

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 25, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain John D. Vincer, center chaplain, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage, bless the people of these United States with Your abiding presence. Bless those assembled here in Congress who represent them. May they realize the strength of Your love and the support of their respective constituencies. Enliven them with Your eternal Spirit that awake to Your command they may be kept from complacency, self-concern, and fear of new ways. Inspire their minds with the vision of a nation made beautiful and righteous in service to one another and to You, our God. Renew in all our Nation's people a feeling for community, that every one of us may be a steward of the heritage of our common humanity and grow in the way which You have consecrated for us. It is with grateful hearts we pray our prayer this day. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8708. An act to extend the authority of agency heads to draw checks in favor of financial organizations to other classes of recurring payments, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 3337. An act to authorize the acquisition of a village site for the Payson Band of Yavapai-Apache Indians, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8694. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Yavapai-Apache Tribe in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 22-E and 22-F, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1152. An act to facilitate the preservation of historic monuments, and for other purposes.

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. 1991. An act to assist in meeting national housing goals by authorizing the

Securities and Exchange Commission to permit companies subject to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 to provide housing for persons of low and moderate income; and

S. 2411. An act to establish the Cumberland Island National Seashore in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

## MONETARY POLICY IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the news has been filled with accounts of intervention by the Federal Reserve System in foreign exchange markets to help maintain the value of the dollar.

These news stories plainly indicate that the Federal Reserve has been operating in secrecy and that these accounts were more or less "leaked" to the press. No public announcement was made of the operation and, once again, the Federal Reserve System appears to be operating as if it were a "separate government."

Obviously, it is important that the Federal Reserve System participate in maintaining the value of the dollar, but it is equally essential that it be understood that monetary policy is the responsibility of the elected representatives of the people and that it cannot be carried on independent of the President. The responsibility and initiative on such matters must rest with the administration.

Because of space limitations, I will not be able to go into this question in detail at this point in the Record; however, I will extend my remarks later in today's Record and include newspaper clippings on this point.

## SECRETARY GENERAL WALDHEIM'S COMMENTS ON BOMBING OF DIKES IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, appealed to Washington to "stop bombing the dikes of North Vietnam." Later, perhaps after giving the statement the careful thought which should have preceded it, Secretary General Waldheim admitted that he could not verify the reports. His information, he said, came from "private channels to Hanoi."

One of the greatest inconsistencies in this inconsistent war has been the highly selective criticism engaged in by presumably intelligent, informed leaders. The well-documented, brutal invasion of South Vietnam and the daily shelling of civilians by the North Vietnamese did not bring imploring words to the North Viet-

namese aggressors to halt their savage actions. But undocumented, rumor-inspired gossip generated by Hanoi produces indignant appeals to "stop bombing the dikes."

The United States cannot expect to escape criticism on every occasion. But certainly we can expect the leader of a world organization to avoid jumping to conclusions. We can expect him to be evenhanded and unselective in his criticism. We can expect, above all, that he have concrete evidence in hand before making serious charges from his international podium.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 280]

Abourezk	Edmondson	Mollohan
Alexander	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Nedzi
Anderson, Tenn.	Fulton	Nelsen
Baring	Gallagher	Patman
Blaggi	Gettys	Pelly
Blanton	Gray	Rarick
Blatnik	Griffiths	Robison, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hagan	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Halpern	Roybal
Caffery	Hanna	Runnels
Camp	Harrington	Ryan
Clark	Hathaway	St Germain
Clay	Landrum	Scheuer
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	Shipley
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Springer
Conyers	McClure	Stuckey
Culver	McDonald,	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McEwen	Terry
Dowdy	McKay	Udall
Dulski	McKinney	Ullman
	Mikva	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

## THE OMINOUS FISCAL SOUNDS

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, sounds emanating from the fiscal experts of the Government and from the press are ominous. And they are growing more ominous each week. It now appears that in Federal funds, this Government will go deeper in debt—during the 4-year period ending next June 30—by something in excess of \$107 billion.

Based on figures announced yesterday, the Federal funds deficit for the fiscal year 1972 just closed on June 30 was about \$26 billion. And the projected Federal funds deficit for the current fiscal year 1973 was estimated early last month

at \$37.8 billion, but in my judgment it may well exceed \$40 billion.

These Federal funds deficits add up this way:

[In billions]	
Fiscal 1973 (as recently projected)-----	\$37.8
Fiscal 1972 (tentative actual)-----	26.0
Fiscal 1971-----	29.9
Fiscal 1970-----	13.1
Tentative total, the 4 years-----	106.8

The current fiscal year 1973 figure of \$37.8 billion is subject to many uncertainties. As I indicated, in my judgment it may well exceed \$40 billion.

Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to realize that almost one-fourth of the entire national debt will have accumulated during just the 4-year period, June 1969 to June 1973.

Of course, by whatever method of measurement, the budget is seriously out of balance. The Alice in Wonderland, so-called full-employment budget is in deficit. The unified budget which counts in the trust fund surpluses is in deficit. And of course the Federal funds budget is in deficit.

And every current sign points to a worsening situation.

