far as this rule is concerned. He is not suggesting this should be an open rule or a limited open rule. What he is suggesting is a rule which will make in order nongermane amendments to the debt ceiling legislation. He has just gone one step further than anybody talks about when they talk about an open rule. He wants a closed rule which will permit specific amendments which otherwise would not be in order.

Let us understand the situation. The amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin is proposing and suggesting he would like to add onto this bill was proposed in the Ways and Means Committee. It was necessary for the chairman of our committee to rule that it was out of order as being nongermane.

It was done, I am sure, on good authority. If it was nongermane in the committee, it would be nongermane on this floor, so I take this time, Mr. Speaker, only to make clear that this is not just a matter of the normal open rule that the gentleman from Wisconsin is suggesting. He is suggesting we have a closed rule but that we permit specified nongermane amendments, and I suppose if he is going to let other people add amendments to his proposal that we could cover almost anything under the sun on this particular piece of legislation that does require expeditious action.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, all the remarks directed to the Reuss amendment indicate that the distinguished Speaker would recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin to offer an amendment if the previous question is voted down. I know of no reason why the Speaker should. He might surprise everybody and recognize the gentleman from Iowa to offer his amendment to provide for mandatory balanced budgets and annual payments on the debt each year. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois would welcome that amendment, which is certainly germane to this bill for that would be financial responsibility at its best to again have balanced budgets and annual payments on the huge debt. That is the only way we are ever going to stop increases in the debt ceiling. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois would want to support that kind of amendment to this bill, and I would hope he would vote to defeat the previous question so the bill could be opened up and permit the Speaker to recognize me to offer an amendment to do something worthwhile about the serious financial situation in which we find ourselves.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Speaker might recognize someone to offer an amendment to take care of the very tragic questions the gentleman brought to the House when he says he is disturbed about the low rate of reinvestment. Certainly there is a low rate of reinvestment in America, because there is a large exporting of investments and jobs overseas. Perhaps if the previous

question is voted down, the Speaker would recognize somebody to offer that amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am refering to rule VIII, pertinent to the duties of Members, clause 657, which involves personal interest, stating in part: "Unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, leading up to the parliamentary inquiry, section 659 says:

It is a principle of "immemorial observance" that a Member should withdraw when a question concerning himself arises . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is, in view of the Reorganization Act of 1970, and even prior to that, the establishment of the Standing Committee on the Conduct and Standards of Ethics of Members, inasmuch as it has become common knowledge as the result of reportorial objective enterprise that there are over 190 Members, including the gentleman from Missouri, that have pecuniary interest in banks and monetary exchange, would it be the intention of the Speaker to see that rule VIII applies in the vote on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the precedents under the rule to which the gentleman makes reference are clear that the Speaker has usually held that the Member himself should determine the question. It is a question for the conscience of the Member.

Mr. HALL. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Unless a point of order were made based on this rule it would not be the intention of the Chair to direct the Members that they should as a matter of conscience assess their own pecuniary interest in voting on such a matter?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would leave the matter of conscience to each Member's own judgment.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Chair. I shall not raise such a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. REUSS. 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 205, nays 181, answered "present" 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—205

Abbitt	Andrews, Ala.	Archer
Alexander	Andrews, N. Dak.	Arends
Anderson, Ill.	Baker	Grover
Barrett	Gubser	Pryor, Ark.
Belcher	Halpern	Purcell
Bell	Hammer-schmidt	Quie
Betts	Hanley	Quillen
Biester	Hansen, Idaho	Railsback
Blackburn	Harsha	Rhodes
Bolling	Harvey	Riegle
Bow	Hastings	Roberts
Bray	Hillis	Robinson, Va.
Brooks	Hogan	Robison, N.Y.
Brotzman	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Calif.	Runnels
Broyhill, Va.	Johnson, Pa.	Ruppe
Buchanan	Jonas	Ruth
Burke, Mass.	Kazen	Sandman
Burleson, Tex.	Keating	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Keith	Sebelius
Byron	Kemp	Shoup
Cabell	King	Shriver
Camp	Kluczynski	Sisk
Carey, N.Y.	Kuykendall	Skubitz
Carlson	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Carter	Latta	Smith, N.Y.
Casey, Tex.	Lent	Springer
Cederberg	Lloyd	Stanton, J. William
Chamberlain	Long, La.	Stanton, James V.
Chappell	McClory	Steed
Clausen, Don H.	McCloskey	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	McCollister	Steiger, Wis.
Collins, Tex.	McCulloch	Stephens
Conable	McEwen	Stratton
Conover	McFall	Stubblefield
Conte	McKevitt	Talcott
Corman	McMillan	Taylor
Coughlin	Macdonald, Mass.	Teague, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	Mahon	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Mailliard	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Mallary	Thomson, Wis.
de la Garza	Martin	Thone
Delaney	Mathias, Calif.	Ullman
Dellenback	Mayne	Vander Jagt
Dorn	Michel	Veysey
Downing	Miller, Ohio	Waggonner
Dulski	Mills, Ark.	Wampler
Duncan	Mills, Md.	Ware
du Pont	Minshall	Whalen
Dwyer	Monagan	Whalley
Edwards, Ala.	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Eshleman	Moorhead	Whitten
Fish	Morgan	Widnall
Fisher	Nelsen	Wiggins
Flowers	O'Konski	Williams
Forsythe	O'Neill	Wilson, Bob
Fountain	Passman	Winn
Frelinghuysen	Pelly	Wolff
Frenzel	Pepper	Wright
Frey	Perkins	Wyatt
Fuqua	Pettis	Wydler
Garmatz	Peyser	Wylie
Gettys	Pickle	Young, Tex.
Goldwater	Poff	Zion
Gray	Powell	
Green, Oreg.	Preyer, N.C.	
Griffiths		

NAYS—180

Abzug	Danielson	Harrington
Adams	Dellums	Hathaway
Addabbo	Denholm	Hawkins
Anderson, Calif.	Dennis	Hays
Annunzio	Derwinski	Hechler, W. Va.
Ashbrook	Devine	Heckler, Mass.
Ashley	Diggs	Heinz
Aspin	Dingell	Helstoski
Badillo	Donohue	Henderson
Begich	Dow	Hicks, Mass.
Bennett	Drinan	Hicks, Wash.
Bergland	Eckhardt	Horton
Bevill	Edwards, Calif.	Howard
Biaggi	Eilberg	Hull
Bingham	Evans, Colo.	Hungate
Blatnik	Fascell	Hunt
Boland	Findley	Hutchinson
Brademas	Flood	Jacobs
Brasco	Flynt	Jones, Ala.
Brinkley	Foley	Jones, N.C.
Burlison, Mo.	Fraser	Jones, Tenn.
Burton	Galifianakis	Kastenmeier
Byrne, Pa.	Gaydos	Koch
Carney	Giaimo	Kyros
Clancy	Gibbons	Landgrebe
Clawson, Del	Gonzalez	Leggett
Clay	Goodling	Lennon
Cleveland	Grasso	Link
Collins, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Long, Md.
Conyers	Gross	Lujan
Cotter	Gude	McClure
Crane	Haley	McCormack
Culver	Hamilton	McKay
Daniels, N.J.	Hanna	Madden
	Hansen, Wash.	Mann
Mathis, Ga.	Pucinski	Smith, Iowa
Matsunaga	Randall	Snyder
Mazzoli	Rangel	Spence
Meeds	Rarick	Staggers
Melcher	Rees	Steele
Metcalfe	Reid	Stokes
Mikva	Reuss	Stuckey
Miller, Calif.	Rodino	Sullivan
Minish	Roe	Symington
Mink	Rogers	Terry
Mitchell	Roncalio	Thompson, N.J.
Murphy, Ill.	Rosenthal	Tiernan
Murphy, N.Y.	Roush	Udall
Myers	Rousselot	Van Deerlin
Natcher	Roy	Vanik
Nedzi	Roybal	Vigorito
Nichols	Ryan	Waldie
Nix	St Germain	White
Obey	Saylor	Wilson, Charles H.
O'Hara	Scherle	Wyman
Patman	Scheuer	Yates
Patten	Schmitz	Yatron
Pike	Selberling	Young, Fla.
Poage	Shipley	Zablocki
Podell	Sikes	Zwach
Price, Ill.	Slack	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hall

NOT VOTING—44

Abernethy	Dent	Karth
Abourezk	Dickinson	Kee
Anderson, Tenn.	Dowdy	Kyl
Baring	Edmondson	McDade
Blanton	Erlenborn	McDonald, Mich.
Boggs	Esch	McKinney
Broomfield	Evins, Tenn.	Mizell
Burke, Fla.	Ford, Gerald R.	Mollohan
Caffery	Ford, William D.	Mosher
Celler	Fulton	Moss
Chisholm	Gallagher	Pirnie
Clark	Griffin	Sarbanes
Colmer	Hagan	Satterfield
Curlin	Hébert	Schneebeli
Davis, S.C.	Holifield	Schwengel

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Fulton for, with Mr. Abourezk against.

Mr. Davis of South Carolina for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Hagan against.

Mr. Blanton for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. William D. Ford against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Griffin against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Sarbanes against.

Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Mizell against.

Mr. Schneebeli for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Erlenborn for, with Mr. Mosher against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Schwengel against.

Mr. McDonald of Michigan for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Curlin with Mr. McDade.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon and Mr. RUNNELS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. PODELL, DONOHUE, and CONYERS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. 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. 15390) to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15390, with Mr. HUNGATE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the action we are requesting on the debt limitation at this time does not represent any increase in the debt limitation at all. Instead, we are asking only that the present debt limitation of $450 billion, which now applies through June 30, 1972, be extended for an additional 4 months, or through October 31, 1972. Otherwise, the limit reverts to $400 billion on July 1. Since this limit only applies through October of this year, this means, of course, that it will be necessary for the Congress to consider the question of the debt limitation once more this fall. However, I want to emphasize that we, at this time, are not requesting any increase in the present debt limitation. Whatever increase subsequently proves to be necessary will be considered the next time Congress has this topic under consideration.

As the Members of the House know, this is the second time this year that we have taken up the public debt limitation and the provisions of this bill will make it necessary that we act once more on this subject this year. This, of course, is not the first time that we have dealt with the debt limitation more than once during a year. In 1963, for example, the limit was raised three times, and since 1954 this is the fourth year in which the Congress has been called upon to raise the debt limit more than once during the year.

By the action we are taking in this bill, we essentially are postponing consideration of any increase which may be required in the debt limitation until toward the end of this session of Congress. We are recommending this to the Congress because we are not satisfied that the information we have before us now is adequate to make a determination of the minimal increase in the debt limitation which may be required for the remainder of this year.

Last February when the administration first asked us for a higher debt limitation for this year, the budget which had just previously been submitted to the Congress by the President provided for a unified budget deficit of $38.8 billion and a Federal funds deficit of $44.7 billion. It also estimated the deficit for the fiscal year 1973 on a unified budget basis at $25.5 billion and on a Federal funds basis at $36.2 billion. Based on these data, the administration asked for a $480 billion public debt limitation to carry it through February of 1973.

We did not believe that the information available to use then was adequate to make a responsible determination of the debt limit required. For that reason, we requested instead a debt limitation of $450 billion to carry us through June 30, 1972. Evidence to date certainly has justified the skepticism we expressed last February. The administration currently estimates for the fiscal year 1972 a unified budget deficit of $26 billion and a Federal funds deficit of $32.2 billion. This means that the current unified budget estimate is $12.8 billion less than the figure the administration gave us to work with this last February. My own view is that the deficit for 1972 actually will be still smaller than that now estimated by the administration.

On the other hand, the administration now estimates a unified budget deficit for the fiscal year 1973 at $1.5 billion above the $25.5 billion estimated last January, or at a level of $27 billion. The Federal funds deficit which corresponds to this is $37.8 billion. Frankly, I believe that this too is likely to be substantially in error. In this case, however, I expect the deficit for the fiscal year 1973 to be substantially above the level the administration has now given us.

In my view, the estimates of budget outlays recently presented to the Congress by the administration represent an inadequate review of the budget. They take into account only two types of changes: namely, budget outlays the administration planned for fiscal year 1972 which are now expected to occur in fiscal year 1973 and congressional action on outlays with respect to the 1973 budget which has already been completed. In this last category, for example, is the increase in outlays by $1 billion in the benefits provided to coal miners under the "black lung" bill.

The revised estimates are inadequate, however, because they make no attempt to reflect probable congressional action unless it has already become law or unless the legislation was included in the President's initial budget. As a result, the outlay estimates do not include, for example, any of the effects of the water pollution control bill which is now in conference nor the five bills providing various improved benefits and services to veterans, including substantial veterans' educational benefits. These programs alone could raise outlays by $1 to $2 billion, and I am sure there are other cases where spending which did not occur in the fiscal year 1972 will occur in the fiscal year 1973.

Still another possible area of budgetary discrepancy is in the estimates of receipts. Here the estimates for the fiscal year 1972 were substantially off because the administration did not anticipate that individuals would not elect to increase withholding allowances under the new system and, therefore, had substantial overwithholding in the fiscal year 1972. Unless taxpayers desire to continue this substantial overwithholding in fiscal year 1973, however, there could well be a significant drop in receipts below the estimates of the administration early next year.

Because of the many uncertainties which still exist with respect to the budget for the fiscal year 1973, the Ways and Means Committee concluded that it was not appropriate at this time to make a final determination as to the debt limit required by the fiscal year 1973. As a result, instead of providing the $465 billion limitation which the administration now asks for through February of the next year, the committee's bill continues the present $450 billion limit through October of this year. The administration has indicated that it believes it can operate satisfactorily with this limit through October. Before that time, the Committee on Ways and Means will report a debt limitation bill based on more adequate experience which will be sufficient to carry the Government through the remainder of this fiscal year and at least through part of the next year.

I also want to remind my colleagues that there is a very narrow margin of time available between our action today on the debt limit and the expiration date on the present limitation, this Friday night.

Actually we are not increasing the debt but merely continuing for these 4 additional months the $50 billion temporary addition to the public debt ceiling that would otherwise expire on June 30 next, which is only 3 days from now. The ceiling on the debt would revert to the permanent limit of $400 billion on July 1. The actual debt outstanding in all probability will be in excess of $425 billion. The Secretary of the Treasury will have some cash on hand at the end of the fiscal year. It is my information that he would have enough cash on hand to pay bills for about 6 days because we are now paying those accumulated bills at an all-time high per week.

Delay in extending the debt limit will reflect adversely upon the ability of our Government to meet its financial obligations and will simultaneously cause financial distress to contractors and their suppliers and employees, and Federal employees and the retired as well as the poor who rely upon the Federal Government for regular benefit payments. The outstanding Federal debt on June 30 will not be affected, but no new issues may replace those expiring.

The greatest burdens will be borne by those whose vulnerability is reflected in their reliance upon periodic checks from the Treasury. The dangers to them and others from the financial brinksmanship we engage in with last minute delays in extending the debt limit are not worth it.

While we fully intend to provide for the pressing needs of the Government, we are most anxious not to provide too generous an allowance under the debt limitation for the period immediately ahead. I say this because of our interest in bringing every possible pressure to bear on holding down expenditures.

I have been trying as hard as I could to get the Congress to adopt a spending ceiling in keeping with the recommendation of the administration and in keeping with the record of what we accomplished during the calendar year 1968 when we imposed a ceiling for the fiscal year 1969 under the Johnson administration. We required him at that time to reduce his planned spending, except for those items that were noncontrollable items.

Actually, we said that $6 billion must be saved; $8.3 billion was saved under that ceiling. We made the mistake, however, of allowing so many items to be free of the ceiling that those items, uncontrolled as they turned out to be, went up $6 billion more than had been originally budgeted.

So we came out with actual savings that year of $8.3 billion minus the $6 billion—or $2.3 billion. It was our fault. The administration did better than we had asked it to do on the controllable items—to the extent of $2.3 billion.

I think the Congress should regain its constitutional prerogative of saying what is going to be spent in a fiscal year, and not leave it to some budget director or to a President or to anyone else downtown who is not given that authority under the Constitution.

As you know, each year we go through the process of creating additional budgetary authority for somebody to spend—$276 billion of it in 1973 according to the mid-session review, when this is added to what is already in the pipeline, they will have available for spending downtown in the fiscal year 1973 and later years $566 billion.

It just happens that nobody can find the ways and means in 1973 of spending that kind of money, or enough contractors to absorb it.

The President says he only wants to spend out of that amount $250 billion, and he is asking us to put him in a straitjacket so that he cannot exceed that figure.

Look at the past record. Every year—year after year, and not just in the last 3 or 4 years but over a long period of years—we apparently are ending up spending much more than it was originally estimated would be the case. If we put the ceiling on the spending level, we will at least avoid those increases that have occurred in the past. But we are not going to do it—apparently there is some objection to it.

In the absence of an expenditure limitation we are doing the best we can to use the debt limitation as a substitute for such an expenditure ceiling. It is, of course, a poor substitute, but it is the best that we can offer until the Congress provides for the ceiling on expenditures which I believe it should provide in this session of Congress.

I asked the committee not to go along with the request for the $15 billion increase we were told would take us some time into February 1973. When we increase this limit in September or in October, or whenever we take action on it again, I want it to be only for the amount of money that is required in addition to our tax revenues to finance the Government for the fiscal year 1973.

I cannot tell now how much that additional amount will be. Maybe we cannot tell as accurately as I would like by waiting until September or October, but certainly we should have a better idea of how much we have increased or decreased the spending level through our own action here.

I also believe we will have a better idea of what our receipts will really be by that time. We will know this because we will have a better idea of where the economy is headed, and what the gross national product may be for the calendar year 1972.

All of these factors lead me to conclude, as they did other members of the committee, that we should take another look at the debt ceiling this fall—so we can draw a hard line with the debt ceiling this time for the fiscal year 1973.

Maybe, as weak a tool as it is, it will help the President to accomplish the objective of a spending limitation.

The debt limitation may not be a good way of controlling expenditures, but to the extent that it will work, I want to see us use it because, Mr. Chairman, I think we have come to the day of reality in this country.

I have heard for a long time about what we should do, and what we must do. I think we are in the stage in our history, on the fiscal side of government, where we must recognize that really the question should be, "What can we do?" What can we do with the resources we have, with priorities established, as they, of course, will be, as a result of political considerations? I still think we are going to have to stop this business of borrowing $30 to $40 billion a year in addition to what we can raise in taxes.

You know and I know that if the Ways and Means Committee should bring a bill to the floor of the House—yes, it could raise some revenue. But the only way in the world we are going to get the amounts of money we want to take care of the problems of the elderly, the sick, the aged, the cities, and all of the other problems we have, is through greater economies in government spending—through control of our Government spending—and at the same time through the generation of greater productivity on the part of the private sector of this great system of ours.

Do you know that jobs have been going up in the government sector for the last 12 months at a faster rate than they have in the private sector? Jobs in government, which are dependent upon the revenues produced by those who work in the private sector, are going up at a faster rate. Yes, we have got to get this economy moving at a much, much faster pace than it is if we are going to solve all of the many problems we have in this country. We must be realistic. Until we get the economy back to a full employment level, when revenues will be materially larger, we must control our spending.

That is why I think it is so important right now for us to utilize this debt limitation as effectively as we can in the absence of a spending limitation—to see what we can do to hold down on what is spent by the administration.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am aware of the President's request that we impose an expenditure ceiling on ourselves and on him, and, as I remember, it was for some $250 billion this year. Is there any way we can find out from the executive branch where they anticipate cutting? We all know there are some areas that cannot be cut.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is true.

Mr. CORMAN. We have appropriated more than the $250 billion this year.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will pardon me, my friend from California knows that we do not appropriate dollars in the sense that he is talking about. We create in the hands of somebody downtown budget authority to employ additional personnel or to enter into additional contracts.

Mr. CORMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. As I understand, the President wanted to hold both himself and us to his budget expenditures. We have run over those. Education, water pollution, and black lung are the three I remember offhand.

Is there a way we can find out from the President before we impose an expenditure ceiling where he anticipates the cuts might be so he will comply with the expenditure ceiling?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I notice there are those who say that the Department of Defense can be cut 10 or 12 percent. I have heard studies along that line. I have heard candidates for certain high offices say they can be cut that much. I do not know whether they can or not, but I dare say that most other agencies of the Government could be cut that much and still nobody would be deprived of any real services they are now receiving.

Mr. CORMAN. We are not aware of the plans of the President as to where he is going to cut.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I understand that. I do not know whether you can find that out or not, but if we are going to save this country from fiscal bankruptcy, we had better start thinking in terms of curbing the appetites of all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 13 minutes.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the vote was the closest vote that has ever been recorded in the House of Representatives, to my knowledge, solely on the question of a gag rule. With a change of 14 votes, the gag rule would have been defeated. I think we should get ready now for Sep-

tember when this bill comes up again. When it comes up again, it will have the same thing in it, $70 billion, part of the national debt that has been paid for once, but not canceled. It is costing us $4 billion a year to pay interest on paid-for bonds. It is just not right. It is against conscience.