#### CRITICISM OF U.N. MEMBERS OF CONDUCT OF WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, last night and this morning the news media quoted the Secretary General of the United Nations as saying he had "private and unofficial information" that the United States is bombing the dikes in North Vietnam, and called on the United States to refrain from such bombing. Later, after the damage had been done, naturally, he conceded that he could not verify his earlier information.

It appears to me that the Secretary General, Kurt Waldheim, is being used as a tool by a carefully planned propaganda campaign by North Vietnam and its allies—including a small vocal minority in this Nation. The irony of the entire situation is that, while he castigates the United States for allegedly bombing dikes in North Vietnam, which our President says we are not doing, the Secretary General nowhere—I repeat, nowhere—mentions the fact that regular army troops of North Vietnam have invaded South Vietnam in direct contravention to existing treaties and international law in an effort to overrun the south. Is this an oversight by Mr. Waldheim?

Did the Secretary General call on North Vietnam to withdraw its invasion when its tanks crossed the DMZ? Were there any cries of outrage when An Loc was under siege for almost 2 months by the North Vietnamese, resulting in scores of deaths of civilians and noncombatants?

Was there a public statement by Mr. Waldheim when the refugees from An Loc—mostly women and children—were slaughtered by mortars and artillery as they were fleeing?

Who of all the member nations of the United Nations publicly condemned North Vietnam for the 3,000 men, women and children killed and buried in common graves during the 1968 Tet offensive?

All that is necessary to stop all the bombing, not just allegedly bombing dikes, is for the North Vietnamese to stop invading and killing South Vietnamese.

In view of this failure of the United Nations in the past to assist in resisting Communist aggression and the attitude of the Secretary General, I think it is time to reassess our membership in the United Nations and our financial commitment to it.

#### LEGAL SERVICES ATTORNEYS SHOULD PAY THEIR OWN EXPENSES TO ATTEND BAR ASSOCIATION CONVENTIONS

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, this year the National Bar Association, a fine professional organization is holding its annual convention in Miami Beach July 31 to August 6 and the American Bar Association will hold its convention in San Francisco for the inclusive dates of August 14 through 17.

Throughout the history of the OEO legal services program, both of these bar associations have consistently supported the realization that we need free legal services for the poor. However, I am today advised that our Office of Legal Services is now requesting that all the legal services attorneys, who have been milking the Federal Government and the taxpayers in many respects, have authorized free travel for the legal services attorneys out of the project funds and also have per diem paid while they attend both conventions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time the Acting Associate Director of Legal Services Mr. Theodore Tetzlaff, of the Office of Legal Services, should begin to realize we pay our own way to conventions, and there is no reason why the men in OEO legal services cannot do likewise and stop milking the public.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1972, I was unable to be present on the House floor during consideration of the following proposals.

For the RECORD, had I been present, I would have enthusiastically voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 265, H.R. 14424, the rule under which the National Institute of Aging was considered, I would have voted "yea";

Rollcall No. 266, H.R. 14424, final passage of the bill which would amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Aging, I would have voted "yea";

Rollcall No. 267, H.R. 14455, final passage of the bill which would 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, I would have voted "yea"; and

Rollcall No. 268, H.R. 15081, final passage of the bill which would 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, I would have voted "yea."

#### ADJOURNMENT IN EXCESS OF 3 DAYS OR FOR ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 648) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 648

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the provisions of Sec. 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 USC 198), as amended by Section 461 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 [Pub. Law 91-510; 84 Stat. 1193], the House of Representatives and the Senate shall not adjourn for a period in excess of three days, or adjourn sine die, until both Houses of Congress have adopted a concurrent resolution providing either for an adjournment (in excess of three days) to a day certain, or for adjournment sine die.*

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—as I understand the Clerk's reading of this resolution, and from contact with the distinguished majority leader just prior to its presentation, this requested approval will for all intents and purposes obviate the intent of the Joint Commission on the Reorganization of Congress and indeed the statute evolving from the Reorganization Act of 1970.

It was the hope of that Commission, which held 3 years of hearings, and of the Committee on Rules, which later submitted the bill that became the Reorganization Act of 1970, that the Congress could obviate the impasse between the legislative and/or authorizing committees vis-a-vis the operating or appropriations committees to the place where we could accomplish our work in a so-called constitutionally defined short session of any given Congress, and be out of here at least by the end of July.

I understand the need and the necessity for the House-Senate concurrent resolution as submitted by the gentleman from Louisiana. I do not understand why it needs to be open ended as to date.

I wonder if the distinguished majority leader can explain, Mr. Speaker, why it is until such time as subsequent concurrent action or joint action sets a date certain, or adjourns for over 3 days.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Louisiana.



Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is, of course, correct in his principal statement that under the terms of the so-called Reorganization Act passed several years ago, unless some action is taken, the Congress would be forced to adjourn by July 31. The gentleman, of course, is well aware of the fact that there are a number of very important authorization bills, and still a series of appropriation bills that have not cleared one body or the other.

The idea at this time of attempting to set a date certain for adjournment is something that is just without the knowledge either of the Speaker or of the majority leader. We just do not know.