TIME OF GAG RULE LIMITED

Mr. Chairman, Congress is responsible, and this House has its responsibility. I predict that the time of the gag rule is limited. The gag rule is on the way out. This vote demonstrates it. Why have a gag rule? Why should a few Members be allowed to gag others that are elected just as all other Members are?

Every Member of this House that has ever served here came here as one elected by his constituents, and not one has ever been appointed. The House of Representatives is from the people. The people have charge of the purse strings by having charge of the House of Representatives. Every 2 years, if there is a bad performance, the people can change that trend by electing a new House of Representatives.

Also, certain bills, such as appropriations and revenue and tax bills, can only be introduced in this body. They can be introduced only in this body, and they cannot be introduced in the other body.

Members of this body are elected only for 2 years, they have a tenure of only 2 years, and then the people can ask their Representatives to do their duty and assume their responsibility.

When we vote for a bill that we know has in it $70 billion, that we know has been paid for once, that is not a responsible action. It is an irresponsible action. Nobody can deny that. It is documented. It is known. We are voting for it today. It is $70 billion to pay for that twice. It has been paid for once. In September they will expect us to do it again. Vote to pay for it, and then, of course, just have a gag rule, if that is what Members want but I am going to start now, and I believe other Members will, to try to stop this gag rule business.

If the question ever reaches the Supreme Court of the United States—it will be very difficult to get it there, because the rules are so strict and rigid we can hardly bring a case so the Supreme Court can pass on it—but if it every gets there, I predict it will be unanimously held unconstitutional. For 434 Members to vote to gag one Member the other of the 435, a Member who is elected and sent here to have a voice and do something meaningful in the proceedings is certainly wrong and unconstitutional. If he is gagged, he can do nothing meaningful. He cannot offer an amendment, he cannot talk about an amendment, he cannot talk about the bill under a gag rule, unless he is given the time, as my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) gave me 5 minutes—but that is all. It is not a fair break, and it is not a fair way for the representative government to be conducted.

The people of this Nation are screaming for one thing, for a fair and equitable tax reform law. We will never get it under a gag rule, but when we get the gag rule disposed of, and we have 14 more votes on a vote like this, we will get rid of that gag rule and we will get rid of some of the tax loopholes that are making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

The poor man does not have the benefit of a tax loophole. He does not have earnings that permit him to take advantage of it. The rich people do.

We have to get to this tax reform bill. The people are crying out for it. They want it. They feel they are being imposed upon. Some of them actually say they are being cheated. I know they are not being treated right. They are being treated wrong.

This House of Representatives, a part of the U.S. Congress, has great responsibility, and should assume that responsibility and commence now to vote against the gag rule, in September, when this same bill will come up.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me just emphasize the point made by the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Really in this operation today we are not raising the debt ceiling or the borrowing authority of the Government. That is currently authorized at a level of $450 billion. On June 30, however, that figure will drop, unless action is taken here, to $400 billion.

What is proposed here is that we continue the $450 billion on through October 31. Let us make it perfectly understood that also means the Congress is going to have to act again before we finally adjourn or recess for the November election. We are going to have to do something about it sometime between now and October 31.

But, so far as the action here today is concerned, all we are doing, really, is continuing the current level of authority to borrow.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We will, however, have equaled the record, will we not, on voting on debt ceilings, since it will be mandatory that we vote again in October?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Or September.

Mr. GROSS. Or September. Hopefully it will be in September, so that we can get away to do a few days of campaigning in October.

We will have equaled the record of having voted three times in 1 year on the issue of a debt ceiling.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not know that that will break a record. Perhaps it will. We have had other years, I know, when we have done it at least twice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time yielded by the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I guess in one other year we have done it three times.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. We are just tying the record.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is what I thought; we are just tying the record.

I will say to the gentleman, frankly, I am not sympathetic with the idea of just waiting until September. I believe we know as much now as we will in September.

As I suggested before the Rules Committee, that is the position taken by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. That is as far as they wanted to go.

We have to do something between now and July 3 or 4, at least. When one is faced with the proposition that this is all one can have, this is all they are willing to do, one had better go along with it if one has to have it.

Mr. GROSS. The newspapers said we had to wait to get an opportunity to vote on the revenue bill until the Governor of New York and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) decided they had the votes to pass it. I just wondered whether we would be caught in some kind of a situation like that later on this fall, in voting on a real lifting of the ceiling.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. All I can suggest to the gentleman is we would be in an intolerable bind if we did not ask today to keep the level at $450 billion after June 30, which is next Friday.

As the chairman suggested, I think you could run the affairs of Government for 3 or 4 or 5 days after that with the cash that exists, but you have to recognize that there are bonds people want to cash in, people with savings bonds, and you have to pay them off, and there are roll-over notes, which I will go into in more detail in the statement I am putting into the RECORD. However, we can probably last for 3 or 4 days into next week, and that is it, and then the Government would stop as far as paying any bills or redeeming bonds are concerned. We would be in that same situation if we do not then act again before next October 31. These are just the facts as we find them.

Mr. GROSS. At least by next September we will know the identity of the Democrat Presidential candidate.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is what I suggested to the Committee on Rules, but what else we will know I do not know. I do not know whether we will know more about our fiscal situation.

Mr. Chairman, the present debt ceiling is $450 billion, consisting of a $400 billion permanent ceiling, and $50 billion in temporary borrowing authority through June 30 of this year. This means that 3 days—Friday of this week—the debt limit will revert to the permanent ceiling of $400 billion. The bill before the House would extend the present additional $50 billion in temporary borrowing authority through October 31 of this year.

The debt subject to limit on June 20 stood at $427.5 billion, far in excess of

the $400 billion permanent ceiling that will prevail after this Friday unless legislation is enacted this week amending the existing law.

It is therefore imperative that we act promptly on this bill.

Failure to act will preclude the Treasury from refinancing or rolling over maturing issues after Friday, many of which become due on a weekly basis.

Additionally, it would not be possible to issue any new debt obligations to finance the ongoing costs of Government. Payroll savings plans would cease to operate, creating disruptions to a program that has long served the needs of our people and their Government. The Treasury's cash balance would soon be exhausted and the Government would begin defaulting on its obligations. The chaotic conditions that would prevail would undoubtedly entail extensive additional costs to the Treasury as a result of stop-gap measures designed to meet the crisis, threatened potentially higher borrowing costs to the Government in the future, could undermine the dollar and economic stability, and impair the fiscal credibility of the U.S. Government.

For these reasons, I have always recognized the necessity of providing appropriate increases in the debt limit to meet the Government's borrowing needs. Since an appropriate debt ceiling is one tool—admittedly crude, but nevertheless important—for encouraging fiscal responsibility, I have, on occasion, opposed increases of too great an amount or for too long a period to provide meaningful restraint. But, I have always recognized that fiscal responsibility requires prompt and timely action to provide needed borrowing latitude consistent with fiscal responsibility.

This bill clearly meets that criteria. The bimonthly estimates in the committee report project a debt level of $446.4 billion on September 15 of this year, assuming a 6 billion cash balance—a little more than our weekly spending rate. On October 30, the debt will be $497.3 on the same basis. The debt limit will again revert to the permanent ceiling of $400 billion on October 31 insuring that the entire matter of an appropriate debt limit must again be reviewed in a little more than 3 months. I do not believe we could responsibly recommend a tighter ceiling—either as to amount or duration. Frankly, I personally have some reservations about the wisdom of establishing a time framework that requires this Congress to go into the entire matter again in the very near future. But, it is clear that the ceiling estimated by this bill is a tight one in every respect.

It is particularly ironic, Mr. Chairman, that we must extend the Government's borrowing authority the very next week after voting for a $30 billion program—retroactive to January 1 of this year—to share "individual income tax revenues" with our States and localities. One thing is made crystal clear by this sequence of events—we are simply borrowing additional money at the Federal level to make it available to States and local officials. I hope all of those who voted for revenue sharing will now vote for the necessary borrowing authority to finance the program.

Mr. Chairman, when the House debated H.R. 4690 to raise the debt ceiling in March 1971, I stated:

> I think it is time that we all—not just we politicians in the Congress of the United States, in state houses, in the county courthouses, or in the city halls—but all of our people come to a recognition that we are asking our government to provide services in excess of what we are willing to pay for on a reasonably current basis. *This is the kind of environment that can lead only to fiscal trouble.*

This admonition cannot be repeated often enough until it becomes part of our public policy. Until it does, we will be confronted with the unpleasant task of periodically increasing the public debt limit.

That is the task we face today. It is unpleasant, but we cannot avoid the obligation to act. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 15390.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. 15390

A bill to provide for a four-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 92-250 and section 2(a) of Public Law 92-5 are each amended by striking out "June 30, 1972," and inserting in lieu thereof "October 31, 1972,".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, no amendments are in order to the bill except those offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There are none, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUNGATE, 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. 15390) to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation, pursuant to House Resolution 1021, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the 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. 15390 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 168, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—211

Alexander	Green, Oreg.	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Pelly
Andrews, N. Dak.	Griffiths	Pepper
Annunzio	Gubser	Perkins
Arends	Gude	Pettis
Ashley	Halpern	Peyser
Barrett	Hamilton	Pickle
Belcher	Hammer-schmidt	Podell
Bell	Hanley	Poff
Bergland	Hanna	Preyer, N.C.
Biester	Hansen, Idaho	Price, Ill.
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Pucinski
Boland	Harvey	Purcell
Bolling	Hastings	Quie
Bow	Hathaway	Railsback
Brasco	Hays	Randall
Bray	Heckler, Mass.	Rees
Brotzman	Heinz	Rhodes
Brown, Mich.	Hicks, Mass.	Robison, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hicks, Wash.	Rodino
Buchanan	Hillis	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Burleson, Tex.	Hosmer	Rostenkowski
Byrne, Pa.	Howard	Roush
Byrnes, Wis.	Hungate	Ruppe
Carey, N.Y.	Jarman	St Germain
Carlson	Johnson, Calif.	Sandman
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Casey, Tex.	Jonas	Sisk
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	Skubitz
Celler	Kazen	Smith, Iowa
Chamberlain	Keating	Smith, N.Y.
Collier	Keith	Springer
Colmer	Kemp	Staggers
Conable	Kluczynski	Stanton, J. William
Conover	Landrum	Stanton, James V.
Conte	Latta	Steed
Corman	Lent	Steiger, Wis.
Cotter	Lloyd	Stephens
Coughlin	McClory	Stratton
Culver	McCloskey	Stubblefield
Daniels, N.J.	McEwen	Stuckey
Danielson	McFall	Talcott
Davis, Ga.	McKay	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	McKevitt	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Macdonald, Mass.	Thomson, Wis.
Dennis	Mahon	Thone
Derwinski	Mailliard	Tiernan
Donohue	Mallary	Udall
Dorn	Mann	Ullman
Downing	Martin	Van Deerlin
Dulski	Mathias, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Duncan	Matsunaga	Veysey
du Pont	Mayne	Vigorito
Eckhardt	Mazzoli	Waggonner
Edmondson	Meeds	Ware
Edwards, Ala.	Melcher	Whalen
Eilberg	Michel	Whalley
Esheleman	Mills, Ark.	Whitehurst
Evans, Colo.	Mills, Md.	Widnall
Findley	Minish	Wiggins
Fish	Mink	Wilson, Charles H.
Flood	Minshall	Winn
Foley	Monagan	Wright
Forsythe	Moorhead	Wydler
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
Frenzel	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Garmatz	Nedzi	Zablocki
Gettys	Nelsen	
Giaimo	O'Hara	
Grasso	O'Neill	
Gray		

NAYS—168

Abbitt	Addabbo	Andrews, Ala.
Abzug	Anderson, Calif.	Acher
Adams		Ashbrook

Aspin	Gonzalez	Rangel
Aspinall	Goodling	Rarick
Badillo	Gross	Reuss
Baker	Grover	Riegle
Begich	Haley	Roberts
Bennett	Hall	Robinson, Va.
Bevill	Harrington	Roe
Biaggi	Harsha	Rogers
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Roncalio
Blackburn	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Brademas	Henderson	Rousselot
Brinkley	Hogan	Roy
Brooks	Hull	Roybal
Broyhill, N.C.	Hunt	Runnels
Burlison, Mo.	Hutchinson	Ruth
Burton	Ichord	Ryan
Byron	Jacobs	Satterfield
Cabell	Jones, N.C.	Saylor
Camp	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle
Carney	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Chappell	King	Schmitz
Clancy	Koch	Scott
Clausen, Don H.	Kyros	Sebelius
	Landgrebe	Seiberling
Clawson, Del	Leggett	Shipley
Clay	Lennon	Shoup
Cleveland	Link	Sikes
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	Slack
Collins, Tex.	Long, Md.	Smith, Calif.
Conyers	Lujan	Snyder
Crane	McClure	Spence
Daniel, Va.	McCollister	Steele
de la Garza	McCormack	Steiger, Ariz.
Dellenback	Madden	Stokes
Dellums	Mathis, Ga.	Symington
Denholm	Metcalfe	Taylor
Devine	Mikva	Terry
Diggs	Miller, Ohio	Thompson, Ga.
Dingell	Mitchell	Thompson, N.J.
Dow	Montgomery	Vanik
Drinan	Morgan	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	Myers	Wampler
Fascell	Natcher	White
Fisher	Nichols	Whitten
Flowers	Nix	Williams
Flynt	Obey	Wolff
Fountain	O'Konski	Wyatt
Fraser	Patman	Wylie
Frey	Patten	Wyman
Fuqua	Pike	Yatron
Galifianakis	Poage	Young, Fla.
Gaydos	Powell	Zion
Gibbons	Price, Tex.	Zwach
Goldwater	Quillen	

NOT VOTING—53

Abernethy	Dwyer	McDade
Abourezk	Erlenborn	McDonald, Mich.
Anderson, Tenn.	Esch	
	Evins, Tenn.	McKinney
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	McMillan
Betts	Ford, William D.	Miller, Calif.
Blanton		Mizell
Boggs	Fulton	Mollohan
Broomfield	Gallagher	Mosher
Broyhill, Va.	Griffin	Moss
Burke, Fla.	Hagan	Pirnie
Caffery	Hawkins	Pryor, Ark.
Chisholm	Hébert	Reid
Clark	Holifield	Sarbanes
Curlin	Karth	Schneebeli
Davis, S.C.	Kee	Schwengel
Dent	Kuykendall	Sullivan
Dickinson	Kyl	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	McCulloch	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Abourezk against.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Fulton for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Davis of South Carolina for, with Mr. Hogan against.

Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. William D. Ford against.

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Griffin against.

Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Sarbanes against.

Mr. Blanton for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Schneebeli for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Caffery against.

Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. McDonald of Michigan for, with Mr. Mizell against.

Mr. Broyhill of Virginia for, with Mr. Mosher against.

Mr. McKinney for, with Mr. Schwengel against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Curlin with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Reid with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Kuykendall with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Pirnie.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday last, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1234) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1234

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1973, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) (1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1972 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following Appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1973:

District of Columbia Appropriation Act;

Department of Housing and Urban Development; Space, Science, Veterans, and Certain Other Independent Agencies Appropriation Act;

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act;

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Public Works for Water, Pollution Control, and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act;

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act; and

Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation Act.

(2) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority: *Provided,* That no provision in any Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1973, which makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation, shall be effective before the date set forth in section 102(c) of this joint resolution.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided,* That no provision which is included in an Appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable Appropriation Act for 1972, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and the Senate.

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1972 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority—

activities for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1972: *Provided,* That none of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be used for Exercise Reforger or Exercise Crested Cap or similar dual base exercises;

activities for which provision was made in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities for which provision was made in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1972, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, and section 655(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended;

activities for which provision was made in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended;

activities for continuation of high-speed ground transportation research and development;

activities under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, for which provision was made in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972; the Office of Education and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1972;

and the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities for higher education, library resources and educational renewal, for which provision was made in the Office of Education and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities for social and rehabilitation services, the Office of Child Development, and maternal and child health project grants, for which provision was made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1972, and the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972;

activities for work incentives for which provision was made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1972;

activities of the American Revolution Bicentennnial Commission;

activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

activities in support of Free Europe, Incorporated, and Radio Liberty, Incorporated, pursuant to authority contained in the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1477), notwithstanding Section 703 of that Act; and

activities for which provision was made in the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act, 1972, for the National Industrial Reserve established by the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1973.

(d) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing the following activities, but at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate—

activities for (1) civil rights education, for which provision was made in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972; (2) emergency school assistance activities for which provision was made in the Joint Resolution of July 1, 1971 (Public Law 92–38); (3) youth development and delinquency prevention for which provision was made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1972; (4) aid to land-grant colleges, grants for construction of undergraduate facilities, undergraduate instructional equipment, equipment and minor remodeling, and research and development for which provision was made in the Office of Education Appropriation Act, 1972; and (5) functions transferred to the Action agency by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1971 and Executive Order 11603 approved July 1, 1971.

SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable Appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) August 18, 1972, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 103. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in subsection (d)(2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 106. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during the fiscal year 1972.

SEC. 107. Any appropriation for the fiscal year 1973 required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need (to the extent any such increases cannot be absorbed within available appropriations) for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases as may be granted pursuant to law to civilian officers and employees and to active and retired military personnel. Each such appropriation shall otherwise be subject to the requirements of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is the continuing resolution which will enable the Government to continue to operate after next Friday, June 30. The outside effective date of the resolution is August 18, 1972. Of course, appropriation bills that become the law in the meantime will be the controlling element in the spending of the various departments covered by the particular bill.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. Speaker, when we pass the agricultural appropriation bill on Thursday, the House will have passed 10 of the 13 regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal 1973, which begins next Saturday.

The Senate by the end of this week will, it is expected, have passed nine of the fiscal 1973 appropriation bills.

Three of the annual appropriation bills will hopefully go to the President this week—the District of Columbia appropriation bill, the legislative appropriation bill, and the Treasury—Postal Service—General Government appropriation bill. Conference reports have been filed on them and if they all clear Congress this week, they should shortly become law.

The remaining appropriation bills which we will have to report to the House when we come back on July 17 will be the military construction appropriation bill, the defense appropriation bill, and the foreign assistance appropriation bill.

Certain actions will have to be taken otherwise. For example, we will, I believe, have to provide an appropriation—probably this week—to take care of an addition to the disaster relief fund. The President is today urgently recommending $100 million additional for disaster relief, because of recent disasters in various parts of the country.

RATES FOR OPERATIONS

The pending resolution is the standard, garden variety continuing resolution which continues all the agencies and departments of Government, and they are continued at certain specified rates.

For example, on the three bills which will not have passed the House or the Senate, the general ground rule during this interim as to the rate for operations will be the budget request for 1973 or last year's appropriation, that is, fiscal 1972, whichever is the lower. That is standard.

Then, as to any bill which has passed the House, but not passed the Senate, the House figure or last year's appropriation, whichever is lower, will be the general ground rule.

As to the appropriation bills—and we expect there will be nine of them—that have passed both the House and the Senate, the lower of the applicable figures as between the two Houses will be controlling until the expiration of this continuing resolution or, of course, until they are signed into law.

FREE WORLD FORCES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In the military authorization bill last year, in the military appropriations bill for the current year, there was a ceiling of $2.5 billion imposed on expenditures by the Government for activity in Vietnam.

In the authorization bill passed by the House earlier today, that ceiling is sought to be raised to $2.7 billion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. YATES. In the bill that was passed by the House today, that ceiling was raised to $2.7 billion because the administration, I understand, has exceeded the limitation on spending in Vietnam that was imposed by the Congress.

Will the continuing resolution continue our spending at the level imposed by the Congress in last year's bills at $2.5 billion or at the level of the bill that was passed by the House today at $2.7 billion?

Mr. MAHON. The continuing resolution will provide for expenditures for free world forces in Southeast Asia at the rate of the existing law, which is $2.5 billion.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

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

CONTINGENCY PROVISIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I note this language on page 3 of the bill as follows:

Provided, That no provision in any Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1973, which makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation, shall be effective before the date set forth in section 102(c) of this joint resolution.

Then turning to page 7 of the resolution, section 102(c) reads or provides:

August 18, 1972, whichever first occurs.

Will the gentleman explain the meaning of that to the House?

Mr. MAHON. The House passed several

appropriation bills containing items where there was no related legislative authorization enacted into law as to fiscal year 1973. For example, the authorization had passed the House with reference to the National Science Foundation and the Coast Guard and some other activities.

The appropriation bills containing such items went to the other body. In passing the bills, the other body added the proviso in various places, providing that those funds should not become available until the related authorization had been enacted into law.

Well, many of the authorizations involved have not become law and will not become law by next Saturday, July 1, when the continuing resolution takes effect. So, if the bill has passed the House and passed the Senate, then according to the yardstick the basis upon which the department or agency will operate is the House or the Senate figure, whichever is the lower. The Senate figure, with the proviso saying that the amount is not going to be effective until the related authorization is passed—the Senate figure in those instances will be zero, so a number of agencies would come to a screeching halt next Saturday unless we add the proviso to which the gentleman makes reference.

EXPIRATION DATE OF CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. GROSS. I am still not clear as to the meaning of August 18, 1972, the date predicated.

Mr. MAHON. The expiration date of the whole continuing resolution is August 18, the date when it is planned to recess for the Republican National Convention. We will have to pass another continuing resolution if we do not get the appropriation business completed by the 18th day of August.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the August 18 date means?

Mr. MAHON. Oh, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Contingent upon the adjournment for the Republican Convention until after Labor Day?

Mr. MAHON. I would hope that we would get the appropriation bills completed by August 18. Ten bills will have passed the House by this weekend. Nine bills, I believe, will have passed the Senate by this weekend. Only three bills remain to be reported to the House, and they are held up because of lack of legislative authorizations. We passed the Defense authorization bill in the House today. I would think we could complete the appropriation business by August 18. We would be doing quite well if we did so, but it is an objective devoutly to be sought.

May I add that we should be able to bring in conference reports on the seven bills that will be in conference after we come back on July 17. We will have a month to work on them and to process the three bills yet to be reported to the House. As I mentioned earlier, three conference reports are filed and we hope the House and Senate can clear them to the President this week.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include excerpts from the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the pending resolution. It explains the resolution in considerable detail and contains a table on the appropriations bills for fiscal 1973 and certain other pertinent information:

DETAILS ABOUT THE RESOLUTION

Comporting with continuing resolutions over a period of many years, the emphasis in the resolution is on the *continuation of existing projects and activities* at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the current (fiscal year 1972) rate; the budget request for 1973, where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses. The whole thrust of the resolution is to keep the Government functioning on a minimum basis until funds for the full year are otherwise determined open.

For many years, it has been necessary to provide some stopgap appropriations through continuing resolutions. Officials having responsibility for managing programs during such interim periods are not—certainly should not be—unaware of the fact that the whole thrust behind these measures is to do *only* the minimum necessary for orderly continuation of activities, preserving to the maximum extent reasonably possible the flexibility of Congress in arriving at final decisions in the regular annual bills. Recognizing the almost countless differing situations involved in operating the far-flung activities of government, continuing resolutions have by design always been drawn rather broadly, counting heavily on administrators to follow a prudent and cautious course in respect to a particular program encompassed within an overall appropriation item.

Without laying down any hard and fast rules and short of encumbering, administrative processes with detailed fiscal controls, the Committee nonetheless thinks that to the extent reasonably possible, departments, and agencies should avoid the obligation of funds for specific budget line items or program allocations, on which congressional committees may have expressed strong criticism, at rates which unduly impinge upon discretionary decisions otherwise available to the Congress.

The general basis of operation is this:

If the applicable 1973 appropriations bill has passed both Houses but has not cleared conference, and the particular amount or authority therein differs, the pertinent project or activity continues under the lesser of the two amounts and under the more restrictive authority. Section 101(a)(3) deals with this.

In that connection, there is a new proviso added to the usual wording of section 101(a)(3), as follows: Provided, That no provision in any appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1973, which makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation, shall be effective before the date set forth in section 102(c) of this joint resolution.

In several of the appropriation bills for 1973 the Senate has attached provisions to a number of appropriations, making their availability contingent on enactment of authorization legislation. Thus, in these instances the effective Senate-passed amounts are zero and if the provisions are operative as of July 1, under the standard applications of the section 101(a)(3) groundrule they would be without funds come July 1. Pending disposition of the provisions and the authorizations to which they refer, the above-quoted provision in the accompanying continuing resolution is necessary to avoid what would in its absence be the case; namely, an abrupt cutoff of funds for many important on-going programs and agencies come midnight, June 30.

Where a bill has passed only one House, or where an appropriation for a project or activity is included in only one version of a bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity continues under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current fiscal year 1972 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is the lower. Section 101(a)(4) deals with this.

Where neither House has passed the applicable appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1973—and that will, as things now look, be the case for 3 of the 13 scheduled annual bills for 1973—appropriations are provided for continuing projects or activities conducted during fiscal year 1972 at the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate for 1973, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority. Section 101(b) deals with this. And there is an exception in respect to the Department of Defense relating to certain training exercises.

The Committee has included a provision which prohibits the Department of Defense from obligating funds under this resolution for carrying out the Reforger IV exercise of the Army and the Crested Cap exercise of the Air Force. In these exercises United States forces are transported to Europe for coordinated training with other NATO forces. The purpose of this limiting proviso is to carry out the intent of the conferees on the Department of Defense Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1972. The conference report (House Report 92–754 of December 14, 1971) discusses the conduct of these exercises on page 6 and states in part that:

"The objective of the conferees is to prevent any further obligations for these exercises through the use of funds provided in this bill, and to prohibit the use of funds made available through Continuing Resolutions for similar Reforger and Crested Cap exercises during fiscal year 1973."

If there is no budget estimate or if the budget request has been deferred for later consideration, special provision is made for continuation until the question is disposed of in the course of processing the applicable regular bill. Section 101(d) deals with this.

The resolution does not in any way augment the appropriation for a given project or activity in the regular bills for the fiscal year 1973. In the words of section 105 of the resolution itself:

"SEC. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law."

In other words, while this resolution—as in the case of similar resolutions of previous years—does not enumerate *specific* amounts that may be obligated and expended for the countless activities of government during the period of the resolution (or such shorter period as the resolution may operate as to particular departments or agencies), the controlling factor, known to all who have any responsibility for the management of the programs or the obligation of the funds, is that whatever is used during this interim must be taken out of, or charged against, whatever amount is finally appropriated, or otherwise made available, for the whole year.

Section 101(a) and following subsections of that section of the resolution are drawn along conventional lines of similar past resolutions, except as noted above, and deal with appropriation bills that, according to the present schedule, will have passed at least one House before July 1.

Section 101(b) and following subsections of that section of the resolution are drawn along the conventional lines of similar past resolutions, except as noted above, and, generally, encompass those activities to be con-

sidered in connection with appropriation bills not yet reported fom the Committee on Appropriations or which are otherwise not presently included in a bill.

Section 101(c) relates to Senate housekeeping operations and is identical in substance to previous resolutions.

Section 101(d), also drawn along conventional lines, generally deals with activities being conducted in the fiscal year 1972 for which at the moment there is no fiscal 1973 budget estimate or authorizing legislation, and such items are not effectively covered by previous subsections of Section 101.

Section 102 provides that the resolution ceases to apply to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which effective provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus *the scope of the continuing resolution constricts as each bill is enacted; the resolution will be wholly inoperative after the last bill for 1973 is approved, or August 18, whichever first occurs.* Any bills not legislatively finalized by August 18 will have to be covered by another continuing resolution.

Section 103 is standard, and obviates a lot of unproductive paperwork that would otherwise be necessary.

Section 104 is standard in continuing resolutions, and is self-explanatory.

Section 105 is also standard and self-explanatory.

Section 106 is also standard in continuing resolutions, *forbidding* the use of funds provided in the joint resolution to *initiate any new project or activity or to resume any which was not being conducted in fiscal 1972.*

Section 107 is a standard-type provision made necessary when general civilian or military pay raises, which are mandatory insofar as administrative discretion is concerned have not been specifically appropriated for or were not in effect for the full period of the prior fiscal year but which by their operation will be annualized in the fiscal year to which the resolution relates. The going salary rates authorized by any pay raise legislation must be continued uninterrupted at the higher rates even though the related specific appropriation increases have not been enacted.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

Fiscal year 1972

In this session, Congress has processed three appropriation measures relating to the current fiscal year 1972, namely, an urgent supplemental bill; the Second Supplemental bill; and a special resolution relating to gold revaluation.

In summary, budget requests for new budget (obligational) authority considered in these measures totaled $7,423,419,448. Amounts enacted totaled $6,905,174,329, for a net reduction of $518,245,119.

Fiscal year 1973

The following table on bills relating to the fiscal year 1973 shows the latest situation:

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1973 (AS OF JUNE 26, 1972)

[Note.—As to fiscal year 1973 amounts only]

Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (−)
In the House:			
1. Legislative	$433, 627, 004	$427, 604, 764	−$6, 022, 240
2. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4, 687, 988, 600	4, 587, 104, 350	−100, 884, 250
3. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20, 173, 185, 000	19, 718, 490, 000	−454, 695, 000
4. Transportation	2, 909, 181, 095	2, 791, 614, 095	−117, 567, 000
Advance 1974 appropriation	(131, 181, 000)	(131, 181, 000)	
5. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	343, 306, 000	332, 306, 000	−11, 000, 000
6. Labor-HEW	27, 327, 323, 500	28, 603, 179, 500	+1, 275, 856, 000
7. Interior	2, 520, 340, 000	2, 529, 558, 200	+9, 218, 200
8. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	5, 066, 603, 000	5, 057, 145, 000	−9, 458, 000
9. Public Works—AEC	5, 489, 058, 000	5, 437, 727, 000	−51, 331, 000
10. Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection	12, 952, 177, 400	[1] 12, 897, 010, 900	−55, 166, 500
11. Foreign Assistance	(5, 163, 024, 000)		
12. Defense	(76, 986, 184, 000)		
13. Military construction	(3, 017, 800, 000)		
14. Supplemental, 1973			
Total, House bills	81, 902, 789, 599	82, 381, 739, 809	+478, 950, 210
In the Senate:			
1. Legislative	519, 347, 899	514, 722, 880	−4, 625, 019
2. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20, 258, 183, 000	20, 583, 370, 000	+325, 187, 000
3. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	$343, 306, 000	$313, 706, 000	−$29, 600, 000
4. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4, 704, 326, 600	4, 820, 717, 769	+116, 391, 169
5. Transportation	2, 909, 181, 095	2, 906, 994, 095	−2, 187, 000
Advance 1974 appropriation	(131, 181, 000)	(131, 181, 000)	
6. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	5, 066, 603, 000	5, 057, 186, 000	−9, 417, 000
7. Labor-HEW	(27, 416, 788, 500)	([1] 29, 464, 035, 500)	(+2, 047, 247, 000)
8. Interior			
9. Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection			
10. Public Works-AEC			
Total, bills cleared Senate	33, 800, 947, 594	34, 196, 696, 744	+395, 749, 150
Enacted:			
1. Legislative	519, 347, 899	[2] 513, 787, 980	−5, 559, 919
Total, bills enacted	519, 347, 899	[2] 513, 787, 980	−5, 559, 919

[1] As reported.
[2] Conference report as filed.

Note.—2 other reports filed June 26 and June 27 (D.C. bill and TR.-P.S.-G.G. Bill).

The foregoing table relates only to the regular annual appropriation bills.

COMPREHENSIVE BUDGET SCOREKEEPING

For general reference purposes of Members and others, it may be of interest to again call attention to the periodic budget "scorekeeping" reports issued by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reducation of Federal Expenditures. These reports are designed to keep tabs, currently, on what is happening in the legislative process to the budget recommendations of the President, both appropriation-wise and expenditure-wise, and on the revenue recommendations, and not only from actions in the revenue and appropriation bills but also in legislative bills that affect budget authority and expenditures (backdoor bills, bills that mandate expenditures, and so on).

Several such reports have been issued this year—the latest one as of June 16—and another is due shortly. Copies are sent to the office of each Member.

Mr. GROSS. I must say to the gentleman that I fear the worst.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, and that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain tables and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because of a meeting with a group of my constituents on May 11, 1972, I was unable to be present for rollcall No. 145. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14896, THE SCHOOL LUNCH BILL, ON THURSDAY, JUNE 29, UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other legislative business on Thursday it may be in order to call up for consideration the bill H.R. 14896, the school lunch bill, under suspension of the rules.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what the request would involve? Namely, would it involve a violation of the Reorganization Act of 1970 insofar as the 3-day rule and the rules of the House are concerned?

Second, would it invoke the two-thirds

vote requirement as under any suspended rule?

Mr. PERKINS. First, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that, in my judgment, it would not violate the rules of the House. The report has been printed. It was printed yesterday. The bill was reported unanimously out of the committee last week. We complied with the rules of the committee, and I think we complied with the rules of the House.

In answer to the second part of the gentleman's question, I should think it would require a two-thirds vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Would the Chair confirm that if the unanimous-consent request is granted that the rules for suspension would be in effect and a two-thirds vote would be required to suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the gentleman's unanimous-consent request it would require a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Chair. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

QUALITY OF EDUCATION OF AMERICAN CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there are few things with higher priority on the national agenda than the quality of education of American children.

That fact has prompted the Congress to enact and fund the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other legislation, all designed to provide this issue with care and attention commensurate with its importance.

Even so, the American system of public education is still experiencing financial problems. State and local tax rates, which support the system, continue to rise toward the critical level, adding dangerous weight to the taxpayers' burden and giving rise to talk of even greater Federal assistance.

Because of its concern for the minds and characters of young Americans, the Congress is going to respond to this problem to whatever extent is necessary. It should and it will.

An integral part of the American education system—almost since the founding of the Republic—has been the nonpublic elementary and secondary schools which have produced many millions of conscientious, productive citizens.

This other system of education, representing the best of America's pluralism, is likewise experiencing financial difficulties. Higher costs have seriously depleted their resources, shortages of teachers have thinned their ranks. A great part of America is dying.

To cite an example, some 1,300 Catholic parochial schools have closed their doors in the past 5 years. This has added nearly half a million pupils to the public schools. In the diocese of Fall River in my congressional district, 19 schools have closed during this period, moving 5,000 children into public schools.

The seriousness of that situation was brought home to me at a meeting recently in Fall River with the Reverend Patrick O'Neill, superintendent of schools for the diocese, attended by clergy and laity.

I will soon meet with Msgr. John Boyd of St. Patrick's in Fall River and with other concerned persons, Catholic and non-Catholic, on the problem.

This same situation is being duplicated among other nonpublic schools in every part of the country.

Currently, there are about 4.5 million students in more than 13,000 nonpublic school systems in the United States. Of these, 85 percent are Catholic, 7 percent are nonsectarian, 3 percent are Jewish, and 5 percent include various other types and denominations.

The best estimates are that if all or most of these pupils had to be absorbed into the public school systems of this Nation, it would cost local taxpayers in the neighborhood of $10 billion, to say nothing of the Nation as a whole in terms of increased Federal assistance. Of that amount, approximately $3 billion would be an annual cost increase and the rest over various time periods for capital expenditures.

In my own congressional district, Mr. Speaker, if all the nonpublic schools were to close, it would increase local tax rates in varying amounts. The real property tax rate in the city of Fall River is expected to be about $190 per $1,000 assessed valuation this year. Closing the nonpublic schools would make that tax rate $236.20, an increase of $46.20, to give an example of the impact this would have in a specific instance.

Other examples of tax rate increases would be in the city of Attleboro, Mass., an increase of $6.40 per thousand; in the city of Taunton, an increase of $39.70 per $1,000; in the town of Somerset, $9.20; Swansea, $34.60; and Westport, $26.90.

It makes sense that if the public school system as it is today is experiencing financial problems which cry for solution, the swelling of the system by another 4.5 million children would make the problem a national crisis.

Financial problems aside, such an influx of youngsters would seriously hamper the quality of public education itself by overcrowding facilities and severely straining existing resources.

To head off such a catastrophe, I and several other Members have introduced legislation to provide tax relief to the parents of children attending private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Their Federal income tax bill would be reduced by half the total annual tuition they must pay, or by $400, whichever is less. For those earning more than $25,000 a year, the tax relief would be proportionately reduced.

We also have word, Mr. Speaker, that the President is going to include a similar proposal in the tax reform package he is preparing to present to the Congress.

That is welcome news, indeed, although I almost wish we do not have to wait that long, because this situation is so critical, it cannot wait for the torturous voyage of a tax reform package through the House and the other body. I would like to see the tax credit legislation separated and proceed on its own.

I have taken this special order today, Mr. Speaker, to point out the seriousness of the situation confronting us and to propose a reasonable solution. I am grateful to those other Members that join me in underlining the critical nature of the problem.

The tax relief I am proposing would cost the Treasury an estimated $508 million annually. Mr. Speaker, I think that compares favorably with the $3 billion or more it would cost the taxpayers if these schools were shut down.

I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. MILLS) and to the ranking Member of the minority (Mr. BYRNES) who have also sponsored this legislation.

I believe this legislation is in the national interest and is needed now. Its passage should be a high priority in this Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentlewoman for obtaining this time for the purpose of speaking about aid for nonpublic schools, which is one of the chief areas of concern in education across the land today.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our colleague, Mrs. HECKLER, for her recognition of the crisis in private education and to thank her for arranging this opportunity for those of us who share her concern to participate in this discussion.

The private and parochial elementary and secondary schools of America make an essential contribution to pluralism in our society and provide an alternate and vital choice in our system of education. Private schools of various kinds are able to draw upon financial resources not available to public institutions—and which would not otherwise be available to education. They provide diversity, choice, and healthy competition to traditionally public education and serve the public purpose by providing the means for a substantial group of Americans to express themselves socially, ethnically, culturally, and religiously through education institutions. Our private and parochial schools and colleges add a dimension of spiritual value to education which is invaluable to the moral fiber of the Nation itself; and in my view, it would be a tragedy of the first magnitude if tax-supported State schools were to drive private institutions out of existence.

Many public school systems are currently in the throes of a financial crisis

stemming principally from the fact that local and State revenues have not kept pace with spiraling costs. To the extent that financial difficulties have affected most school systems in recent years, they have affected private schools—which have no tax base—even more. Total private school enrollment exceeds 5.2 million, or approximately 10 percent of our schools, and it has been estimated that if most or all private schools were to close or turn public, the added burden on public funds by the end of the 1970's would exceed $4 billion per year in operations, with an estimated $5 billion more needed for facilities.

Without weakening our commitment to public education, I believe that Congress must protect and encourage the private option. The private option should not be available only to the wealthy. That is not the American way. And America is richer for the diversity of those groups which prefer a distinctive schooling.

Without question, respect for the doctrine of church-state separation and restraints placed on private school aid by court decisions in interpreting provisions of the Constitution have greatly limited available options. However, the first amendment to the Constitution, which enjoins the separation of church and state, also specifies that nobody shall be prevented from exercising his right to freedom of religion. Forcing a parent to take his child out of a private school because he cannot afford to support two separate school systems is an obvious infringement of the right to religious protection under the first amendment itself. I feel it is essential that we maintain the integrity of the doctrine of church and state and that the state should be neutral in its dealing with religion, but, nonetheless the doctrine of separation does not require that the state be hostile to religion.

I have cosponsored legislation for an income tax credit plan which would allow parents of a nonpublic schoolchild to deduct from their final tax liability an amount equal to one-half of the tuition paid up to an overall limit of $500 per dependent. By providing assistance directly to the parents of schoolchildren and not the schools, I believe that this tax credit concept is consistent with constitutional criteria.

I hope that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will soon see fit to bring these tax credit measures up for consideration so that we may get on with the challenge of rescuing our hard-pressed private schools.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1972, I introduced H.R. 12611 which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a Federal tax credit to an individual in an amount equal to 50 percent of any amounts paid by him during the taxable year as tuition for the education of any dependent—for whom he is entitled a personal exemption—in a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school.

The maximum credit allowed a taxpayer for the education of any dependent may not exceed $500 in any taxable year. The credit allowed for these tuition expenses cannot exceed the taxpayer's tax liability.

The need for this legislation is becoming increasingly urgent. Today, American education, public and nonpublic, is in a state of crisis. There is a widespread unwillingness on the part of the Nation's taxpayers to incur the increases in taxes, especially property taxes, necessary to provide adequate financing for public schools. This situation has been aggravated by recent Federal and State court decisions which have held that existing systems of public school financing are discriminatory and unconstitutional because of the disparities in spending among school districts.

Nonpublic schools are also having serious financial problems. Low- to middle-income parents are having a hard time meeting the tuition costs of nonpublic schools as high taxes and inflation continue to make inroads in their earnings. Enrollment in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools has been declining steadily over the past several years—from 6.3 million in 1965 to 5.7 million in 1969. The Office of Education estimates that the total enrollment in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools will decline to 5.4 million in 1972. Roman Catholic schools, which comprise the bulk of nonpublic schools, have been forced to close hundreds of schools in the face of increasing costs. One of their major problems has been their inability to compete with public schools in meeting the salary demands of lay teachers, as the number of members of religious orders engaged in teaching steadily decreases.