As the gentleman has been informed heretofore, we do not expect to complete the work of this session prior to the Friday before the Republican National Convention, which convenes, I believe, on August 21.

So the best answer I can give the gentleman is we just do not have a date certain. Until such time as we were in a position to write a date certain, it would be a vain and useless thing to do so now.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I appreciate the gentleman's efforts, and those of the leadership, but I submit that this body, had we decided to work hard and schedule heavily last week and all of this week, could have certainly brought up our three remaining appropriation bills in the same manner they have been brought up in the past; that is by again fragmenting if not breaking the rules of the Reorganization Act which we adopted in full faith, without the necessary authorizing bills being enacted into law.

We have done that regularly all this year in order to expedite the work of the House, and the "debating society" on the other end of the Capitol could get down to work and accomplish the same thing on the necessary or requisite operating bills or appropriation bills, perhaps, if we held the whip hand over them as Representatives of the people, once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out we could still have an increment of dates and thereby stick to the principles of the Reorganization Act we adopted, rather than make it open ended. That is what this concurrent resolution, the way it is worded, will do.

Second, I believe we all ought to realize in adopting this we are defying and flying right in the face of, and in fact going against, any attempt to complete the business of the Congress in due time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, could the House have any assurance, the slightest assurance, that having returned after Labor Day, following the Republican Convention, there will be a sine die adjournment of Congress sometime in September?

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman knows

that the leadership prepared a schedule of days off for this session and, if the gentleman will refer to this, he will note that we expressed the hope then that we would have completed the business of this session by August 18, which is the Friday before the Republican National Convention.

Now, in truth and in fact, the House has done, in my judgment, quite well. But we still have the foreign aid bills, the foreign aid authorization and the foreign aid appropriation, the military construction appropriation bill, and the defense appropriation. These are very important matters, particularly the defense appropriation bill. There is also the Water Quality Act which is still in conference and there is the debt limit extension and a housing bill.

I will not seek to enumerate all of them, but there are matters of importance pending before this body. There is welfare reform. We passed welfare reform a year ago, and it is still pending in the other body. There is revenue sharing. We passed revenue sharing a month ago or 6 weeks ago, and it is still pending in the other body. I for one am not going to try to adjourn this session of Congress until those bills have been enacted into law. I hope that will happen before the end of September or the first week of October.

I trust that the main business of the House after we come back from the Republican convention will be conference reports, but it is our intention to see that these bills are presented to the President before we leave here.

Mr. GROSS. I take it I am not going to get any kind of assurance from the distinguished majority leader that we will not be here and in session on October 1 or even later while the procrastinating Members of the other body campaign the length and breadth of the country, seemingly, without any penalty except that imposed upon the House by forcing it to stay in session.

Mr. BOGGS. I am not in a position to criticize the other body. It has been my experience, having been here a long time, that many times this body is held up by the other body, but sometimes the other body does not get our bills until late in the session. I believe, however, if the measures I mentioned are acted on expeditiously by the other body, we could conclude the business of this session by the first of October.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask my distinguished colleague from Louisiana if he meant he was taking the position that as majority leader he was not going to allow this House to adjourn or this Congress to adjourn sine die until all of the legislative proposals he recommended had been signed into law.

Mr. BOGGS. No. Not at all. As a matter of fact, in answer to my good friend's inquiry, I named just a few bills, most of which the President has said he considered essential. There are many other bills pending. Whether or not we have time to

consider them in this session I do not know, but what I am trying to say to the gentleman from Louisiana as well as the gentleman from Iowa is that except for those measures we have pretty generally completed the work of the House of Representatives.

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

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14911, LEAVE FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN A MISSING STATUS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1049 and ask for its immediate consideration:

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1049

*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. 14911) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the armed forces who are in a missing status to accumulate leave without limitation, 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 Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H.R. 14911, a bill authorizing members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status to accumulate leave without limitation. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate on the bill and, of course, as an open rule it is open to amendment. This bill is very brief and so is its objective. The bill simply authorizes

an amendment to the present law so as to give prisoners of war an extension of time for accumulated leave.

Under the present law a man in the service who is a prisoner of war can accumulate under certain conditions up to 90 days of leave. This would amend that law and extend the provisions of the law as long as these unfortunate people are prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about the prisoners of war. In fact, all of the arguments that are made for ending the war are based primarily upon the fact that we want to get our prisoners back home.

This is an unfortunate situation that we find ourselves in dealing with this Communist country. It is very difficult even to find out how many of our boys they have there as prisoners.

This is the least that we can do for this military personnel. I do not anticipate one single vote against this bill. As one who is always concerned about the cost of every piece of legislation that comes before my committee and comes before this body, I want to say that I enthusiastically embrace this bill and its accompanying cost.

It is estimated it will cost somewhere between \$13 million and \$14 million, if the war is ended in 1973, if our prisoners are released at that time. If it goes as far as 1975, it would cost a little more than \$15 million.