It is in our national interest that our dual system of public and private elementary and secondary schools continue to survive. The final report of the President's Commission on School Finance states:

> One significant way in which nonpublic schools serve the public purpose is that they provide diversity, choice and healthy competition to traditional public education . . . nonpublic schools serve the public purposes by providing the means for a substantial group of Americans to express themselves socially, ethnically, culturally, and religiously through educational institutions.

Parents who want their children to have the benefit of religious instruction as well as academic instruction have the double burden of supporting public schools through property taxes in addition to paying tuition expenses at nonpublic schools. I think it is only fair to grant some small tax benefit to the parents of these children.

When parents send their children to nonpublic schools, the public burden to be borne by taxes is reduced substantially. If the over 5 million children now in nonpublic schools suddenly applied for admission in the public school system, the full extent of this tax saving to the general public would be readily apparent.

Under present tax law, persons who pay taxes to a State or local government for various purposes are allowed to deduct these taxes in computing taxable income on their Federal returns. Payments made by parents to support nonpublic schools are entitled to similar recognition, since the additional taxes that would be required to finance the education of their children if enrolled in public schools would be deductible in computing Federal income taxes.

If my bill is enacted, most of the children presently enrolled in nonpublic schools will be able to stay. In addition, more parents will be able to send their children to such schools, and the problems of financing public schools will be lessened.

I have chosen a tax credit for inclusion in my proposal because it will be of particular advantage to the low- and middle-income taxpayer. A tax credit, which is a direct deduction from income tax liability, provides a greater benefit than an itemized tax deduction. A deduction benefits higher income groups more than the lower income groups. For example, a $100 deduction benefits a taxpayer in the 14-percent tax bracket only $14; whereas a taxpayer in the 70-percent tax bracket would derive a tax benefit of $70 for a $100 deduction. In contrast, a tax credit reduces the taxpayer's tax liability $1 for each $1 of tax credit, regardless of his tax bracket.

A tax credit would also enable those taxpayers who do not itemize their deductions to obtain the deduction since it would be subtracted from final tax liability.

Also, there are judicial and constitutional limitations on providing public funds to nonpublic schools. My proposal to provide tax credits for the expenses of tuition would, I believe, be wholly permissible. In fact, the President's Commission on School Finance recommended the use of tax credits in addition to other forms of assistance to solve the financial crisis of nonpublic schools.

We cannot permit our nonpublic school system to die. Monopoly in education stifles innovation and creativity. We must reverse the current trend. Enactment of my proposal will be a giant step toward achieving this objective.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that Federal tax relief should be provided for parents of students attending nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 15069, a bill that would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This legislation would allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary and secondary education of dependents.

The recent financial crisis which has prompted the closing of many nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, and threatens the existence of many more, presents a double jeopardy to our Nation.

First, the already overburdened public school system is unable to absorb a substantial increase of students and still remain an effective educational institution.

Second, the closing of nonpublic schools, which could add up to 5 million children to public school classrooms, would mean a financial burden of between $4 and $5 billion to be borne by the taxpayers. At a time when we are making every effort to relieve the plight of the taxpayer in many areas, it would be counterproductive to allow such an increase in taxes.

One of the greatest strengths of the American educational system has always

been the deeply imbedded tradition of diversity. I think every parent must have the opportunity to choose the type of elementary and secondary schooling he wants his child to have. At the same time, it is the responsibility of Congress to assure that adequate options are available to the parent. We take diversity for granted in scholarship, politics and business. Why should we settle for a single choice in education?

Mr. Speaker, income tax credits would assist low- and middle-income families who are too often deprived of freedom of choice by economic necessity. At the same time, the public schools would continue to receive necessary funds, and no additional administrative burden would be placed on them. It is my view that passage of a bill authorizing Federal income tax credit for tuition payments to nonpublic elementary or secondary schools would be a great service to both education and the public good.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation to provide a tax credit for tuition payments to private elementary and secondary schools, I am pleased to participate in the current discussion. Private schools in my congressional district fulfill a vital role in the region's total educational resources. But rising costs have placed an increasingly heavy financial burden upon parents of these pupils, and, accordingly, upon the institutions themselves. Recognition of the importance of private schools and their economic needs leads me to support tax relief of the type proposed.

I was especially pleased to read in this morning's Washington Post a news story suggesting that President Nixon has decided to include a tax credit proposal in the comprehensive tax reform legislation which he expects to submit to Congress next year. This encouraging news follows the release of a report of the Presidential Panel on Nonpublic Education, which advocated a tax program of this type. It also brings to mind an important address which the President made in April, in which he expressed his concern over the results which total collapse of nonpublic schools would have on our educational system. He stated:

> The disappearance of all nonpublic schools in this country would saddle the American taxpayers with an additional $3 billion annually in operating costs, plus as much as $10 billion in new school construction. Seventy percent of that burden would fall upon seven States: California, New York, Illinois, Ohio, New Jersey, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.

I urge my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House of Representatives to give serious consideration to this legislation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to commend our colleague, the Honorable Mrs. HECKLER, for taking this special order on a very important subject. I welcome the opportunity to express my concern about the grave problems presented by the closing and consolidations of private schools coupled with the rapidly increasing costs of public education. Obviously it is necessary to relieve the parents of children in private schools from the dual burden of supporting both the private and public school systems as well as to encourage more efficient utilization of existing school facilities and thereby to reduce the pupil load on public schools. In March of this year I introduced legislation to provide a Federal tax credit for up to 50 percent of tuition paid, or a maximum of $400, for dependents who attend a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school.

More than 5 million pupils attend our Nation's nonpublic schools. However, this number has declined by 1.4 million in the past few years, from a figure of more than 6.5 million students in the nonpublic schools in 1963. Rising tuition costs are a major reason why parents are forced to take their children out of nonpublic schools. Often their children must be placed into overcrowded, larger classes in public facilities. Quality education for increasing numbers of students is in jeopardy.

In the city of Milwaukee students in the parochial school system account for nearly 80 percent of students in nonpublic schools in the city. In the last 5 years the number of pupils in these schools has declined from 47,900 to 28,000, and 21 parochial schools have closed their doors completely. At the same time, the cost of educating a child in the public school system in Milwaukee has increased from $496 in 1966 to $837 in 1971—an average increase of 14 percent in the last 5 years.

The President's Commission on School Finance, in a study dealing with the financial implications of changing patterns of nonpublic schools in major midwestern cities, estimated that if all of Milwaukee's nonpublic schools were to close, Milwaukee taxpayers would have to provide an additional $47.8 million to educate these children, and $28.7 million in additional State aid would be needed in Milwaukee. The national percentages are similar. The President's Commission on Nonpublic Education has termed the decline in private school education a "crushing burden" on our public school systems.

A Federal tax credit to parents for half of the tuition they pay for the education of their children in nonpublic schools up to a maximum of $400 per dependent will save money for all American taxpayers, and for all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. This measure will enhance the heritage of diversity which has always characterized our national school system by allowing parents to have freedom of choice in determining the kind of education their children will receive. Finally, the measure will reverse the increasing financial burden which elementary and secondary education costs have placed on all taxpayers, particularly the local property taxpayer.

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of legislation to provide a tax credit for tuition for nonpublic education. I shall be very brief.

We all know the traditional arguments in favor of assisting nonpublic education, and are well aware of the additional difficulties that would arise in the public education system if many of our nonpublic schools were to fail to reopen in the fall. Quality education would surely and certainly be the loser. These are not the only reasons to maintain the nonpublic school system, however.

In every facet of our day-to-day life we have a choice. A choice of where to live, a choice of where and how to shop, a choice in politics. Having these choices has contributed so much to making ours the great Nation that it is.

Having a choice in educational institutions strengthens our system of education and gives us a graduating class each year that has had the benefit of a more diversified system than could possibly be attained with a single education system. These young men and women will take advantage of this diversification to carry our country forward in every field of endeavor.

This freedom of choice has contributed greatly in the past, and can continue to do so in the future. But that future rests here, and it is now the responsibility of the Congress to provide for its continuation.

I just noticed a pertinent Associated Press story on the cloak room ticker off the House floor and it is as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—President Nixon favors a tax credit of up to $200 per child as the principal way to aid non-profit private schools, primarily parochial schools, against rising economic difficulties, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget has told Congress.
>
> In a letter to Rep. Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Caspar W. Weinberger said Congress also should consider granting tax credit for fees paid to public schools.
>
> A measure pending in Congress would grant a credit of 50 per cent, up to $400 per child per year. The administration favors a credit of 100 per cent, up to $200 per child.
>
> Weinberger said the $400 proposal would induce private schools to raise tuition in order to increase revenues by capturing the credit.
>
> "In so doing, the schools would reduce the number of low and moderate income families who could afford to send their children to nonpublic schools," he said.
>
> The cutoff for the credit should be $18,000 in annual income, Weinberger said, because most taxpayers whose children attend nonpublic schools have incomes below $18,000.
>
> Allowing the credit for parents of children in public schools, he would "limit inequitable dual burdens as far as possible.
>
> And he asked the committee to consider ways in which the benefits of the credit "might be available to families who pay no income tax."

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, nonpublic schools across the country are facing the prospect of closing their doors against students forever. Most of these schools simply are receiving inadequate revenues to pay for the services they have been providing for millions of youths every year.

Their difficulties in most instances are traceable to the financial bind in which most parents of those children are finding themselves. More and more parents are unable to pay both their taxes for public schools and the tuition and costs of private schools.

Several bills have been offered to this Congress to relieve this problem. I have introduced a bill which would provide $125 credit on Federal income tax returns of parents and guardians for each child in an elementary or secondary nonpublic

school. It would give $600 tax credit for youths attending college.

Most other bills offer similar relief to parents or guardians who have borne the burden, in effect, of supporting two school systems. Last April 6, President Nixon told Catholic educators in Philadelphia that some assistance should probably be given to Catholic schools. Soon after, the Panel on Non-Public Education presented a 58-page report to the President, recommending income tax credits for low- and middle-income parents of children in nonpublic schools.

Quality education and assuring that it continues and improves is probably the most important commodity that we can pass on to the next American generation. It seems certain that education quality would be impaired if nonpublic schools are forced to close their doors forever. America's public schools do not have enough room or enough faculty and administrators to educate both public and nonpublic students.

I do not propose that we should provide total inducement for continuing nonpublic educational facilities—nor do most of the other proposals. What I do suggest is that some assistance be given so that enough school doors, both public and nonpublic, remain open that our children and their children receive a quality education.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONTROVERSY SURROUNDING PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Commerce Committee hearings on "The Federal Sports Act of 1972" have helped make it clear that a great deal of the controversy surrounding professional sports operations in this country today is based on hearsay and emotion rather than on the facts. To the end that more Members of Congress have the facts as well as the perspective of a Commissioner who has helped guide pro football through difficult times to unprecedented growth and popularity, I think it is appropriate that NFL Commissioner Pete Rozelle's testimony before the Commerce Committee be included in the RECORD.

Commissioner Rozelle's testimony, I believe, very effectively defuses some of the faulty premises upon which those supporting Federal regulated pro football base their positions. He answers the misconception that professional football is not now regulated, the myth that all professional sports are homogeneous by nature, and the fallacy that vital interests are not adequately represented.

My opposition to the bill is based on 13 years of pro football experience, as past president and cofounder of the AFL Player's Association, and my experience as a first term Congressman who has seen the chaos that can be inflicted on the private enterprise sector by unnecessary Federal intervention. It is my conviction that the interests of all parties—fans, players, and owners, and whatever problems now existing can best be reconciled and resolved through the recognition of a mutuality of interest and the willingness to pursue the collective bargaining process of which I am a strong advocate.

I insert Commissioner Rozelle's testimony in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF PETE ROZELLE BEFORE THE COMMITTE ON COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE

Your committee was good enough to invite me to comment on S. 3445, and I am pleased to accept that invitation. I have with me my counsel, Hamilton Carothers.

I think I understand the sentiments which have encouraged you, Mr. Chairman, to believe that a federal agency dealing with professional sports is desirable. The National Football League wishes there were fewer disputes and less controversy in professional sports. We look forward to a time when the sports pages will be devoted more to athletic achievements and team play and less to strikes, litigation developments, contract negotiations, and the business aspects of sports.

But I don't believe that a federal sports commission is the answer—for a great many reasons. In my view, proposals such as S. 3445 are based on a number of premises which are not supported by the facts.

In the first place, it is simply not true that professional sports are "Big Business." The reality is that professional sports are, in economic terms, very small business indeed. There has not, for example, been a year in the history of pro football when the gross income of all twenty-six NFL clubs in the aggregate amounted to the gross income of a department store like Woodward & Lothrop's here in Washington. I don't want to overdo this point—and I know it is not the total answer to the concept of a federal sports commission—but it is quite likely that professional football, one of the more successful professional sports, ranks somewhere behind the shoelace industry in economic terms. This at least raises the question whether the creation and staffing of an agency to deal with professional sports represents a sound expenditure of taxpayers money. The Federal Communications Commission, for example, has an annual budget of about $32 million and the Federal Power Commission spends about $22 million annually.

Secondly, it is a mistake to consider professional sports, simply because they are professional sports, as having any essential elements in common. In terms of their needs, their income sources, their contract requirements, and their business practices, one professional sport bears about as much relationship to another as the movie business does to the television business. In all of their fundamental aspects, they differ from one another as much as a hockey puck or a baseball does from a football. It would simply not be possible to establish rules which could be applied fairly and reasonably to sports in general. And anyone who tried to deal authoritatively with the particular and individual problems of each sport would have to have the knowledge of the Almighty, the judgment of Solomon, and the vision of Joan of Arc. I don't find these qualities available in anybody—not even in Howard Cosell.

Thirdly, I cannot accept the premise that professional sports are today inadequately regulated. Indeed, I have concluded that professional football is the most over-supervised, over-examined, and over-regulated business in America today.

The National Football League and its member clubs currently operate under the federal antitrust laws, the National Labor Relations Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, the Federal Communications Act, the Federal Securities Laws, the rules and regulations of the Price Commission and of the Pay Board, and under a number of federal acts dealing with professional sports in particular. Each member club is also subject to the standard array of laws applicable to local business, such as the laws of workmen's compensation, local safety and health codes, and local tax laws.

In the twelve years I have been commissioner, the Antitrust Division has conducted detailed investigations of NFL affairs on eight separate occasions—once in court, once through an eighteen-month grand jury proceeding, once pursuant to a civil investigative demand, and on five occasions through informal requests for documents. The NFL's television practices have twice been investigated by the Federal Communications Commission. Member club endorsement and licensing practices have twice been investigated by the Federal Trade Commission. The League's tax practices have been exhaustively reviewed by the IRS on two different occasions and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has made a half-dozen investigations of league and member club employment practices. The league and its member clubs have been involved in four separate proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board. I have personally participated in as many as twenty different appearances before congressional committees over this period which have examined substantially every phase of NFL affairs. Six different congressional committees have taken or are about to take testimony on various aspects of NFL operations during the current session of Congress. Professional football may well be the most regulated and supervised business in America today.

I am personally persuaded that most if not all of the so-called problems and issues which arise in professional sports would be more expeditiously and more amicably resolved to the interests of all concerned, including, fans, players, and owners alike, if there were not this continuing resort to outside influence as a method of obtaining support for particular positions.

It should also be noted that S. 3445 is not intended to be a substitute for these confusing and often conflicting patterns of supervision and regulation. The bill would expressly preserve the application of all present laws and regulations as well as any future laws which Congress may choose to enact. Thus NFL players and owners would still have their collective bargaining rights under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board, the courts would still continue to apply the antitrust laws to one phase or another of sports affairs, and all other federal and state regulatory requirements would still have to be met. The federal sports commission would just be another layer of regulation on top of the court, agency, and congressional decisions which seem to emerge almost weekly in the field of sports.

Lastly, I think it misguided to conclude that a federal sports agency will somehow make whatever problems exist in professional sports simply go away. For one thing, many of the so-called issues of NFL operations are, in my view, based more on popular misunderstanding than on analysis and knowledge of the facts. I don't hesitate to include within that comment the current criticism of the NFL's so-called "Blackout" practices. We have had on many occasions the expe-

rience of finding that third parties, when they had the opportunity to become fully acquainted with the facts, were willing to acknowledge that a supposed remedy for a particular "problem" was totally impracticable or that there was not anything realistic about which to complain. We even had the experience of being sued in court only to have the litigant discover in his trial preparation that the facts were not as had been represented to him.

In major part, this may be due to the fact that everyone believes he understands about professional sports but very few people actually do. This may explain why many sports critics often are inconsistent in their criticisms and objectives. Some of the most vociferous critics of the Washington Senators' move from Washington, for example, would heartily endorse regulatory principles which would require Bob Short to remain in Washington while they would equally endorse regulatory principles which would permit any or all of his players to leave the team and move to Texas.

In brief, I do not believe that the problem of reconciling the interests of fans, stadium authorities, players, owners, TV viewers, networks, and amateur athletes is going to be effectively resolved by waiving the magic wand of federal supervision. If a sport cannot accomplish this itself, through a fair accommodation of the interests of each, the sport itself will bear the penalty.

END OF U.S. GROUND COMBAT ROLE IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1972, the United States began to withdraw its last combat infantry brigade from South Vietnam. The departure of the 3d Brigade of the 1st Air Cavalry Division officially ends our ground combat role.

After the Communist invasion of South Vietnam through the DMZ by 12 divisions on March 30, President Nixon's response in calling for U.S. air and naval attacks against Communist military targets was an inevitable decision. However, President Nixon has continued to withdraw American ground forces from South Vietnam. Our U.S. troop strength is now below 49,000 men and this reduction will be continued. President Nixon has withdrawn more than 500,000 American ground troops since he was elected to the White House less than 4 years ago.

Over 100,000 South Vietnamese have been driven from their homes by this invasion. They all have fled south—away from the Communist invaders. Political factions which were previously hostile to President Thieu have put aside political differences in condemning the invaders. Yet, there are some Americans who have condemned President Nixon, not the invading Communists, for the terror inflicted on these people. Some U.S. political figures use the word "immoral" every time they speak of our efforts to help the South Vietnamese defend themselves, but they do not call this massive invasion of South Vietnam "immoral."

President Nixon's visits to Moscow and Peking, Russian President Podgorny's recent visit to Hanoi, and Dr. Kissinger's recent visit to Peking indicate that strong efforts are underway to obtain a negotiated peace. It is possible that these efforts, initiated by the United States, will be successful and peace will come to Southeast Asia in a manner that will not have appeased Communist aggression.

TINICUM MARSH

When the Senate passed H.R. 7088, which establishes the Tinicum National Environmental Center, it added an amendment requiring the General Accounting Office to audit the use of Federal funds for the acquisition and restoration of the Tinicum Marsh. On Tuesday, June 20, 1972, the House concurred with this amendment. This action cleared the way for President Nixon to sign H.R. 7088 into public law, and then the Department of the Interior can start acquisition on privately owned sections of the land to be included in this, the first National Environmental Center in America.

BUSINESS EXECUTIVES

A group called the Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace and New National Priorities—BEM—has announced its opposition to my reelection to the House of Representatives. The following information about this group will be of interest to you.

Last year when the National Peace Action Coalition—NPAC—announced its intention to shut down the Government of the United States in a massive "May-Day" demonstration in Washington, the BEM announced its solidarity with the NPAC. The 1971 annual report of the House Committee on Internal Security states that the NPAC is dominated by the Socialist Workers Party, whose members are dedicated to the violent overthrow of our system of government.

Only one of the former Government officials and diplomats listed as sponsors of the BEM is not a Democrat. Why did these men not cry out against this war when Democratic administrations were sending more than half a million Americans to fight in Vietnam? I also question why the Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania, who is also a BEM sponsor, is listed only as Milton J. Shapp, president of the Shapp Corp. of Philadelphia?

Obviously, the BEM will not stand close scrutiny. Of the 10 House votes on which BEM decided to oppose my reelection, only two votes were close. The others had up to 278 Congressmen voting for them, clearly indicating a wide bipartisan support.

REVENUE SHARING

With my support, on June 22, 1972, the House has passed the revenue sharing bill H.R. 14370. This legislation will give fiscal assistance to State and local governments from Federal revenues. For the first time we will take money from the Federal bureaucracy where, far too frequently, it is wasted, and give it to State and local governments which will put the money to work immediately. Many of us feel that, by distributing the funds to local governments, the people will be able to have better control of where the money is spent, and that it is spent wisely and properly.

Because the distribution formulas contained in the bill are not equitable, and will unfairly distribute the available funds, I voted against barring amendments on an early unsuccessful procedural question. To illustrate this point, compare per capita funds given to Pennsylvania and to New York. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will receive $8.28, while New York gets more than twice as much at $17.23 per capita. The combined State and local government receipts are also inequitable. In Pennsylvania, the combined per capita receipt will be $25.33, while New York will receive almost $10 more at $35.29.

The original administration's general revenue sharing bill provided for a more equitable distribution of revenue sharing money to the States. However, Chairman WILBUR MILLS and the predominately Democratic House Ways and Means Committee decided on a vague formula for the distribution of this money; it even includes something called urbanization. I will work next year to introduce amendments to the law to insure a more equitable distribution in the future.

Every municipality in the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania will receive revenue sharing funds for the calendar year 1972, if the Senate passes this bill.

STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION

President Nixon is continuing his efforts to guarantee us a generation of peace. His latest success was the strategic arms limitation agreement worked out during his recent Moscow visit. The President has urged the Congress to approve the agreements by September 1, so that the second round of the strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—can begin in October.

The President has said that he wants the Congress to make a very searching inquiry into the agreements so that we can be totally convinced that they are in the interest of the country and world peace. However, the President has pointed out that it is important for America to go forward with building up our offensive weapons systems to the extent permitted under the accords. For the United States to unilaterally reduce its offensive programs would mean that the Soviets would lose any incentive to negotiate the followon agreement.

RETARDED CHILDREN

As the result of a recent civil case in the U.S. District Court, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is attempting to locate thousands of mentally retarded children, many of whom would be able to make great progress in overcoming their handicaps, but who are not receiving all of the educational benefits to which they are entitled. If a parent or guardian of a retarded child would like additional information, they should contact their local school district. If contact at the local school district cannot be made, please call, collect, the Office of Right to Education, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The number is 717–787–3990.

CHILDREN'S CHOIR

My wife and I talked to Mrs. Julie Nixon Eisenhower at a conference of the Northeastern U.S. Republican Women at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel where the All-City Elementary Choir from the

Chester School District entertained the group by singing at the banquet. Julie was so impressed with the children's performance that she asked to be escorted to the stage to thank them personally. We are all proud of Mrs. Roberts, supervisor of music, and Mrs. Rudnick, choir director, and the children for their excellent performance.

MAGNA CARTA—COMMEMORATION OF ITS 757TH ANNIVERSARY, IN PHILADELPHIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my native State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is rich in our American history. The fundamental act of union for the formation of the United States was the Declaration of Independence in 1776 by the Continental Congress, then sitting at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. It was the Convention of 1787 at the same place that framed our Constitution. Although the first Congress of the United States met in New York in 1789, in 1790 it chose Philadelphia as the temporary seat of the new Government when Washington was President.

As students of history know, the Constitution was not a suddenly devised framework of government but the culmination of experience dating back to the Magna Carta of 1215 when 25 barons of England united to force King John to sign and observe it.

The Baronial Order of Magna Carta, composed of men who are lineal descendants of these 25 barons of England, and of which William Hannis Perot of Philadelphia is Marshal, customarily commemorates the signing of the Magna Carta on the Sunday nearest June 15 of each year at historic Christ Church in Philadelphia, the church attended by Washington. Most of the members of the order live in the Philadelphia region; some in the Washington, D.C. area. This order through the years has been a highly effective patriotic group in keeping alive the memories of the Magna Carta as a vital landmark in the development of constitutional liberty.

On June 11, 1972, at this church, the Barons celebrated the 757th anniversary of the ensealing of the Magna Carta in an impressive program led by the rector, the Reverend Ernest A. Harding, D.D., in which a member of the order, the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, distinguished former Member of the Congress from Kentucky, and the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission that supervised the construction of the Panama Canal, made the address for the occasion and received the Annual Award of the Order, which reads as follows:

The Baronial Order of Magna Carta presents its Magna Carta Day Award to Governor Maurice Hudson Thatcher in recognition of his service to humanity:

Particularly is this made for his championing the Freedom of the Individual, furthering the significant tradition begun in 1215 by the Barons of England.

(Panama Canal Seal.)

(Kentucky Seal.)

(Picture—ship in Panama Canal.)

Christ Church in Philadelphia.

Magna Carta Sunday, June 11, 1972.

WILLIAM HANNIS PEROT,
Marshal.

HENRY PICHON KROGSTAD,
Keeper of the Signet.

(NOTE.—Framed with White House Timber.)

During the program, Governor Thatcher, together with Marshal Perot, former Marshal Charles Edgar Hires, Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., also a member of the order, and Gilbert H. Dehnel of Washington, D.C., sat in the George Washington pew.

So that the indicated address may be suitably recorded in the annals of the Congress for the benefit of present and future readers, I include herewith the indicated address as part of my remarks:

ADDRESS OF MAURICE H. THATCHER

To the Members of the Baronial Order of Magna Carta and their families; friends and neighbors from Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, and other points; Rev. Doctor Harding and the membership of this historic Church, I must extend my deepest thanks and most grateful appreciation for their presence on this occasion.

I also wish to thank with like appreciation, Baron and Mrs. Ross Porter Skillern for the gracious courtesies accorded myself and my traveling companion, Mr. Gilbert Dehnel of Washington, D.C. as guests in their charming home. Also, my thanks to others.

Then, I wish to give assurance of my most grateful acknowledgment for the outstanding honor that was voted to me by the Baronial Order last fall, and now awarded.

When I recall that men of such eminence as Generals MacArthur and Bradley; Chief Justice Bell, and certain outstanding members of the Baronial Order have been recipients of this Award, I am indeed, humbly grateful that I am now thus honored.

I know of no region more historic than that of Philadelphia, and its environs. Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell have their significance and memories.

Great appreciation is due the Welsh and Swedes, as well as the English, Scotch and others. William Penn and his Quakers structured a lasting monument. Here Benjamin Franklin grew into the vast proportions of a practical idealist, statesman, scientist, and successful civic and Revolutionary leader.

This Commonwealth itself is a beautiful domain. Its great rivers, its mountains and valleys—together with its farming areas—present an unexcelled panorama of beauty. Valley Forge and Gettysburg—and the Gettysburg Address—speak for themselves.

Its historic worth is beyond all measurement.

Besides the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania there are three other Commonwealths in our American Union, namely, Massachusetts, Virginia and Kentucky.

My own Commonwealth of Kentucky—with the aid of Daniel Boone, himself a native of Pennsylvania, led the effort for the early settlement of Kentucky; and in time's course, there were born in Kentucky, the respective leaders of the North and South in the Civil War era, Lincoln and Davis.

During my service in the Congress as Representative of the Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky District (1923–33), I had pleasant relationships, on both sides of the aisle, with Pennsylvania members of the House. I make special reference to Doctor Henry W. Temple of the Washington District, J. Banks Kurtz, of the Altoona District, and Thomas Butler of West Chester.

Dr. Temple, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and on special National Park assignments, occupied posts where he was able to serve my efforts—and did serve them—to obtain enactment of Bills I sponsored. They were important measures, and became laws—such as the Acts creating the National Cave Mammoth Park in Kentucky, and the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the City of Panama, an institution dedicated to research touching the cause and prevention of tropical diseases, both human and veterinary.

The Laboratory, starting with an annual authorization of $50,000, now has an annual budget of a million dollars; and Congress also has authorized and appropriated several millions for expansion of the Laboratory activities, made necessary by the great functions it has been called upon to serve.

Indeed, its achievements have been of such character as to make of it the outstanding institution of its kind in all the world. Panama is an ideal spot for such activity.

For more than 40 years, I served as the Vice President and General Counsel of the parent institute; and am yet filling the post of General Counsel; and am now the Honorary Life President of the Institute. All these services, I may say, have been rendered without compensation.

Some of you will recall that I was a Member of the Isthmian Canal Commission under appointment of President Taft, in April 1910. I served until August 1913—all during the construction era.

My identification with the great enterprise throughout my tenure was also that of Civil Governor of the Canal Zone. Colonel William C. Gorgas of Yellow Fever fame, was also a Member of the Commission; and we had our official headquarters in the same building.

I was charged with certain duties which supported him in his important health and sanitary work; and it has given me great pleasure, in and out of Congress, in the years that followed, to have the opportunity to further provide for expansion of tropical research:

The Republic of Panama ceded to our Institute, for the purposes of a laboratory, important lands and buildings in the City of Panama, and we have erected additional structures with Congressional funds.

On an occasion of this character, it is expected, I believe, that the Awardee should submit some remarks dealing with matters of current concern.

This is the Age of Violence. Never in human history has there been such brutal conduct by people in the world, as is now taking place.

Under science the miracle of today becomes the commonplace of tomorrow.

The great achievements of science have been, in large measure, utilized by evilminded individuals for the most wicked deeds which mankind has ever conceived.

Communism—the deadliest of evils, is busy as never before. We must wisely deal with these conditions, else they will destroy us. For this reason I speak of them.

Assassinations, murders, thefts, robberies, holding for ransom, hijacking, guerrilla monstrosities; slaying by wholesale of the innocent and defenseless, and degeneracies, have become the order of the day. No depraved or cruel act is missing.

The news media, in every category, in large measure, are being prostituted; and the old Commandments, containing the essence of life experience; and the noble instructions of the Sermon on the Mount, are

being discarded in the world-at-large, and held in contempt.

We canonize our criminals. They get the publicity, the sympathy, and the eulogies, and the acquittals. Our virtues are kept under the bushel, and fail in inspirational value. The red-carpet treatment has all too often been accorded by naive courts, juries, and others charged with the responsibilities affecting the social structure. Shrewd, bold, conscienceless members of my own profession, often go beyond all decent bounds, and defy the courts, and enable the worst criminals to escape the whips of justice, and repeat their offenses.

The TV and radio, and other media with certain exceptions, which so often have instructed and inspired, and with so much potential for good, have all too oft become sewers of filth and degeneracy. In large measure, the children are neglected, and left to establish their own associations and considerations—with the inevitable results.

No further enumeration is required. However, we cannot ignore what is so patent; such things bring disaster. I am a firm believer in the divine mission of Man; but I can have, of course, no conception as to the time he must live and struggle before he scales the peaks of lasting good. He has come far, but yet has far to go. Meantime, we must may seem to be.

Also, it is fortunate that most of our humankind are optimists, rather than pessimists. They are moved by the consideration that the glass is half-full, rather than half empty. Only virtue makes for lasting peace and happiness. War is monstrous, yet, it has always obtained. Thus, the race muddles on.

In our own country, we stand in greater need of what we call conscience. Order is Heaven's first law; the Universe, with the infinity of celestial bodies, is regulated by law and maintained in order. The human creature on our own planet—as well as those which may inhabit any like orbs—is endowed with the faculty of reason; with faith, that is to say, reasoned hope; with the belief of the pure in heart that the soul shall have immortal being.

"Hats off to the past, and coats off to the future," must yet be the homely slogan.

I believe that mirth and music are material gifts from Heaven to Man, in compensation for the tragedies of life. Good thought and conduct constitute good morals. Evil is the exact opposite. If we transgress, we are punished, in one way or another.

All the qualities of humanity that are possessed of hope, faith, courage, diligence, reason, love of home and country, vision and noble ideals, must be exercised as indispensable labors in humanity's forward march. Apropos, the spirit of reverence and the Church must perform their necessary roles.

These observations are indeed trite. The multiplication table is trite, but reliance on the mathematics of Newton took the Astronauts to the moon, and thru the voids of space.

Our Baronial Order—whose members are decendants of sureties of A.D. 1215, has great opportunity for noble and patriotic service. It has also great responsibility, and, I believe, is meeting its obligations with fine dispatch.

The Magna Charta is a lengthy instrument of 61 articles. On June 12, 1215, it was adopted to hold in restraint, a cruel, despotic King John of England. Twenty-five sureties were named from the roster of Barons, to require the arbitrary King to pay allegiance to the Great Charter, which relates to benefits and property and other rights to the Barons, as well as the people in general.

Under the benefits conferred by Magna Charta, England, and the course of civil and religious liberty made lasting progress.

The next great document of liberty was the Mayflower Compact, adopted in November 1620 by the Pilgrims in Cape Cod Harbor. It was brief, but of essential character. It provided, in simple words, a comprehensive, organic and formal instrument enabling the establishment of Plimoth Plantation—on the Plymouth Rock site, binding equally on all; and assuring total equality, and to make all needed laws. Under it, the Pilgrims lived and prospered, with complete civil and religious liberty.

This modest compact proved to be the acorn which rooted and grew to the great oak of our Constitutional government, which we must uphold and sustain.

In conclusion, let me say, as did Tiny Tim in the immortal Christmas Story of Dickens, "Lord bless us all, each and everyone!"

CIA SMUGGLES OPIUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am releasing today substantial new evidence that indicates U.S. pilots flying CIA operated helicopters have been smuggling opium inside Laos.

What this new evidence indicates is that U.S. pilots using U.S.-owned planes are illegally smuggling opium in Laos, some of which has almost certainly been sold to U.S. GI's in Southeast Asia and some of which has almost certainly been smuggled into illicit U.S. drug markets.

I am releasing today a letter which I have received from Alfred McCoy, author of a forthcoming book on heroin traffic in Southeast Asia, which details the allegation of United States and CIA complicity in drug traffic. If these allegations are true, then the CIA is implicated in fostering the drug traffic that ruins the lives of tens of thousands of Americans.

According to the information Mr. McCoy has given me, a Laotian district chief and other officials have told him that American helicopters flew Meo officers into Laotian villages where they purchased opium. The opium was also transported out by American pilots and planes to Long Tieng, the CIA headquarters in Northern Laos where it was allegedly refined into morphine and eventually heroin.

The Meo tribesmen, as many of my colleagues know, had been recruited by the CIA and form a mercenary army which fights the Pathet Lao Communist guerrillas. For the Meo, opium is considered an important cash crop.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked CIA Director Richard Helms to thoroughly investigate Mr. McCoy's allegations. Since Mr. McCoy obtained his information late last summer it is imperative to determine whether this kind of drug trafficking is still going on. A principal, unanswered question which the CIA must resolve is "At what level in the CIA were officials aware of this illicit drug traffic?"

It is also becoming increasingly clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Nixon administration is covering up and contradicting itself about the importance of heroin traffic in Southeast Asia. After Mr. McCoy testified before a Senate committee last month the State Department termed his charges about the involvement of Government officials in Southeast Asia as "unsubstantiated." However, the U.S. Army Provost Marshal reported in 1971 that high ranking members of the South Vietnamese Government were in the top "zone" of the four-tiered heroin traffic pyramid.

Mr. McCoy, quite rightly, also disputes the State Department's claim that "Southeast Asia is not a major source of heroin on our market." This statement by the State Department directly contradicts a General Accounting Office report which states that:

> The Far East is the second principal source of heroin entering the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative to determine whether the CIA is still involved in opium traffic and who was responsible for the alleged involvement of the CIA with the opium growers of Laos.

My letter to Mr. Helms follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1972.

Mr. RICHARD HELMS,
Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELMS: I am publicly releasing today substantial new evidence that indicates that U.S. pilots flying CIA-operated helicopters have been smuggling opium inside Laos. These allegations are contained in a letter and additional information that I have received from Mr. Alfred McCoy, author of a forthcoming book on heroin traffic in Southeast Asia. If these allegations are true, then the CIA is implicated in fostering the drug traffic that ruins the lives of tens of thousands of Americans.

I am writing to you today to request that you thoroughly investigate Mr. McCoy's allegations. Since Mr. McCoy obtained his information last summer, it is imperative to determine whether this kind of drug trafficking is still going on. A principal unanswered question which the CIA must resolve is: "At what level in the CIA were officials aware of this illicit drug traffic?".

I hope that you will report to me in full the results of your investigation.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

ROONEY REQUESTS HALF BILLION FOR RELIEF OF FLOOD RAVAGED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of probably the most destructive flood in America's history I have today announced that I will request an additional half billion dollars in Federal funds for relief in the five States which have been declared disaster areas by President Nixon.

The $92.5 million now available to the States in the President's disaster relief fund will not begin to compensate the losses suffered by the five States. If Pennsylvania were to receive the entire $92.5 million it would cover only about 10 percent of the cost of putting the State back together.

I have introduced legislation to provide relief funds in the amount of one-half billion dollars to the States which have been declared disaster areas by the Presi-

dent. This money would be disbursed by the Office of Emergency Preparedness whose primary function is the administration of the President's disaster relief fund. In past crises involving disaster areas in several States OEP has apportioned financial aid to the States according to the amount of damage sustained in the respective States. This is the only fair and realistic method of tackling the massive cleanup job ahead.

Pennsylvania, hardest hit by the flooding by a wide margin, would receive the lion's share of the supplemental appropriation, and Florida, having the least amount of damage of the five States, would receive the smallest portion. The remaining money would be distributed by OEP to Virginia, Maryland, and New York.

Other Members and I of the Pennsylvania delegation will meet with Governor Shapp today to discuss the crippling effects of the flood.

I hope to explore all avenues of Federal assistance with the Governor and arrive at some concrete goals with regard to the needs of the stricken Pennsylvania communities.

BEEF PRODUCERS GET SHORT END OF STICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the action the President took on Monday of this week in lifting completely all restrictions on the imports of foreign-produced meats may be the lesser of two evils. It will not accomplish the effects desired. Indeed the President himself warned that it may be many months before prices will be affected in this country.

Meat prices, and particularly beef prices, have been the subject of controversy and sharp debate for some months. The record shows that beef prices at the slaughter level are today about the same as they were 20 years ago. Of what other foodstuff may the same be said?

Of course, beef prices at retail have been up and remain high. We have shown that unlike the slaughter price, today's retail beef prices are from 40 to 100 percent higher than they were 20 years ago. It is, therefore, fairly obvious that the spread margin goes to the wholesaler and retailer and not to the beef grower.

I have opposed increasing meat import quotas and my position on this point has not altered. However, I am well aware of the dilemma in which the administration finds itself—it seems to feel that lifting the meat quota is more acceptable than clapping price controls on all raw agricultural products, including meat. Remembering the effect of price controls on meat some years ago, I shudder at such a prospect. Obviously, increasing meat imports is the lesser of two evils.

In my judgment, price controls on farm products will not materially affect or halt increases in food prices. The problem is not at the farm. Prices at the farm level for raw agricultural products are not greatly different than they were 20 years ago, as the case of beef. In the interim, labor costs on the farm have risen steeply and all other costs of farm production from machinery to pitchforks have jumped from 50 to 15 percent.

Price controls on raw agricultural products would bring about a freeze but the ultimate result must be sharp shortages in all foodstuff supplies. The farmer simply cannot be expected to accept being made the sacrificial goat.

INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Independence Day, July 4, is the most meaningful day in American history. The countless celebrations and parades are mere demonstrations of the affection and dedication the American people feel for their country. Perhaps an even more accurate measure of the Nation's pride in its history and traditions may be found in our literature. The beautiful art of poetry is often used as a vehicle to express one's loyalty and devotion to all of the good things America has stood for over the years. Recently, two short poems were presented to me by Dr. Frances Clark Handler, who is the national director of the National Poetry Day Committee, Inc., and the Florida State Poetry Society, Inc. These poems express very ably the sentiments of millions of Americans, and I commend them to my colleagues:

GLORY-GLORY

(By Dr. Frances Clark Handler (1969))

There flies the FLAG
Of this Freedom-land!
Here comes the marchers
Beating the band.
Skip a heart-beat thrill
Start stamping your feet
For a glorious FLAG
Never downed in defeat!
Hum all the tunes as . . . .
They pass in review . . . . .
Carrying OUR FLAG
With the red-white and blue.
Nothing compares with this
Wonderful thrill . . . . . .
At the sight of our Banner
As our eyes tear-fill!

FOURTH OF JULY

(By Dr. Frances Clark Handler (1967))

Can anyone see the Flag go by
Without a tear come to the eye
Tears for the many young and brave
Tears for lives they willingly gave
Never questioning duty right
For ideals we all must fight
So . . . our American Flag . . . . . be
Symbol . . . . of . . . . our . . . . Democracy!

TRAVEL INDUSTRY

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, having the honor as well as the good fortune to represent the congressional district which includes as one of its key areas, the city of Miami Beach, America's best known travel resort, I have a deep awareness of the benefits the travel industry creates for this country, both as a growth industry and as an instrument through which Americans traveling in the United States are made more aware of their own heritage, and as a means by which visitors from other nations in increasing numbers are learning more about our country.

I am pleased that the platform committee of the 1972 Democratic National Convention extended an invitation to the Miami Beach Tourist Development Authority, an official government agency of the city of Miami Beach, to appear before it at its meeting held on June 9 in Atlanta, Ga., for the purpose of properly urging that the 1972 Democratic Party platform include a statement emphasizing the importance of both national and international travel in and to the United States, and that the platform also contain a commitment to broaden the scope and responsibility of the U.S. Travel Service in this regard.