I say this is the least that we can do for those who are suffering over there in these prisons.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself very briefly to another phase of this unfortunate war—a war that we should never have gotten into to begin with—but a war that once we got into it, we never have attempted to win. Rather, we have followed the usual procedure of appeasement in dealing with the Communists.

I know that it is an unfortunate war. I know that every effort is being made by the President of the United States to end this war on some semblance of an honorable basis. But it is burning me up to see the tactics that some people in this country use to express their opposition to the war.

Now I am not going to go into any political or partisan discussion here. But whether it be a gracious thing to do or not, I am just going to pick out one individual who has aroused my particular ire in the last few weeks—and I refer to a certain actress by the name of Jane Fonda who has just visited Hanoi. I do not know how she got over there. I just wish she had never gotten there. I wish she had stayed at home to begin with. Nor do I know what her political philosophy is.

Now what good purpose could she have in going over there and making the utterances that she made? Did she go over there to try to end the war—which is the common goal that all of us seek? You and I and every Member of the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States—all patriotic Americans—some of whom may differ as to how the war might be ended, seek to achieve that simple goal of ending the war.

What purpose, I repeat, did she hope to achieve? Did she go over there to plead with Hanoi to end the war? Did she beseech Hanoi to release our boys imprisoned there? I have not seen anything in the printed word emanating from there that indicated that that was her purpose. On the contrary, the strong inference is that she went over there with pleasing platitudes to the common enemy; with assurances that this country was divided on the war.

I saw a picture of this misguided woman in the press the other day as she was leaving the hostile country with her clenched fist waving at the Hanoi soldiers; with them in turn having broad smiles upon their faces.

What—I repeat—what was the purpose? What did she hope to accomplish? The inevitable conclusion one must reach is that she went over there to encourage them in their fight; to hold on; to defeat the anti-Communists of South Vietnam and to wreak further injury, bodily harm, death, and bloodshed upon the Americans who remain over there.

I try to have sympathy with the other fellow's point of view. The most charitable thing that I can say about this woman is that she is misguided, she lives in a synthetic and unrealistic world; in a Hollywood atmosphere, as it were. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the actions of this, I repeat, misguided person is unpardonable. In previous wars she would have been charged with treason. Certainly if she were a citizen of North Vietnam and used the same tactics in this country she would have been so charged—and likely have faced a firing squad on her return to her homeland.

Will her actions hasten the release of these prisoners of war? Will they hasten the return of those of our men and women who still wear the uniform over there? I do not want to be too hard on people who differ with me, but I cannot arrive at any conclusion other than that this effort on her part and that of other similarly misguided people can result in the prolongation of the war.

I hope and I think most of the people of America share the views that I have tried so feebly to express.

I wish that I possessed the powers of speech to appropriately decry and deplore the actions and the utterances of this citizen of the United States. Miss Fonda, by virtue of her talents as an actress, has achieved considerable status in our great common country—a position which she would have found far more difficult to attain in a foreign and communist country. I can only repeat that I deplore this unfortunate incident. By contrast, I rather like the action of another American—Stephen Decatur who exclaimed when others were questioning another war, "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), and urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support completely the remarks of the distinguished chairman

of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER).

The purpose of H.R. 14911 is to permit members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status, including prisoners of war, to accumulate leave at the normal rate without limitation as to the total amount of leave which may be so accumulated.

It is estimated that if all the uniformed services personnel now carried as missing in action or prisoners of war are removed from that status in fiscal year 1973, the cost would be \$13,399,000. If this were to occur in fiscal year 1974, the cost would then be \$15,837,000. These are nonrecurring costs which depend on when the prisoners and missing are removed from their missing status. Once these members of the uniformed services are removed from missing status, no further costs will be incurred under this bill.

The committee report contains a letter from the Department of Defense favoring this bill.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously recommends enactment of this bill.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14542, AIR FORCE OFFICERS AUTHORIZED STRENGTH

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1048 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

##### H. RES. 1048

*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. 14542) to amend the Act of September 26, 1966, Public Law 89-606, to extend for four years the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Air Force may be increased, and for other purposes. 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 Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1048 provides an open rule with 1 hour of



general debate for consideration of H.R. 14542, the purpose of which is to extend the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Air Force may be increased.

The legislation would extend for 4 years—from June 30, 1972—the number of Air Force field grade officers authorized to serve on active duty. Failure to extend the authority would mean that the number of field grade officers allowed to serve as colonel or lieutenant colonel would be based upon the 1954 table.

It would continue for 4 years the authority for 1,000 additional lieutenant colonels and 1,500 majors.

The legislation would enable the Air Force to continue its current promotion program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has explained, House Resolution 1048 provides for an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

The purpose of H.R. 14542 is to extend for 4 additional years Public Law 89-606, which expired June 30, 1972. This law prescribes an increased number of Air Force field grade officers authorized to serve on active duty. This bill will enable the Air Force to continue its current promotion program.

The estimated cost of this bill is \$4,100,000 for fiscal year 1973, \$4,100,000 for fiscal year 1974, \$4,300,000 for fiscal year 1975, and \$4,300,000 for fiscal year 1976.

The committee report contains a letter from the Department of the Air Force favoring this bill.