The statement made by the Tourist Development Authority before the platform committee most clearly and admirably illustrates why the promotion of travel, and especially foreign travel to the United States from abroad, should receive the attention of the Congress, and I include this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

STATEMENT OF JACK D. GORDON, CHAIRMAN, MIAMI BEACH TOURIST DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

The Miami Beach Tourist Development Authority is the official agency of the City of Miami Beach for the promotion of tourism. The Authority's activities are supported by the revenues provided by a 2% Resort Tax applying to the purchase of lodgings, food and beverages within the city limits of Miami Beach as authorized by the legislature of the State of Florida. Under the terms of the city ordinance establishing the Tourist Development Authority, and by virtue of the Enabling Act passed by the 1967 session of the Florida Legislature, the sole purpose of the Tourist Development Authority is the promotion and enhancement of tourism in and to the City of Miami Beach.

The Tourist Development Authority of the City of Miami Beach wishes to thank the Platform Committee of the 1972 Democratic National Convention for the opportuntiy of making this statement relative to the importance of the emphasis it believes tourism to the United States from foreign countries should receive in the 1972 Democratic Platform. For your consideration in this regard, we respectfully submit the following:

1. The movement of U.S. citizens overseas as visitors to foreign countries is increasing rather than diminishing, despite a series of governmental efforts to induce American citizens to spend vacations in the U.S.A. The campaign urging Americans to vacation in the U.S. had its origin in the Federal government's obvious desire to avoid adding to the balance of payments deficit. It has now become evident that the only way in which travel and tourism as an industry can be helpful in this regard is to atract more and more foreign nationals to become visitors to the United States. It is estimated that the net outflow of dollars due to foreign travel by Americans approximates $5.5 billion. The inflow from foreign visitors to America is only $2.9 billion.

2. The Federal government agency responsible for overseas tourism to the United

States, which includes cooperation and coordination with state and local tourist promotion agencies and groups, is the United States Travel Service. U.S.T.S. operates under the aegis of the United States Department of Commerce, and its director has the title of Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The history of the United States Travel Service is one of broad concepts and well-intentioned programs, both of which have consistently fallen victim to severe under-funding in the Federal budget. This has come about not because any echelon of the Federal government has denigrated the importance of bringing increasing numbers of foreign nationals to the United States, but rather because other priorities have been set by the Federal government in the past decade.

3. Local and state agencies and groups involved in the promotion of tourism are usually themselves the victim of underfunding, and are generally ill-equipped to undertake any independent effort in areas outside of the United States and Canada to promote tourism to their cities and states. The result has been that the build-up of overseas tourism to the United States has suffered from a lack of coordination and direction at the Federal level, due in the main to under-funding, and a generally feeble effort at local and state levels due to a combination of under-funding and a lack of knowledge and personnel.

4. The Tourist Development Authority of the City of Miami Beach, recognizing the need to attract overseas visitors, has used its funds to open an office for the promotion of tourism to Miami Beach and to Florida, in London, England. This office is still new and in the process of becoming established as an effective instrument, but during its brief life, the Tourist Development Authority has been impressed both by the willingness of U.S.T.S. to assist, and the high caliber of the limited assistance it has been able to provide. In addition to cooperating with the Tourist Development Authority in the promotion of travel from the United Kingdom and from Europe, U.S.T.S. has engaged in cooperative promotion with the Miami Beach Tourist Development Authority in Canada, and has evinced a desire to undertake a cooperative Latin American promotion.

5. The effective promotion of overseas tourism to all areas of the United States depends upon a broad understanding of the needs and desires of visitors coming to this country from overseas, and the ability to create and carry out group travel, promotion, and arrangements in conjunction with carriers and destinations. To do these things effectively requires a major commitment at the Federal level to develop increased knowledge and capability for the attraction and handling of overseas visitors within the United States, and for the undertaking of effective group travel promotions and arrangements from abroad.

6. It should be significant to the Federal government to understand that all of the combined budgets of the United States Travel Service and of state and local promotional agencies are significantly out-spent by competitive overseas destinations, the promotion of all of which are either direct government expenditures or government subsidized expenditures. These competitive overseas destinations appears to be out-spending the United States, purely on the basis of actual government expenditures, in the ratio of 20 to 1. U.S. tourism, therefore, finds itself in the position of being a major industry and one which can be of significant benefit in reducing the balance of payments deficit through attracting overseas visitors to the United States, especially from the viewpoint of a benefit-to-cost ratio insofar as promotional expenditures versus dollar return are concerned, while at the same time it is an industry faced with major government-subsidized competition from abroad. It is also an industry for which there is no help to be found in tariffs or quotas, but which is dependent on the Federal level upon the funds allocated for the activities of the United States Travel Service.

7. Beyond the need to attract overseas visitors to the United States purely from the point of view of dollar earnings, there is probably no more significant activity to be undertaken in terms of building good will and understanding of this country among citizens of other nations, than through the purposeful increase in travel to the United States by citizens of other nations. This includes all categories of travel—holiday travel, trade groups, professional and study groups, students, etc. This means that every dollar devoted by the Federal government for the promotion of tourism cannot only be justified by the dollar results it will achieve; it can be justified to even a greater extent on the basis of the very evident need for building up increased understanding and good will on the part of citizens of foreign countries for the United States.

The Tourist Development Authority of the City of Miami Beach, therefore, respectfully urges that the Platform Committee of the 1972 Democratic National Convention favorably consider in the 1972 Platform of the Democratic Party a strong commitment to expand the scope of the responsibility and activity of the United States Travel Service, including the capability of promoting domestic travel and resort areas within the United States to citizens of the United States as a means of providing reinforced domestic competition to overseas destinations, and to provide the requisite Federal funds to accomplish this. We firmly believe that this is not only called for because of the reasons cited above, but that the investment of funds is exceedingly well-justified by the excellent record of accomplishment of this agency of the Federal government, which has been achieved despite a consistent lack of adequate appropriations.

The Tourist Development Authority of the City of Miami Beach expresses its appreciation to the Platform Committee for the opportunity of making this statement, which it hopes will receive favorable consideration by the Committee in its formulation of the 1972 Platform.

THE MEAT IMPORT ACTION IS A STRIKEOUT

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, when the mighty Casey came to bat all Mudville said, "Hurrah!" and when Casey struck out there were only tears and muttering in Mudville.

And it is like that on yesterday's Executive order to lift meat import quotas. Consumers are supposed to hurrah because they are told beef will get cheaper.

If that is what is supposed to happen because of the Executive order suspending import quotas, someone just struck out because housewives making their meat purchases for their families are not helped in any way by this maneuver affecting import quotas for beef and mutton.

First, much of the imported meat comes from dirty plants in the various 40 countries that ship meat to the United States. Second, the quota of beef is almost all boned out meat that is not cheap. It goes into hamburger or hot dogs or stew or sausage meats and wholesales at about 70 cents a pound. At retail meat counters it costs about 85 cents a pound as hamburger. There are virtually no steaks, roasts or other cuts in the import package.

As to the dirty part of it, the General Accounting Office study in 1971 of 80 meatpacking plants in four different countries was a documentary describing in detail the actual shortcomings and sloppy contamination of meat in a large number of the foreign plants inspected. By accepting meat from almost 1,000 foreign plants licensed to sell in the United States we sacrifice wholesomeness and as a result we are getting meat products from plants which do not meet the high standards required by our law.

In Australia, out of 30 plants inspected by the General Accounting Office, 10 had to be delisted; that is, their license to sell meat in the United States was canceled, because they were dirty plants and the meat produced was unsanitary.

Had all of the nearly 1,000 foreign plants licensed to sell here been inspected by the General Accounting Office we would have probably cut the list substantially. There is every indication from the GAO report on those plants they did inspect that all foreign licensed plants should be promptly reviewed to ascertain how many of them are actually meeting our standards.

Our total imports of beef last year under quota were about 1.2 billion pounds. It is likely most Americans ate some of this beef, mostly without being aware of it as the imports are mixed in with domestically produced beef. Our inspection of imported meat here in this country is done on a random selection basis devised by statisticians. Less than 1 percent of the imported meat in a shipment is actually inspected. Even that amount is inspected under a system prescribed by the Department of Agriculture which permits the acceptance of a certain amount of dirt, blood clots, cysts, manure, hair, or several other objectionable features which departmental jargon records simply as defects. Their theory is that a little bit of any of these defects mixed in with a lot of meat is nonharmful.

I am sure housewives, and for that matter their husbands and all the rest of the family would find it quite unappetizing to be told that the hamburger or hot dogs they are eating could be made from meat products which, while statistically acceptable to the Department of Agriculture, contain many instances of the above unwholesome defects.

I have known of the shortcomings of the inspection of imported meats for some time and have drawn the attention of the House to the needs for reform of the inspection procedures as they affect imported meat. The Department of Agriculture is not entirely aloof to these suggestions. It made plans for some changes last year and I am told as a result of the General Accounting Office report that they have made some other changes to make their inspection of foreign plants more effective.

However, they are way behind in adopting all of the needed reforms. There should be complete inspection in the United States of all of the frozen meat that is slaughtered 4 to 8 weeks prior to the time it arrives in this country. It should be thawed out and inspected piece by piece before it is ground into hamburger or put into weiners where it is impossible to ascertain whether it was completely sanitary, wholesome or fresh.

It is next to impossible to determine if the meat had any blood clots or cysts, or was mixed in with manure, dirt, hair, or any of the objectional defects for which our meat inspectors routinely examine, after it is ground up or flaked.

By increasing quotas for meat imports we are encouraging greater shipments of meats from foreign plants to this country and these will very likely be a scraping of the bottom of the barrel concerning the quality and wholesomeness of the additional meat that our offshore suppliers will attempt to stir into the trade channels of this country. There will be pressure to find new sources of meat from additional unqualified plants in the countries we are already dealing with, and to encourage other countries, notably the small have-not nations, such as many in Latin America, that have not been selling us meat in any quantity, to step up their shipments to us. We are already burdened with the system of faulty inspections, incomplete examination of imported meats for wholesomeness and a sort of diplomatic immunity to foreign meat packing plants which undermine our high domestic standards on meat sanitation. The General Accounting Office report attests to all that. Now we are going to have them scraping the packinghouse floors for more meat to let in.

So that is why I say someone instrumental in drafting the Executive order has struck out. Strike one is that it will not mean consumer bargains. Manufacturers or processors and hamburger chains get most of it, and the price is at our U.S. price levels. Strike two is that if the supply is increased in appreciable quantity, we will further aggravate the situation as to wholesomeness and unsanitary meat. The deeper we go in scraping the bottom of the world barrel of meats the worse condition we are going to find the meat scraps in. It is already bad enough now and reform is desperately needed on our inspection system of imported meats.

Strike three is that the ineffectiveness and the dangers of this ploy to appear as a friend of the consumer will soon become as apparent as the absence, when this Executive order was being floated, of the Secretary of Agriculture who promised farmers he would fight all moves to put a ceiling on livestock prices "like a wounded steer."

And it was after Casey's strike three that all Mudville knew the ball game was over and we had lost.

CARL RICH: A LOYAL SERVANT, A BELOVED FRIEND

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, members of this body who knew him mourn the passing of Carl W. Rich, a lifelong resident and public servant of Cincinnati.

Carl died unexpectedly Monday in the city which had been his home since birth, September 12, 1898. It was there that he became a favorite alumnus of Walnut Hills High School. It was there that he obtained three degrees, including an honorary L.L.D., from the University of Cincinnati.

He was later an instructor on the university's faculty and then he served his city and Hamilton County as assistant city solicitor, assistant prosecutor, prosecuting attorney, city councilman, mayor, and common pleas court judge. He was elected by his townsmen in 1962 to the 88th U.S. Congress where he served until 1965.

Carl Rich was president and chairman of the board of the Cincinnati Royals Professional Basketball Team. Many people referred to him, because of his many civic endeavors, as Mr. Cincinnati. It was a most appropriate title.

In addition to being a Member of Congress, Carl served his country on two other occasions. He entered the Army as a private in World War I and was separated as a second lieutenant. The year following Pearl Harbor, he resumed Army duty as a lieutenant in the infantry reserve and served with the Chemical Warfare Division. He came out 3 years later with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

There were few, if any, civic organizations in Cincinnati that Carl was not a member of, or had not served in some official capacity. He received the national distinguished service award of Tau Kappa Alpha, a forensic honor group, in 1961, and was a 33d degree Mason and Shriner. He was a member of the Hyde Park Community Methodist Church.

Cincinnati lost a valued citizen and servant in Carl Rich's passing. And, I lost a very personal friend. Carl Rich was one of the finest people I ever met. I was indebted to his guidance and counsel through the years. It is with deepest sympathy that I extend condolences to his family. He was a dear friend.

TEMPORARY REMOVAL OF MEAT IMPORTS A STEP IN RIGHT DIRECTION; COMPLETE REPEAL OF MEAT IMPORT QUOTA LAW STILL NEEDED

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the decision announced by the President yesterday to suspend meat import restrictions during the rest of this year is a step in the right direction. But if the long-range food needs of this Nation are to be met, if meat is to be available on the American dinner table at stable prices, then complete repeal of the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 is imperative.

While suspension of import restrictions for the rest of the year will let some extra supplies in and will help to hold price speculation, it is unrealistic to expect the exporting countries to disrupt their traditional marketing patterns for a 6-month gain. Only repeal of the Meat Import Quota Act will assure these Nations that the American market is worthwhile. They will then be able to plan their herd developments so as to begin to meet the continuing long-range needs of the American shopper.

Some 50 Members of the House have sponsored legislation which I have introduced which would repeal the meat import quota law. The President has admitted that it is an anticonsumer piece of legislation. Now is the time to repeal this law—once and for all.

During the coming weeks, I will be seeking additional cosponsors to this repeal legislation. I hope that all the Members of this body will support this effort to bring greater price stability to the American marketplace.

MONTAN WAX

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been my belief that many inequities exist in the trade relations among nations and firms within those nations. One of these inequities has been brought to my attention on numerous occasions. This inequity may appear to be insignificant when weighed against the massive importance attributed to many larger issues of international trade. This issue deals with one item, montan wax, within the tariff schedules of the United States. It is my belief that an inequity in international production costs of montan wax could be remedied by the following bill, which is offered for that purpose.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That item 494.20 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "Free" in column 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "100% ad val.".

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after date of the enactment of this Act.

The effect of this bill would be to stimulate production of montan wax in the United States. This stimulation of production would occur by enhancing the competitiveness of American firms with respect to the firms of column 2 nations. These nations have consistently been able to undersell American firms due to lower costs of production. Consequently the production capabilities of montan wax in the United States have been inhibited. This bill should be considered for the following reasons:

First. It is in the best interests of the United States to enhance her internal montan wax productivity. Montan, bareco, and carnauba hard waxes are used in the production of carbon paper. Carbon paper, though perhaps not essential to our national security, is none-

theless of moderate importance in the running of our Government as well as most businesses. I will not overemphasize this importance; however, each of you may look at the uses your respective offices make of carbon paper to determine its relative importance.

Second, montan wax, being one of the three hard waxes which go into the manufacture of carbon paper, is produced, for the purposes of U.S. consumption, in the United States and East Germany. We annually consume approximately 8 million pounds of this wax per year in the production of carbon paper. We have the internal capability of meeting this demand but our primary producers of these hard waxes are unable to produce at anywhere near their full capability due to their inability to compete with the lower production costs and therefore prices of East Germany wax.

Third. By putting a 100-percent ad valorem on East Germany produced wax we will raise their costs of supplying montan wax so as to stimulate our internal production of this wax. It has been said that this will only cause East Germany to export their unrefined wax to West Germany who will, in turn, upon refining the wax, export it to the United States under the auspices of their favored nation status. This would have a twofold impact. First of all, very generally, it would aid in stimulating trade between West Germany and East Germany which is, in my estimation, in our best interest. Second, it would add a step in the production cycle of montan wax produced in Germany which, in turn, would cause their production costs to rise. This rise in German production costs would, in turn, enhance the competitive propensity of our Nation's producers of hard waxes, particularly montan wax.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, this bill would promote our internal productivity of montan wax. It might also very well, as I have pointed out, serve to stimulate a facet of trade and hence cooperation between East and West Germany.

A NEW MONETARY CRISIS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Britain floated the pound, and thus became the first major country to break the Smithsonian Agreement on exchange rates. The immediate cause of the action was speculation against the pound, but the result of the action was consternation in the major capitals of the world. Germany and France, and all the other members of the Common Market, were faced with a problem of what to do with their own exchange rates—hold them or set them free—and what to do in case of a speculative run against the dollar—which is almost certain to come. Indeed, the German Central Bank had to absorb almost a billion dollars in the last hour of trading on Friday. Currency exchanges are closed today, but when they reopen tomorrow the surge of speculation will begin with new fervor.

Chances are that Germany and France, and other nations as well, will try to stanch the flow of dollars by imposing exchange restrictions. They may also elect to float their currencies.

Whatever may happen, one thing is clear: Only 6 months after the Smithsonian Agreement, the world is in the midst of its third major currency crisis in less than a year.

There is no sign of real progress toward the monetary reforms that would end these crises; there is no real agreement on even what should be negotiated in reform discussions.

There are signs of emerging trading blocs, which would trade heavily among themselves, but restrict trade between the blocs. Europe would be one such bloc, the United States and a few other countries another; and Japan and other countries the third. This would create a difficult world for all of us, and might signal the end of any hopes for a truly liberalized world trade policy—a policy which in recent years has brought unprecedented growth and prosperity to the nations of the world.

I believe it is urgent for monetary reform to take place at an early date. There is no assurance now that any further devaluation of the dollar can be avoided; there is no assurance now that the world will not break itself up into gigantic trading blocs; there is no assurance now that the world can avoid competitive devaluations and all the economic chaos that this could bring about.

I want my colleagues to be aware of the issues, and aware of what is at stake. With that in mind, last Thursday my Subcommittee on International Finance subject of monetary reforms. I think that you will find instructive the statements submitted by our distinguished witnesses—only hours before the onset of the present crisis.

I will continue to inform the House of matters in the subcommittee's jurisdiction which are of concern to us all; I hope that our efforts thus far will prove as enlightening to my colleagues as it has to me.

Mr. Speaker, I make a part of the RECORD at this point the statements made by myself, Under Secretary of the Treasury Volcker, and Mr. Lawrence Krause at our hearings last Thursday:

OPENING STATEMENT OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE HENRY B. GONZALEZ, AT SUBCOMMITTEE'S HEARING ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1972

I am going to ask your indulgence for a few prefatory remarks.

Exactly one year and three weeks ago I suggested the type of hearing for this subcommittee we have called for today. You will recall that at that time our country and Europe were still reacting to the May 1971 crisis. After some consideration, the leadership and I agreed to suggest that the Joint Economic Committee delve into the subject matter, and this it did. However, I still believed this subcommittee, unlike the Joint Economic Subcommittee, be a legislative body, had an inescapable responsibility.

Yet, I felt the more pressing duty was to expedite, the substantive legislation having to do with the International Financial Institution, Inter Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, and International Development Association, even though there again some pressure was felt to temporize and let the Senate act first. All during the while, I must say I still felt this subcommittee should have had the type of groundwork hearings we commence today.

But the recess in August, the Presidential Pronouncements that same month, Phase II, and so forth intervened.

I am happy we finally begin today.

Ten months ago the President announced his new economic policy in response to growing economic problems here at home and abroad. In its international aspects, the program aimed at an immediate devaluation of the dollar and reform of the international monetary system. The devaluation was intended to make U.S. products more competitive in the world markets, and reorganization of the world monetary system was designed to achieve reforms and changes in world trading arrangements.

The new economic policy launched the nation on a new course, but our destination seems unknown, or at best obscure.

Today, the dollar has been devalued, but no one is really certain that another devaluation can be avoided, as speculators continue to make runs on various markets, and governments abroad have been forced time and again to intervene in order to keep the dollar from plunging below the floor set at the Smithsonian meeting just last December.

There has not been much visible progress toward reforming world trading arrangements, though negotiations seem to be underway constantly.

Finally, we have yet to define the objectives we are seeking in a reformed monetary system.

All of this has caused some anxiety; even the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has felt impelled to set out his ideas for a revised monetary system, and call for action at an early date.

There are many unanswered questions: Will the United States want a flexible or fixed exchange system? Will we ever reopen the gold window? Will we insist that the role of SDR's widen, or will we call for creation of a wholly new international asset against which to peg currencies? Do we want a dollar standard, or will we settle for a Eurocurrency system of some kind?

I believe that by now the United States should have at least outlined its objectives for a revitalized international monetary system. We should have by now been able to define what we hope to achieve, and what steps we have taken or propose to take toward our objective. I do not believe that we can continue this uncertainty forever without causing considerable damage to ourselves and to the rest of the world; without some kind of progress there seems to me to be a danger that not only ourselves but the rest of the world might be unable to sustain growth and prosperity—and in our case, to fully restore our economic well-being.

The purpose of our hearing today is to hear a distinguished expert tell us what he believes ought to be happening in the area of reform, and a distinguished Treasury representative tell us what is taking place. At a later time I would like to have additional sessions to consider some additional proposals and continue to explore what our alternatives may be. I would like to continue hearing from academic experts, and of course from such government agencies as the Federal Reserve Board, which has direct responsibility for implementing a good part of any new monetary policy this nation adopts.

Our first witness is Lawrence B. Krause, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. Mr. Krause was a senior staff member of the Council of Economic Advisers from 1967–69; he is presently a lecturer at the Johns Hopkins University School for Advanced International Studies, in addition to his Brookings fellowship. Mr. Krause is author of a

number of important studies, and most recently "Sequel to Bretton Woods," a Brookings paper which traces the postwar monetary development, and outlines a course for reform of the Bretton Woods institutions.

Mr. Krause.

Our next witness is the Honorable Paul Volcker, Undersecretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs. Mr. Volcker is a man of wide knowledge and experience, and bears great responsibility for managing our monetary policies in these difficult times. During the various crises of the past year or two, he has done a considerable amount of traveling and negotiating, and may be nearly as well traveled as Henry Kissinger.

Mr. Volcker, welcome.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SITUATION: 6 MONTHS AFTER THE SMITHSONIAN AGREEMENT

(By Lawrence B. Krause)[1]

It is a great pleasure for me to be able to accept your invitation to appear before this Committee. I commend the Committee for maintaining interest in what may appear to be an esoteric subject, particularly in this election year. The subject is technical and difficult, but also of substantial importance for the well-being of the United States.

A phase of the international monetary crisis was settled on December 18, 1971 when the major industrial countries at the Smithsonian agreed to realign their exchange rates. The new pattern of exchange rates is quite sensible; remembering, of course, that no structure of exchange rate parities can remain fixed for very long in a world in which countries have the right to determine their own economic policies. But it is clear that the agreement did not settle all of the problems bedeviling the international monetary system. The Bretton Woods arrangements need some fundamental changes. This was recognized by the Group of Ten when they agreed to temporarily suspend the requirement that spot exchange rates be constrained within a 1% deviation from established parities (or central rates) in favor of a 2¼% permitted deviation, and more explicitly by a commitment to seek reform of the system.

During the six months since the Smithsonian agreement, some progress has been made toward reform. First, participants in foreign exchange markets have learned how to cope with the wider bands for spot exchange rates. During the early months of 1972, some market upset did occur because there was not a massive reflow of funds back to the United States as has been anticipated. Since wider bands are designed to discourage short term capital movements among countries, massive flows should not have been expected. Subsequently, however, foreign exchange markets have quieted down indicating that the lesson has been learned, (and also helped along by higher rates in the United States relative to other advanced countries). Foreign exchange markets now operate in a responsible fashion proving the usefulness of the wider bands and strongly supporting the inclusion of wider bands within a permanent reform of the system.

Second, some progress has been made on deciding on the forum in which negotiations for the reform will be held. The organizational issue contains two substantive questions; which countries are to have a say in the negotiations and whether or not the monetary issue will be linked in some way with trade or other issues. Clearly all member countries of the IMF have an interest in the negotiations, yet it would be impossible to negotiate a useful agreement with all members taking part. The proposed solution of a new Group of Twenty that would mirror the Executive Board of the IMF seems like a sensible compromise to the representational issue. All countries can have their views presented for consideration even if they themselves do not have a place at the negotiating table. The linking or non-linking of issues relates to the mandate of the new group. Apparently the Group of Twenty will have a rather broad mandate to consider non-monetary issues, if that should be necessary or desirable. While having a broad mandate should not be bothersome in itself, the desirability of actually linking issues in negotiations needs careful examination.

In a fundamental sense, all economic and political issues involving international relations are linked together. Many potentially contentions issues arise among countries. The resolution of any particular problem does affect how others will be treated. Obviously a virulent trade war will prevent countries from reaching a monetary agreement, but this does not imply the desirability of joint negotiations. As a general rule, complicated issues should be separated so that they can be negotiated in their own terms. There are some areas of overlap that cannot be avoided; for instance the question of whether trade restrictions should be permitted for balance of payments maladjustments. However, these are relatively few and easy to handle. In my view linking trade issues to the international monetary reform would be a mistake. Achieving a monetary reform is immeasurably more important to the United States than progress on the trade front. Since the trade negotiations will likely be much more difficult, linking the two will stand in the way of the monetary reform. Furthermore, different specialists are involved, different methods of negotiations are utilized, and different considerations are paramount which all speaks for separated negotiations.

Progress toward the international monetary reform can also be seen in the preparations some governments are making for the start of the formal negotiation. The British Government for one, is reported to have pushed along their investigations on reform. Hints of our own government's preparations have been made public through speeches of various officials. But I must say that I have noticed that progress has not been made. I had hoped that by now an outline of a U.S. plan for reform would be public so that other governments and interested parties could be studying it; but this is not the case. I feel the negotiations cannot really get started until the U.S. makes its views known and, as far as I know, we have not yet make up our minds as to what we desire.

Clearly the place to start is to decide what we want the revised international monetary system to do for the United States. A number of worthy goals might be mentioned such as the promotion of unrestricted and non-discriminatory international trade and payments and the minimizing of currency crises. In my view, however, the primary goal of the reform should be the establishment of a system which permits the United States and other countries to achieve equilibrium in their international transactions without forcing us or them to forgo basic domestic economic objectives such as full employment and reasonable price stability. In other words, international monetary arrangements should permit countries to have economic independence to the degree they desire it and to the extent they can reasonably utilize independence. Thus I see the adjustment mechanism as the most important subject for negotiation and decision.

An examination of postwar monetary history demonstrates that the only successful methods of correcting balance-of-payments disequiliberia is through exchange rate changes. Neither German border taxes and rebates, French trade restrictions, British stop-go budgets, nor American capital controls has proven effective. Thus the essence of reform in my view is more flexibility of exchange rates than existed under the old Bretton Woods arrangements, and this flexibility should be available to all countries, including the United States. Under the old system, the United States could not initiate a change in the exchange value of the dollar without a major crisis; under a reformed system it should not be much more difficult for the United States to initiate a change than for any other major country.

I will not bore this Committee with my ideas as to how to achieve this result. I have already written them in my publication, *Sequel to Bretton Woods*. Since the completion of that study I have done some more work on the details, but I have not changed my mind on any of the essential features of the proposal.

There are two areas of the reform, however, that need to be highlighted because they are particularly dependent on U.S. decisions. The first relates to the question of what role the dollar should play in the reformed system. The second concerns how much authority member countries and the United States in particular should be willing to delegate to the International Monetary Fund.

It is my belief that the United States will not be able to alter its exchange rate at our initiative as long as the dollar is the primary reserve asset in the international monetary system. Thus I think the United States should declare that we do not want the dollar to maintain its reserve currency role and should endorse one of several methods for replacing it. Being able to issue a reserve currency yielded very few benefits to the United States in the past and imposed certain costs. In the future, the benefits would be reduced and the costs could become very burdensome indeed. Instead, the United States should push for the replacement of the dollar by SDRs with a permanent funding of outstanding official dollar balances. After this happens, the dollar can be made convertible again into established reserve assets. At the same time, the United States should rid itself of all its monetary gold so as to end the tie between a devaluation of the dollar and a rise in the price of gold. It would also be desirable if the Congress would delegate to the President the right to change the value of the dollar within prescribed limits and subject to legislative review. In this way the political constraints on changing the external value of the dollar could be lessened. These steps along with other technical improvements could give the dollar enough flexibility so that we would not have to "shock" the whole world to restore balance-of-payments equilibrium.

The monetary system will work best if all exchange rate parities are only changed by small amounts—say by 1% or less—and if need be rather frequently. This means that countries cannot wait until they are certain that a devaluation is necessary; they must act on presumptive evidence. Such evidence should primarily consist of observations of the exchange markets themselves (both spot and forward). For the United States, this would mean that when there is a clustering of currencies of major countries at their ceilings relative to the dollar, and this situation persists for a number of months, then the dollar should be devalued. For instance, under the present situation a 1% devaluation of the dollar would seem in order. If future developments proved it to be unnecessary, it could then be reversed. Better to make a mistake and reverse it than let a disequilibrium cumulate through inaction.

We must also recognize that if the international monetary system is going to have some degree of fixity of exchange rates and still

---

[1] The views are those of the author and should not be attributed to other staff members, officers, or trustees of the Brookings Institution.

maintain its cooperative character, then some form of central direction will be required. The United States performed this function in the postwar period just as Britain did in an earlier era. The United States is no longer strong enough to accept the responsibility of maintaining the viability of the system by itself. Since no other country is stronger than the United States, the responsibility for directing the system must be exercised collectively through an international organization—namely the International Monetary Fund. This means that the United States like other countries, will have to vest certain powers with the Fund. The IMF should be constantly evaluating the external position of all countries to determine whether a change in exchange rates is required. In that way they can pressure all countries to take part in the adjustment process. I do not think that the Fund should have the power to tell a country which policy to adopt, but they should have the right to tell the country that they must do something to correct its external imbalance. This is what collective responsibility means.

The proposal that I have put forward, I think, arises primarily from the logic of the situation in which the world now finds itself. The world is still too fragmented for a really fixed exchange rate system, but too integrated to easily tolerate truly flexible rates. My proposal is a compromise between the two that can evolve in either direction.

In closing, let me say a few words about the importance of immediate action. It is all too easy to accept the current state of affairs as being reasonably satisfactory. The exchange markets are calm—at least with respect to the dollar. European countries don't seem to be very worried with present arrangements, so why should the United States feel any sense of urgency? It is my belief that the Smithsonian Agreement is nothing more than a useful stopgap, and that present arrangements are essentially unstable. As disequilibria develop among countries, as they certainly will, the lack of an effective adjustment mechanism will become all too painful. Restrictions and controls will proliferate and exchange crises will be formented. This need not happen if we act in time. The United States should lead the way toward reform by putting forward its own proposal to get the negotiations started.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PAUL A. VOLCKER

Mr. Chairman, as you made clear in calling these hearings, there is an intense interest in international monetary reform, and an understandable restiveness to see practical results from this important work. The Administration fully shares that concern. It is in no one's interest to procrastinate. Equally, it is crucially important that the job be done right.

My intention today is to provide a brief "status report," to outline our broad approach toward the task ahead, and to respond to the question that you may have.

Movement toward international monetary reform was launched by the forthright actions announced by President Nixon last August 15. In essence, those actions recognized that whatever the accomplishments of the existing system—and they were very substantial—some of the basic premises that underlay that system were no longer valid. Fundamental changes would be necessary to meet the problems and circumstances of the 1970's and beyond. Those changes must entail not just the mechanics of the monetary system, but new ways of approaching problems that will fairly reflect the existing balance of world economic power and will result in a fair distribution of responsibilities among nations.

Secretary Shultz has asked me to emphasize particularly to the Subcommittee that the change in leadership at the Treasury has in no way changed our goal, our basic approach, or our resolve in seeking those changes.

The first few months after August 15 were necessarily devoted to immediate and urgent problems of achieving needed exchange rate changes and resolving other short-range problems essential to viable interim arrangements—in the process setting the stage for consideration of longer range reform.

By March, we could point to a series of concrete accomplishments:

A major and unprecedented exchange rate realignment had been negotiated in the Smithsonian Agreement, and legislative action to modify the dollar's par value had been completed.

Trade liberalization steps of tangible value had been concluded with the EC and Japan on certain short-term problems, achieving in the process greater recognition that the problems of the monetary system are paralleled by problems of the trading order.

Agreement was reached on wider bands of fluctuation for market exchange rates about the officially stated exchange rates—a potentially important ingredient in any more permanent system as well as a means of facilitating the exchange rate realignment.

Understandings were reached not only to proceed with monetary reform discussions, but to undertake broad trade negotiations with the objective of supporting the goal of an open, liberally-oriented world economy.

It is natural that some time was needed for the Smithsonian Agreement and related arrangements to be digested and fully understood, and for the dollar exchange markets to settle down. By Spring, however, such understanding—and particularly the recognition that we and other nations wholeheartedly accepted and supported that Agreement—had been achieved. We naturally welcome the fact that the dollar has not, for some time, been under pressure in exchange markets, and believe a foundation has been established for dealing in an orderly way with the difficult problems of long-term reform of the trade and payments system.

One element in the more realistic appraisal of the outlook is that it is now widely recognized that exchange rate changes have perverse initial effects and may require two years or so before yielding their full benefit toward balance of payments adjustment. Thus, U.S. trade and basic payments deficits for a transitional period are understandable. Indeed, in recent months, the continuing deficit in our underlying accounts has been covered by a substantial reflux of short-term capital, perhaps in part an unwinding of the so-called "leads and lags" in payments that swung heavily adverse in 1971.

I would be the first to emphasize these developments do not, by any means, assure long-run stability. We continue to face a major challenge in achieving and maintaining a substantially stronger trade position—which, in turn, must be the foundation for lasting equilibrium in our international payments as a whole. The Smithsonian Agreement provides a basic point of departure so far as exchange rates are concerned. But we cannot neglect the task of reinforcing the competitive capabilities and opportunities of our industry in other directions—not least by maintaining better wage and price stability at home. This effort is absolutely fundamental, not just to us but to the world trading community in general. The stability of the international monetary system cannot be achieved without a stable dollar.

These sensible and effective first steps that have been taken are in no way cast in doubt by the erratic fluctuation in the private market for gold—influenced by a combination of self-serving rumors and reduced sales by South Africa, the main producer. These fluctuations in price have had no significant main lesson to be drawn, in my judgment, is the fact that this commodity—characterized by almost fixed production and increasing industrial use, and more than most subject to speculative whims—cannot provide a sensible or lasting foundation for an international monetary system.

With the shift of attention from the immediate issues to long-term reform of the system, we must face the difficult task of transferring agreement on the need for reform in the abstract to hard agreement on specifics. In approaching this task, we have felt it essential to ask fundamental questions about the kind of world we have and want. Monetary issues cannot be considered in a vacuum, without taking full account of the interrelationships with trading rules and practices, the character and magnitude of capital flows, and other questions of international economic policy.

Considering the range and complexity of the issues, no one should be surprised that monetary reform will take time, even among the most reasonable of men. Monetary reform is not a matter of finding an answer in the sense that one discovers a unique solution to a puzzle or works out a mathematical problem. There is recognition that all will benefit from a well functioning system, but that generality cannot disguise the fact that vital national interests are at stake, that perceptions of these interest differ and that, in the end, they must be resolved in a realistic manner. International cooperation involves hard decisions and compromise.

As you know, we have at this stage of discussion presented no monetary blueprint for resolving and reconciling the questions. The problems of technique and mechanism—such as the composition, volume and use of reserves; the international role of the dollar; the nature of the exchange rate regime itself; methods of influencing capital flows, and the like—are important and difficult. They will not be adequately resolved, in our judgment, without an adequate conception of objectives and the nature of the underlying problems—and I would be less than frank if I did not confess that much of the discussion to which I have been exposed seems to slide past these fundamental points.

For instance, we know that the so-called "adjustment process"—the process by which surpluses or deficits are corrected—has not been working well. Indeed, this is the key reason the system broke down. We suspect one of the main factors behind this inadequate adjustment is the fact that most advanced countries, for quite natural reasons, like to run surpluses. Over the years, they have acted relatively quickly (and often are forced to act) to correct their deficits. There is no similar compulsion to correct surpluses. Yet, one country's surplus is another's deficit—and for too many years the United States had provided the residual deficit. Yet, our own efforts to correct that deficit, as so vividly revealed last Autumn, may, be strongly resisted, since those efforts unavoidably impinge on others.

A persistent residual deficit for the U.S. was not consistent, in the end, with the kind of monetary arrangements we had. Many proposals for a new system would require much more effective and rapid elimination of imbalances. In view of our accumulated deficits and the erosion in our reserves, we would need to look forward to a massive strengthening of our reserve position, the prospect of a period of surpluses in our payments, and to longer-term equilibrium. The other side of this coin is that others could not, on the average over the years, continue their accustomed surpluses.

This seems to us to imply the need for strong incentives or penalties for corrective

action by surplus countries as well as by deficit countries if this balance is to be achieved. How willing are countries to accept such strong international "disciplines?" If there is no such willingess, then monetary systems that depend for their functioning on quick and effective adjustment simply will not work.

A related question is how the adjustment should be made. For both practical and philosophical reasons, we seek a balance of payments equilibrium that can be maintained without reliance on controls; indeed, the very word equilibrium implies as much. We believe in present and foreseeable circumstances, sustainable balance in our accounts will require a strong trade and current account position. Yet, some others seem to be saying that somehow we are not entitled to such a surplus, that capital outflows lie at the heart of our problem, and that they (and we) should force "equilibrium" by the indefinite use of controls on investment; or, perhaps, by commitments to raise our domestic interest rates to levels equal to or above those prevailing abroad. Obviously, this issue needs airing.

It is related to the degree of independence that countries—not just the U.S., but virtually every country—seeks to maintain for domestic policy. None of us can live in isolation, and proceed oblivious of the efforts of our actions on others. But if we build a system which unrealistically presumes domestic policies can practicably be tuned to each twist and turn in external circumstances, the system would not, in my judgment, work for long.

Some countries with particularly close trading and political links—such as the European Community—may well perceive a greater potential for coordination of internal and external policies among them. This issue is plainly posed by the drive for greater monetary unit within Europe.

I believe we are only beginning to understand the implication of economic and monetary union in Europe for the world economy. From a world standpoint, there seem to be both dangers and potential advantages. An aggressively expanding preferential trading area with highly protectionist policies in key sectors directly affects our trading capabilities, and has broad implications for the world trading order and the adjustment process. On the other hand, success in achieving monetary unity in Europe could help deal with one source of monetary instability in the past, and permit Europe to cooperate more effectively in building an effective world monetary system. In both aspects, trade and money, the European Community is a phenomenon that cries out for more thought as to how it can be fit into arrangements consistent with the broader world interests.

This listing of issues is hardly exhaustive, but it is suggestive. Without discussion and some common appreciation of these basic problems, our examination of techniques will hardly be fruitful. Again and again, we find these are the issues that lurk behind much of the controversy on mechanics.

Out of these discussions, some fundamental points of convergence are already emerging.

On the question of the *scope* of the reform, I think there is now almost general acceptance of the need for a wide agenda—for extending the dimensions of the examination to include related issues of trading rules, investment and development. There is greater recognition that the review must be deep—that fundamental reform is required rather than a patch-up of Bretton Woods, that new thinking and new concepts are required to meet today's needs.

The question of finding the most appropriate and effective *forums* for reform negotiations has been the subject of considerable discussion in recent months. I confess these decisions have not been reached as rapidly as I expected and wished—they have taken time precisely because they are not an idle debate over the "shape of the table," but because real issues are involved. There is genuine and legitimate concern over the *size* of the table, for effective negotiation requires that the number of voices be limited. There is concern over *who sits around* the table, for membership must be balanced, representative, and at a senior level of political authority. And there is concern over *what gets placed* on the table, in that the negotiators must be given a broad competence to consider all relevant aspects of the operation of the trading order and monetary structure in their search for solutions.

I can report that progress has been made. Nations are in substantial agreement on the formation of limited but representative group, a "Committee of Twenty," under the general auspices of the International Monetary Fund. We have insisted that the mandate extend beyond narrow monetary questions to related trade questions and other related issues, and that the Committee be willing and able to draw on the resources of competent persons and groups in a position to assist even though they may be outside the regular fabric of the IMF.

We envisage that this Group of Twenty will be the main negotiating forum, but we also hope and expect such other bodies as the OECD will participate in the effort. I should note as a point of some importance that we do not believe either the Group of Twenty or the OECD should attempt to negotiate specific trade barriers. That kind of bargaining over specific trade measures—tariffs, quotas, and the like—lies properly in the framework of GATT or other forums.

Finally, there seems to be widespread agreement that, whatever the particulars of the exchange rate regime, in concept it must provide for greater flexibility than in the past—greater and smoother adaptability to changing economic circumstances. The issue, as I see it, is not stability versus instability for the monetary system, but rather how more flexibility in exchange rate practices in the shorter run might contribute to the larger stability of the system as a whole.

Obviously, translating even these broad principles into a specific operational system will take time and, as I have suggested, there are other points on which profound differences remain to be resolved. We have a lengthy agenda.

If that agenda is to be attacked successfully, the United States must unquestionably play a leading role in this effort. We accept that challenge willingly. But, in doing so, there must be a realization that the nature of our leadership must change as economic circumstances have changed. Leadership can no longer be equated with magnanimously accepting disproportionate burdens, acquiescing in discriminatory arrangements, or granting one-sided privileges, in the thought our strength is impregnable and others are weak. Leadership no longer can mean, if it ever did, that the world is waiting for us to impose a "Made in the U.S." label on the monetary order. Leadership does mean using the full measure of our influence and our strength to insist that the monetary and trading system—its burdens, its responsibilities and its opportunities—fairly reflects today's balance of economic and political capacities.