Minority views were filed by Mr. PIKE opposing this bill on the ground that the Air Force rank structure is too heavy. He notes that the Air Force has more lieutenant colonels than second lieutenants, and almost twice as many majors as second lieutenants.

The Committee on Armed Services reported the bill by a vote of 31 to 5.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14538, AMENDING FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) and by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1047 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1047

*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. 14538) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense

Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes. 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 Armed Services, 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. 14538, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3772, and it shall then be in order to consider the said Senate bill in the House.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1047 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14538, the purpose of which is to extend the expiration date of certain authorities under the Federal Civil Defense Act. After passage of H.R. 14538, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 3772 and it shall be in order to consider the Senate bill in the House.

The programs involved are those to make payments for travel and per diem expenses of trainees at civil defense schools, to produce and maintain radiological equipment and to donate the same to States by loan or grant, and to provide financial assistance to States for necessary and essential State and local civil defense personnel and administrative expenses.

The legislation also increases the per annum authorization for financial assistance for personnel and administrative expenses from \$25 million to \$35 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The purposes of these programs are: tend for 4 years the financial assistance programs currently authorized by the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. The present act expired on June 30, 1972.

The purpose of H.R. 14538 is to extend, first, to make payments for travel expenses of trainees at civil defense schools; second, to provide radiological equipment and donate the same to States by loan or grant; and third, to provide financial assistance to States for civil defense personnel and administrative expenses. The per annum authorization for fiscal assistance for personnel and administrative expenses is increased from \$25,000,000 to \$35,000,000.

In estimating costs the committee report provides projected appropriations and projected expenditures. Projected expenditures for these programs are \$21,700,000 for fiscal year 1973, \$30,500,000 for fiscal year 1974, \$33,100,000 for fiscal year 1975 and \$34,800,000 for fiscal year 1976.

The committee report contains a letter from the Department of Defense favoring this bill.

There are no minority views in the committee report.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously approved the bill.

Chairman HEBERT has requested a 1-hour open rule.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3542, ARMED SERVICES LEAVE ALLOWANCES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1046 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1046

*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. 3542) to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of travel and transportation allowances to certain members of the uniformed services in connection with leave. 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 Armed Services, 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 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 now printed in the bill. 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.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1046 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 3542, the purpose of which is to authorize payment of travel and transportation allowances to certain members of the uniformed services in connection with leave.

The legislation would provide travel and transportation allowances between consecutive overseas assignments in order that servicemen could return home and assist their families in packing and moving. Bachelor personnel would be provided the same allowances.

The benefits would include transportation provided in kind aboard military, chartered, or commercial carriers, or reimbursement in lieu of such travel. While awaiting such transportation and while traveling overseas, a per diem allowance is authorized at the established rate for the particular location involved. Within

the continental United States, reimbursement for actual costs of transportation via commercial carriers or a mileage allowance for privately provided transportation would be provided.

Approximately 8,000 servicemen would be eligible for the travel and transportation allowances at an estimated annual cost of \$2,414,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3542 is to provide travel allowances for members of the uniformed services between consecutive overseas assignments in order that they may return home to assist in the moving of their dependents or, in the case of bachelor personnel, to visit with family and friends.

The annual cost of this bill is estimated at \$2,414,000, given present force levels. Future costs could fluctuate depending on force levels.

The committee report contains a letter from the Department of Defense favoring this legislation.

There are no minority views in the committee report.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously recommended enactment of the bill.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AIR FORCE OFFICERS AUTHORIZED STRENGTH

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. 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. 14542) to amend the act of September 26, 1966, Public Law 89-606, to extend for 4 years the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Air Force may be increased, and for other purposes.

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. 14542, with Mr. McFALL 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 Illinois (Mr. PRICE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'Konski) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14542 is a bill which would permit the Air Force to continue for 4 years its current promotion program for majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels.

Before going into what the bill will provide, I think it is most essential to understand what the bill will not do.

First, it does not provide for any increase in grade authorizations for the Air Force.

Second, it does not accelerate the advancement of officers over that which has been maintained for the past 6 years.

Third, it does not give the Air Force officers an advantage over officers in the Army, Navy or Marine Corps—in fact, it will not even give to the Air Force officers the same promotion equity as enjoyed by the officers in the other services.

Now, what will the bill do.

It will continue the Air Force promotion program which has functioned over the last 6 years and provides for the flexibility necessary to maintain the current promotion phase points and opportunity. It provides promotion feasibility for Air Force officers to assure them that advancement opportunities will remain stable and that all year groups will be treated alike as they pass through the various promotion zones. It removes the doubt and concern over "promotion outlook" that now pervades the officer corps in the Air Force.

As you may be aware, the current officer-grade relief measure, Public Law 89-606, expired on June 30 of this year. This act, the fifth in a series of short-term relief measures which have been provided to the Air Force, was enacted by the Congress in 1966 for a period of 6 years. The expiration of Public Law 89-606 and without new legislation, the Air Force will revert to the field-grade limits imposed by the Officer-Grade Limitation Act of 1954.

When this act was passed in 1954, it provided for each separate service, tables, limiting by grade the number of majors and above. Numerical limits, for each grade, were based on the number and distribution of officers serving on active duty in each of the services at the time the legislation was enacted. The limits on the percentage of officers authorized to serve in the grade of colonel and lieutenant colonel were therefore lower for the Air Force because, at the time, they had a relatively junior officer force in terms of years on active duty. In 1953, just prior to the enactment of the Officer-Grade Limitation Act, only 18 percent of the Air Force officers had more than 12 years in service compared with 32 percent in the Army and the Navy. Today, the Air Force has about 34 percent in this category.

The object of restrictions on Air Force promotions in 1954 was to prevent too many young officers from progressing too rapidly to the senior grade. Within 5 years, however, the Air Force outgrew the permanent grade limitations contained in the act and, as a result, in 1959 relief was granted by the Congress. Subsequently, relief acts have been granted—the last being in 1966 for a period of 6 years.

When the House passed the 1966 Grade Relief Act, it did so in a form that would have given permanent relief to the Air Force. In the Senate, however, the bill was changed to provide only temporary relief. They, the Senate, reasoned that they did not consider it wise to meet the promotion problems of one service on a permanent basis without regard for a detailed examination of the needs of the other services. They then expressed the hope that the Department of Defense would conduct an examination of the officer structure in the various services

which would result in uniform promotion legislation and equitable promotion opportunity among the services. The House conferees accepted the Senate version.

It is my duty to report that even though the Congress has been urging the Department of Defense to come forth with such uniform promotion legislation since 1959, no suitable legislation has been presented.

The grade relief in 1966 and which this bill seeks to continue, would permit the Air Force to promote to colonel at the 21st year, to lieutenant colonel at the 17th year, and to major at the 11th year.

The Army now promotes to colonel at the 21st year and the Navy to captain at the 20th to 21st year.

The Army and Navy promote to lieutenant colonel and commander by the 14th and 15th year, as compared to the Air Force at 17 years.

The Army promotes to major at the ninth year, the Navy to lieutenant commander at the eighth year while the Air Force promotes to major at the 11th year.

You will note that the Air Force in nearly all the areas referred to by this bill promotes at a later date than the other services. Failure to grant this relief would cause the Air Force to promote to colonel at the 22d year, to lieutenant colonel at the 18th to 19th year, and to major at the 12th year. It will be difficult to attract and retain qualified officers if we do not provide them promotion opportunities at least somewhat comparable to those in the other services. Now, what would be the consequences of our failure to enact this legislation.

First, it would place a moratorium on active duty field-grade promotion programs for at least 1 year. That is—the grade of major, lieutenant colonel and colonel.

Second, it would force the demotion and/or elimination from active duty of 3,000 field-grade officers. It should be pointed out here that by law, involuntary elimination would affect only reserve officers while demotions only regular officers. It is unlikely that either action could be instituted without causing considerable trauma and damage to the morale of all Air Force officer personnel.

Third, to the extent that elimination of officers would not be accompanied by reduced force levels, expensive pilot and navigator training rates would have to be increased in order to replace those officers forced to leave.

Fourth, the promotion points for Air Force officers would again slip up to 5 years behind the Army and Navy due to the lower percentile of field-grade officers authorized for the 1954 Officer-Grade Limitation Act.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who would suggest that we not pass this vitally needed act claiming that the grade structure of all of the services has become too high. I agree that this is a matter which needs thorough scrutiny by the Armed Services Committee, and I shall recommend to the chairman of that committee that this become our No. 1 project during the next session of the Congress. But at this stage when Air Force personnel are bearing the brunt of the activity in Southeast Asia, I can



think of no worse act we can do than to fail to grant the relief provided in this bill. Some would advocate that we should make a beginning toward reducing the grade structure someplace and this bill is the place to start. I submit, however, that we should continue equality of opportunity to Air Force officers until we have had the opportunity to study the entire officer structure of all the services. To deny the Air Force this relief would, in my opinion, be catastrophic in our efforts to build an all-volunteer force. I can think of no greater priority legislation required than this piece of legislation currently before you.

I urge the support of every Member of this body.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, our colleague on the committee (Mr. BRAY).

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, with great reluctance I oppose this piece of legislation. I have a great admiration for the work that the Air Force is doing. I also realize that they have a very serious personnel problem. It is a problem that is not altogether of their making. However, our approach to this problem, that is handling this problem in a makeshift manner, is worsening and compounding the Air Force problem. Passage of this legislation today will only give the Air Force a temporary easing of this same problem and will make its ultimate situation even more difficult.

I believe it was 10 years ago when legislation very similar to this came before the committee. At that time I suggested that we work out legislation that would take care of the Air Force promotion problem on a permanent basis, instead of merely continuing and worsen a bad situation. I was assured that by the next time that this legislation came up that this would have a permanent situation; that they would bring out substantial legislation that would cure this personnel problem in the Air Force. That went off, I believe, for 6 years.

Four years ago, the matter again came up. At that time I said I did not intend to vote for that legislation which is very similar to this. I again asked the Air Force to work out a real system of promotion instead of merely continuing and aggravating an already bad situation.