We take pride in the record of our leadership since last August 15. We recognized the need for fundamental change. We took the painful measures needed to restore the domestic and international strength of the U.S. economy which must underlie any reformed monetary system. We reached agreement on moves which will yield major support to our balance of payments in the course of 1972 and 1973 after the present period of initial perverse effects ends. We encouraged recognition of the need for reform, and the breadth of reform. We pressed for the formation of institutional arrangements in the Group of Twenty and the OECD to facilitate the negotiation. And we helped to develop the consensus, to the extent it has emerged, on the nature and direction of the reform.

We want to move ahead with monetary reform as rapidly as we can, and—this is critical—as rapidly as other nations will move. We also want to build a monetary structure which will last for a generation. It would be foolish to idle away our chances for a new and better system. But it would be criminal to accept an unsatisfactory agreement for the sake of a prompt agreement.

Our efforts will be aimed at building a sound and enduring system. The stakes are large, and recognized as such. We approach the task in the conviction that failure is not tolerable; that, with persistence and resolve success will be achieved.

THE WEST FRONT

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today on the proposed plans for the extension of the west wing of the Capitol and the legislative challenge it poses for Congress. Presently, we must deal with the Senate amendment No. 36 to the legislative appropriations for fiscal year 1973 which states that—

> No funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said (west front extension) project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

The House managers have requested that we oppose the amendment. It is my opinion that this move would be a mistake. Let us examine the facts.

The Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol was created by an act of Congress in 1955 and given the responsibility to direct government construction on Capitol Hill. The idea of extending the west front was initially introduced by the late Capitol Architect J. George Stewart; under whose guidance the east front of the Capitol was extended between 1958 and 1962. The original argument for the extension of the west front was Stewart's announcement in 1963 that it was about to collapse.

In 1969 the Commission recommended the extension of the west front and $2 million was appropriated for the final planning. At that time preservationists urged that the Commission consider the alternative of restoration, instead of extension; that the preservation of a focal point of our history and its beauty be chosen over functional additions that would destroy the historic character and spirit of the building. Consequently the $2 million in funds were impounded, pending the results of a study on the feasibility of restoration. The Nation's most qualified structural engineering firm, Praeger, Kavanaugh, and Waterbury, of New York, was employed to conduct this study. It was guided by five specific stipulations originally set by the Commission. Briefly these conditions included:

First, that restoration could be undertaken without creating unsafe conditions

and that it would be durable and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

Second, that restoration would not cause any more vacation of existing space than extension;

Third, that the plans for restoration would be adequate for competitive lump sum bidding for the final project;

Fourth, that the cost of restoration would not exceed $15 million; and

Fifth, that the time for restoration activity would not exceed the time necessary for extension.

The results of the Praeger study came out in January of 1971. The engineers concluded that the Capitol was far from imminent collapse, that restoration would be simpler than extension and that restoration could be accomplished at less than $15 million. In short, all five guidelines could be satisfied by a restoration project.

At their own initiative, the AIA appointed a task force on the west front to review the Praeger report. The AIA Task Force concurred with the Praeger-researched conclusions. And yet, the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol unanimously voted to go ahead with plans for extension. One can only speculate why the Commission chose to ignore the opinions of acknowledged experts. The Commission's plans presently include keeping the old sandstone walls intact, and yet, they will be obscured from the outside by the erection of a new marble facade. The Capitol's central section, completed in the 1820's, would be moved forward 44 feet; the old House and Senate wing, built about 1817, would be extended 88 feet and small connecting corridors would be extended 66 feet. This extension of some 163,000 square feet would be accomplished at a cost of $368 per square foot—or a total estimated cost of $45 to $60 million, quite a sum compared to the more modest $15 million projected for a restoration solution.

While the Congress should not be placing itself in the position of expending such sums on a project whose objectives can be accomplished at much less cost, the greatest mistake of the proposed extension would be the desecration of a building that is a keystone in our history. The Historic Site Act of 1935 states that—

> It is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

It is important that we uphold esthetic virtues in an age in which they are too often ignored in the interest of pragmatism and utility. Because it has been irrefutably demonstrated that the west front can be restored, the Commission is now arguing that the added office space afforded by the extension is needed. An argument can always be made that more spaced is needed—Parkinson's law insures that—but we will not always have an opportunity to preserve a structure that is so historically important as the west front of the Capitol. More office space can be built elsewhere, perhaps on top of the Rayburn Annex garages and at much less cost than the $368 square feet estimated for the extension project.

May I say in conclusion that I feel that from an economic, esthetic and pragmatic point of view the Commission's extension project should be reversed.

THE U.S. CAPITOL HAS HISTORIC MEANING FOR AMERICANS ALL ACROSS OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to extend the west front of the Capitol, an issue on which Members of the House will have a chance to vote either tomorrow or Thursday, has become an issue of concern to all Americans who look upon the Capitol as not only the symbol of democracy, but as a link to the history of their Nation.

The meaning which the Capitol holds, not only for the people here in the Washington area, but for Americans all across the country, many of whom have never seen the Capitol in person, is evidenced by editorials and articles that have appeared in hometown newspapers.

These articles are unanimous in their view that the American people do not want $70 million of their tax money spent to cover up the last remaining historic portion of the original U.S. Capitol and turn a historic monument into a 1972 office building.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include some of these articles and editorials, which have appeared in papers from Charlotte, N.C., to Minot, N. Dak., and I hope Members will keep this grassroots sentiment clearly in mind when the Capitol extension project comes up later this week.

[From the Charlotte News, Apr. 3, 1972]

PRESERVE THE CAPITOL

The Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, which was established in 1955 to consider changes in the Capitol's East Front, has now given the go-ahead for final planning of a 160,000-square-foot extension of the West Front. At a total estimated cost of $60 million, that comes to about $375 a square foot, which is somewhat above the market price for office space.

Some of the cost, we're sure, is accounted for by the special nature of the project. After all, one can't just use aluminum siding in adding on to one of the nation's most historic buildings. And there is sure to be a certain amount of costly renovation involved as well. For example, simply restoring the West Front to its former soundness and splendor would cost up to $15 million. Deducting the renovation estimate, however, still leaves the square-foot cost pushing $280.

That's high, even by Washington standards. The mammoth and roundly criticized Rayburn House Office Building, for example, was built for less than a third of that square-foot cost.

But cost is not the prime objection. The real issue is whether a national treasure will be tampered with for no compelling reasons. Even if the addition won't really, in the words of S. C. Sen. Fritz Hollings, make the Capitol into "Disneyland, D.C.," the change is akin to painting a mustache on the Mona Lisa. While it's true that the Capitol has been changed over the years, that's all the more reason to call a halt now while there is something "original" left.

If Congress were so squeezed for space that it faced a choice of altering the Capitol or moving out altogether, the situation might be different. But that isn't the case. Both houses have other plans for providing additional office space, and the New Senate Office Building, completed in 1958, was specifically sited and designed with expansion in mind. If the 285 offices and crannies—an unmarked hideaway is apparently a status symbol in Congress—are really needed, they should be provided elsewhere on the Hill.

As for the Capitol itself, Congress ought to follow the recommendation of the American Institute of Architects and adopt a "permanent policy prohibiting any further major alteration to the Capitol."

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News, Apr. 4, 1972]

DEFACING HISTORY

Congress has voted to convenience itself at the cost of $60 million and at the incalculable cost of defacing the U.S. Capitol.

Congress tried that in 1969, then second-thought itself into a compromise. Members decided that instead of smashing the building's west face they would repair it if it could be renovated safely and conveniently and if the job could be done for $15 million or less. A study supported by a task force of the *American Institute of Architects* concluded that both conditions could be met.

No matter. Unwilling to let facts, good taste or common sense get in the way of a dear opinion, Congress decided last month to proceed with the demolition and extension anyway. For the moment, dissenting Sen. Ernest Hollings has managed to snag the appropriation in his subcommittee.

There it should stay. Lost with the historic outline of the Capitol would be the graceful terraces created by Frederick Law Olmsted, one of the nation's great landscape designers. The Congress that so loves to prattle on behalf of the national heritage would have caused the diminution of that heritage.

The congressmen say they need more offices, more restaurants, more toilets and another barbershop. They probably do, and a grateful republic should be pleased to provide the facilities. Probably Howard Johnson or the Holiday Inn folks could whip up something for them in the neighborhood at a fraction of the cost and with considerably more sensitivity than Congress so far has shown.

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) News, Apr. 5, 1972]

CHANGING HISTORY

Congress is again determined to change the historic facade of the nation's Capitol by proceeding with a 33-foot marble extension at a cost of about $50,000,000.

The west front's sandstone is crumbling and must be rebuilt, but in order to get additional rooms and working space Congress would extend the building, thus destroying its original proportions. More space could be added to the present congressional office buildings, far less beautiful and historic than the Capitol.

The American Institute of Architects has proposed that the west front simply be restored, at less than one third of the cost, without defacing it or destroying its historic authenticity.

Of course Congress knows better and has not listened to such advice. Funds have not yet been appropriated, but unless the people object, they soon will be. Then future generations will see not the original capitol, but a 1970 version.—Mandan Pioneer

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 10, 1972]

REFACING THE CAPITOL

Viewed from the Mall in Washington, the nation's Capitol presents an inspiring sight, especially near sunset. Then the great West front designed largely by the famous Charles Bulfinch glows softly, and its high columns loom from the recess of the wings.

But the West front's sandstone is crumbling, and now the way is open, not to rebuild the historic facade, but to replace it. The Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has voted unanimously to proceed with a 33-foot marble extension, at a cost now put at $50,000,000. The cost was estimated at only $30 million two years ago, and no doubt will be much higher by the time the work is finished, for that is the record on governmental building.

It is a poor time to spend all this money on a project that is unnecessary, for the main argument for it seems to be Congress's desire to get more rooms and working space. That could be provided by extending the present congressional office buildings, where extensions would do no harm to architecture that is almost beyond esthetic injury. Or an entirely new building might be constructed.

But it is the Capitol, the architectural symbol of American government, that Congress is toying with, and it is a great symbol as well. The front will be drastically changed if Congress now appropriates funds; the columns will protrude instead of being framed in the wings, and the symmetry will be reduced from gracefulness to blunt solidity. That is why officials of the American Institute of Architects objected. They proposed that the west front simply be restored, at less than one third of the cost of refacing or defacing it.

Congress has not listened to such advice. Perhaps it would only heed the people and, if so, now is the time to speak out. For the people own the Capitol, and revere it, if Congress does not.

[From the Des Moines Register, Mar. 20, 1972]

WORKINGS OF AN IDLE MIND

(By Donald Kaul)

They're going to tear down the last remaining wall of the original Capitol in Washington. What they say they're doing is "extending the west front" by 88 feet.

What it amounts to, is tearing down the wall, the one that looks out onto the Mall, and building an addition, thereby destroying that glorious sweep of the steps from the street to the Capitol on its hill.

That poor old building has been attacked by more barbarians than the Great Wall of China, all of them wearing business suits.

The problem is that your average congressman or senator is, architectually speaking, a clod. Show him the cathedral at Chartres and a concrete pillbox, ask him which one he likes better, and he'll say:

"Which one has a bigger office for me?"

The American Institute of Architects has protested the extension, preferring instead a "restoration."

But, considering the fact that until a few years ago the Capitol architect wasn't even an architect, you can imagine how much weight that protest carries.

You know, we were horrified last year when somebody set off a bomb in the Capitol. An atrocious act of mindless destruction, we called it.

And so it was. But compared to the mindful acts of destruction of our Congress, it was as nothing, a mere firecracker.

If we cared more, they wouldn't do stuff like that.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., Mar. 11, 1972]

ANOTHER CAPITOL HILL BOONDOGGLE

Hardly to be considered surprising is the finding of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol that Congress should authorize an early start on a multimillion dollar extension of the West Front of the historic building dominating the Washington skyline.

No precise figures have yet been divulged as to costs, but the job has been estimated at "more than $60-million." If it follows the pattern of most other Capitol Hill building projects in recent years, however, the final tally will more nearly double any such estimates.

The commission's recommendations fall into the "ho-hum" category, since the commission was created by Congress and made up entirely of members who, whatever their personal inclinations, are fully aware of their colleagues' propensity for spending public money.

Lacking any evidence that the costly addition could be justified on the basis of the relatively small amount of additional working space it would provide, backers of the West Front expansion anchored their hopes in carefully nurtured fears that the 143-year-old face—the only remaining part of the original structure visible from the outside—was beginning to crumble, and was therefore unsafe and could some day precipitate a major disaster.

The finding blithely overrode the recommendations of the commission's own advisors, a distinguished engineering and architectural firm of New York, which reported more than a year ago that the West Wall was in no danger of crumbling, and that it could be fully restored without impairing its inherent beauty.

Four years ago, on the basis of such warnings, Congress appropriated nearly $150,000 to install heavy flying braces and take other steps to shore up the old sandstone walls. Warnings that any substantial shock could still cause the wall, and perhaps the dome itself, to collapse, were somewhat discounted, however, when terrorists succeeded in exploding a large bomb in the critical area. Although damage was extensive, there was no threat of a building collapse.

The projected West Front extension would largely duplicate the "face-lifting" job done of the East Front, begun in 1958 and completed in 1962, in which the old sandstone front was faithfully reproduced in marble, 32½ feet east of the old front, at an "authorized" cost in those days of $24 million.

The space thus created, in addition to providing a few more committee rooms and private office hideaways, also gives members an exclusive passageway between the House and Senate wings through which they can walk without fear of encountering irate taxpayers.

Tentative plans for the comparable extension on the West Front calls for similar additional facilities, as well as another private dining room for members where they can consume subsidized meals without drawing too heavily on their $42,500 a year salaries.

The project still has substantial opposition, even though their combined voices may be ineffective against the will of Congress members to serve a selfish interest.

Leading the list is the American Institute of Architects, which claims the old wall can be safely repaired and strengthened. Many individual architects, artists and historians have strongly protested at every step of the way everything done so far to destroy the magnificent lines of the original building, and which if continued unchecked could create an aesthetic monstrosity.

Perhaps least effective of all are the pathetic cries of taxpayers who must foot the bill for such creature comforts for their elected representatives which they can only dream about for themselves.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for Tuesday, June 27, 1972, after 6 p.m., on account of official business.

Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today after 4 p.m., and balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MIZELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), from 4 p.m., and balance of the day, 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. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, June 28; and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. WILLIAMS, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. KEITH, for 30 minutes, on June 28.
Mr. SKUBITZ, for 5 minutes, on June 28.
Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SKUBITZ, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. FUQUA, for 60 minutes, on June 28.
Mr. ABBITT, for 60 minutes, on July 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members to extend their remarks preceding the vote on Mr. HARRINGTON's Vietnam amendment: Messrs. MCCLORY, MONAGAN, MIKVA, BURKE of Massachusetts, BOLAND, KOCH, MATSUNAGA, Mrs. ABZUG, and Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. GONZALEZ, notwithstanding a cost of $525, to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in six instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. BELCHER.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. KEATING in two instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. SCHMITZ in five instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.
Mr. KEMP in two instances.
Mr. PEYSER in five instances.
Mr. CRANE in five instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.
Mr. CLEVELAND.
Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. ZION.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in 11 instances.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
Mr. TIERNAN.
Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.
Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. KARTH.
Mr. MIKVA in eight instances.
Mr. FUQUA.
Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.
Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.
Mr. REUSS in two instances.
Mr. HATHAWAY in three instances.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. BADILLO in two instances.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.
Mr. SYMINGTON in six instances.
Mr. DORN in two instances.
Mr. WALDIE in two instances.
Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in three instances.
Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.
Mr. MAHON.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 910. An act for the relief of Dennis Keith Stanley; 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. 6666. An act for the relief of Maj. Michael M. Mills, U.S. Air Force.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 28, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2115. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an urgent proposed supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1972 for disaster relief (H. Doc. No. 92-316); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2116. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on enforcement of housing codes by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and how it can help to achieve the Nation's housing goal; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15641. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15580. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 15474. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and, research in, Cooley's anemia, (Rept No. 92-1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 15475. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national advisory commission to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treatments for multiple sclerosis (Rept. No. 92-1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 15692. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1026. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14455, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and revise the program of assistance under that act for the control and prevention of communicable diseases (Rept. No. 92-1181). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1027. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15081, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack against heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1182). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1028. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15587, a bill to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1183). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15259 (Rept. No. 92-1187). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 15695. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the authorized strength of the Naval Reserve in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15696. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide a misdemeanor penalty for a first offense involving the possession of counterfeit currency of a face value of $100 or less; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 15697. A bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act (23 U.S.C. 110, 138) to clarify the law relating to what constitutes a formal contract between the Secretary of Transportation and a State highway department and stating further circumstances by which a State highway department will be permitted to refuse said aid; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 15698. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the annual registration and inspection of food manufacturers and processors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 15699. A bill to reduce interest rates on Small Business Administration disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15700. A bill to provide financial assistance for the construction and operation of senior citizens' community centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15701. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15702. A bill to prohibit common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 15703. A bill to provide for the establishment of residential treatment centers for emotionally disturbed children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 15704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a refund of the manufacturers excise tax on certain tires, tubes, and tread rubber used by local transit systems furnishing commuter service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of refund payable with respect to fuels used by local transit systems for commuter service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 15706. A bill making additional appropriations to provide relief and assistance in the States of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, New York, and Florida following the recent major flood disaster; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 15707. A bill to amend the black lung benefit provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 to delete the provisions for offset of black lung benefits against State workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, and disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 15708. 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. WYMAN (for himself Mr. LLOYD, Mr. WARE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. BARING, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FISHER, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CONOVER, and Mr. SLACK):

H.R. 15709. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to prohibit the making available of Government procurement sources to Federal grantees and contractors; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 15710. A bill to amend section 401(a)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow multiple employer jointly trusteed plans to allocate forfeitures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15711. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the prohibition on the concurrent payment of compensation for disablity because of a civilian work injury and of reduced retired or retirement pay based on service in the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 15712. 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. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 15713. A bill to impose a duty on imported montan wax if a product of any Communist country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DOW, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 15714. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer a program of direct Federal employment to improve the quality of the environment, the public lands, Indian reservations, and commonly owned and shared resources through a program of recreational development, reforestation and conservation management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOW, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 15715. A bill to establish a National Human Resources Conservation Corps to rehabilitate persons convicted of violating certain narcotic drug laws and persons who volunteer for membership in such Corps and to improve the quality of the environment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MCKAY (for himself and Mr. LLOYD):

H.R. 15716. A bill to establish the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Arizona and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 15717. A bill to improve judicial machinery by providing benefits for survivors of Federal judges comparable to benefits received by survivors of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 15718. A bill to amend the Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Act of 1947 to authorize the restoration and extension of the Sockeye and Pink Salmon Stocks of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEYSER (by request):

H.R. 15719. A bill to authorize the hiring of employees of detective agencies for other than investigative services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 15720. A bill to provide a practicable precipitation management program for the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WARE (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FREY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 15721. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to increase the forgiveness advantage contained in sections 231 and 232 of such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1236. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORGAN (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. NIX, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YATRON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WARE, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H.J. Res. 1237. Joint resolution making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 636. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee for the purpose of conducting an investigation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. QUIE, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. DU PONT, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, and Mr. SMITH of New York:

H. Con. Res. 637. Concurrent resolution calling upon all parties to the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of prisoners of War to insure respect for that Convention by persuading North Vietnam to fulfill its obligations under the Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself, Mr. WYATT, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. FISH, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. WINN, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. ERLENBORN):

H. Con. Res. 638. Concurrent resolution calling upon all parties to the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War to insure respect for that Convention by persuading North Vietnam to fulfill its obligations under the Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. HALPERN):

H. Con. Res. 639. Concurrent resolution urging establishment of a United Nations Voluntary Fund for the Environment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H. Res. 1029. Resolution amending the rules of the House by adding rule XLV on House-authorized Federal budget; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15722. A bill for the relief of David H. Stoll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15723. A bill for the relief of Jane M. Vida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 15724. A bill for the relief of Mr. Abedin Sulejmani; to the Committee in the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15725. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio De La Fuente and his wife, Berta Leticia De La Fuente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 15726. A bill for the relief of David C. Y. Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Tuesday, June 27, 1972*

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, DD., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of Hosts, who has watched over this Nation from the beginning even until now, we thank Thee for mighty men of lofty vision, high idealism, and mature wisdom who have arisen in every generation to serve the common good. We pray that Thou wilt bless our present leadership with grace and strength for their days. Prosper the deliberations of Thy servants in this Chamber to the end that they may legislate wisely and, in concert with their colleagues elsewhere, ameliorate the ills which beset us and so enlarge the opportunities of the people that we may have prosperity and justice at home and a secure and permanent peace abroad. Guide the Members of this body through the labor of this day until the evening comes, then in Thy mercy give them a peaceful rest and renewal of body and soul.

We pray in Thy holy name. Amen.