At that time several of us, including myself, received a promise that there would be positive legislation coming up by the time that that 4-year extension was over. Instead of that, no tangible attempt has been made to suggest proper and permanent legislation. Today we have the same legislation, only worse.

Every time you continue this personnel mess, or whatever you want to call it, it is worse when it comes up again.

The problem that worries me is that of the junior officers of the Air Force, those that we must especially work to retain are being faced with a more uncertain future.

As long as we pass this type of legislation there will be no attempt by the Air Force, no attempt to work out a permanent solution. If this bill is passed—4 years from now they will come up with the same type of legislation to attempt to patch up a worsening situation.

I realize it is probably futile to attempt to defeat this bill, but at least we can send to the Air Force and Defense Department a message that we expect a real and sane piece of legislation, not a stopgap patch.

The more opposition that we can show to this legislation, it may encourage them, to come up with something tangible and real 4 years from now.

I believe that we are doing the Air Force a great disfavor to continue to put off the solution of this problem. I have nothing against the Air Force. They are doing a wonderful job. But they are not handling the personnel problems properly and many Air Force officers of all grades have told me that they are not handling these problems properly.

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

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very valid argument, but I wonder if it is not the Department of Defense that the gentleman should be criticizing at this time rather than the Air Force.

The problem we have facing us is not the total fault of the Air Force—it is also the fault of the Defense Department itself and perhaps all of us. I think that is where we should lay the blame rather than to be critical of the Air Force in this particular instance.

Mr. BRAY. I think there is merit to the gentleman's statement. I am not trying to especially blame the Air Force. The officers of the Air Force are a fine group of men.

But all of us are partially responsible for putting something off, a sensible solution to the problem. It is the junior officers who are suffering.

I agree that the Department of Defense, and perhaps all of us, have been in some part responsible for this. But what worries me is that we are going to deteriorate the strength of the Air Force and lose some of the finest young officers that we have in the Air Force unless we approach this in the proper manner, which we are not doing.

I wish this was only a continuation for 1 year. But the trouble is that unless we get tough you will never get the Department of Defense and/or the Air Force to face up to this problem until they must do so.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me so much time, he knowing full well that I am going to speak in opposition to this legislation.

I do not think there is much—or any question—in the minds of many people in America but that our entire military establishment is overloaded with chiefs and underloaded with Indians.

It is overloaded with fat and underloaded with muscle. We have too much logistic tail and not enough fighting power.

All that this bill does is put the congressional seal of approval on a military establishment which is all fat and not enough fight. This is a bill for the colonels and the lieutenant colonels and

the majors. That is what it is for. We are aware of this problem. There are many epitaphs that you can say for any effort that anybody makes to reform this situation.

You have all heard all of your life all these reasons why we cannot do it. First, "We are studying it." Then, "We are appointing a Commission." Then, "The Pentagon is going to come up with a report." This has been going on for year after year after year after year.

Today we are in the situation where there are more than 12 officers in the Air Force for every airplane in the Air Force. The Air Force has less than 10,000 planes and has over 124,000 officers.

Forget the enlisted men. There are 124,000 officers for less than 10,000 planes. There are more lieutenant colonels and colonels than there are planes and missiles combined in the Air Force. In fact, there are more than twice as many lieutenant colonels and colonels as there are planes and missiles.

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

Mr. PIKE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. That is an impressive statistic, and I was very much taken with the gentleman's report. What would be a sound ratio in the view of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PIKE. In my personal judgment, I would say that the Air Force, as far as officer structure, is a little high on overall structure, but where they are really high is in the realm of colonels and majors. They are low in second lieutenants; they are low in first lieutenants; they are low in captains. These are the people who fly the planes and do the fighting.

What we are after here in this legislation is not to benefit those who fly planes and push triggers; this is to benefit those who fly desks and push papers. This legislation is of great benefit to all kinds of people who are collecting flight pay and never fly an airplane.

We have in our hearings what, to me, is a very pathetic statement, and it came when the chairman of the subcommittee presented this bill to the full committee. He said:

Even though the Congress has been urging since 1959 that the Department of Defense submit legislation which will produce a higher degree of similarity and equality of treatment for all officers throughout the Department of Defense, such legislation is not yet ready to be presented to the Congress.

We spend so much time complaining about how all the flow of power has gone from Congress to the executive branch, but here it is, 13 years that Congress—which, as I understand it, has the duty to raise and support armies—has been waiting for the Pentagon to tell them what the Pentagon wants them to do.

I submit to you ladies and gentlemen that this particular bill—which continues to endorse a bloated rank structure, which continues to support fat as opposed to muscle, which continues to say, we do not need the people who are flying the planes in combat; we need the desk jockeys—should be defeated. We passed similar legislation just 6 years ago. It was the same as this legislation. It was identical, and during the ensuing 6 years the Air Force cut down its total number of

officers by 4,805. The entire Air Force got smaller.

The total number of officers went down 4,805 but they went up by 39 lieutenant colonels, 170 colonels, and 1,672 majors. They went up in all the grades but they went down in fighting power.

If we support this legislation and let them do it for 4 more years, I can tell the Members we are going to see nothing but more of the same.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding. I also compliment the gentleman's subcommittee for the thoroughness of its hearings.

I too want to compliment my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) for the great job he did in investigating this entire matter which is a subject that in itself needs investigation. I made the gentleman chairman of a special subcommittee, which held extensive hearings on the matter. In his usual, typically thorough manner the gentleman has made his report and I am anticipating he will prepare legislation to offer to the full committee in the next session of Congress so we can proceed from there.

I can understand my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), also because I share somewhat his opinion. We sat on the same subcommittee together. This situation is somewhat unsatisfactory to me and members of the committee, but we are faced with a situation where we have to be practical people. This is a sort of interim arrangement until we can get the overall legislation which we need so badly, and I am depending greatly on the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) to propose legislation which will take care of this entire problem for all the services.

However, now we are confronted with a legislative proposal to provide—for a short period of 4 years—the continuation of authority for officer grades within the Air Force.

The ability of the Air Force to carry out its assigned duties rests heavily upon its success in acquiring and retaining a quality officer force. The rapid advance of technology associated with the equipment which is in Air Force custody, emphasizes the urgent necessity of attracting young men with the requisite qualifications to serve in responsible leadership positions throughout the Air Force.

To be successful in this endeavor, the Air Force must be competitive with business, industry, government, and to a certain extent, with other services. In order to compete successfully with these people, the Air Force must be able to provide career opportunities at least comparable to those afforded officers in the other services. In this connection, grade advancement at regular and predictable intervals for qualified officers seems absolutely essential.

There are those who allege that there

are too many senior officers in the Department of Defense. I would point out that we, the Congress, have provided the legislative authority for the current grade structure. The Air Force has conspicuously and continuously operated within the letter and intent of the guidance which has been provided by the Congress, even though there has been a growing disparity in the career progression patterns of the service—much to the distress of the Air Force officer.

It is evident that a permanent solution to the service inequities must be found, and I urge the Department of Defense to expedite its proposals for uniform legislation for all the services. However, until such time as new permanent legislation is enacted, we have a responsibility to the 115,000 Air Force officers to approve this bill.

To neglect this simple, although temporary remedy at a relatively modest cost would not only be shortsighted in the face of our efforts to establish an all-volunteer force, it would be simply unjust to the career Air Force officer.

I therefore join the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in urging full support for H.R. 14542.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my strongest support possible to this legislation.

Since the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has detailed the contents of the bill, I will not repeat.

As I view the bill before you, there is only one simple question—do we want to continue to provide Air Force officers approximately the same promotion opportunities as are provided to officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, then you should vote for this bill. On the other hand, if you want the Air Force officer to be promoted approximately 3 to 5 years later than his contemporaries in the other military services, you should cast a negative vote. That is the real question before us today.

Others here undoubtedly claim that we have too many officers—that is, 124—124 officers to fly 9,676 planes. But those who would challenge, ignore the basic facts that in addition to the aircraft, the Air Force officer must manage 1,054 ICBM's; 221 strategic, tactical, airlift, and general purpose squadrons; and 3,583 installations around the world.

For one moment, let us look at our rated officers in the Air Force which on June 30, 1972 had 55,685 pilots and navigators. Of this number, 4,274 were colonels and 371 were generals assigned to senior executive and command positions. Of the remaining 51,040 officers, 14,702 are navigators and 36,338 are pilots. These 36,338 are being used as follows:

There are 22,260 assigned aircrew or instructor duties or are engaged in advanced flying training. This equates to 2.24 pilots for each Air Force airplane. And, at this point, I would remind you that few of today's aircraft have a complement of only one pilot.

There are 8,539 assigned to oversee aircraft use, control flying and related activities and to do a wide variety of other command and staff jobs requiring rated expertise.

There are 5,539 broadening their management abilities in nonflying duties or attending broad advanced education

programs. For example, not more than 10 percent of the officers in communications, missile operations, electronics, aircraft maintenance or logistics may be rated officers. Not more than 20 percent of the intelligence officers and 30 percent of the R. & D. officers may be rated, while up to one-half of the weapons controllers may be in this category. While a peacetime environment produces a career development opportunity for these officers, their reason for being in the force is to provide an active duty reserve of rated officers to meet the increased demands of a contingency or war, and fill the gap during the time it takes to realize production from increased flying training.

Now, let us look to the status of colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors in the Air Force insofar as participation in Southeast Asia is concerned. I believe you will find these statistics of interest.

Ninety-seven percent of all Air Force colonels have been to Southeast Asia. All but 57 of 3,736 have served there. Of the 155 colonels in the war zone today, 62 are pilots while 52 others are in duties requiring rated skills and 41 are colonels in nonrated jobs. There are also 39 colonels in Southeast Asia now on temporary duty in flying jobs.

The statistics on lieutenant colonels are nearly as impressive. Ninety-seven percent of the lieutenant colonels in the Air Force have been to Southeast Asia, and 677 are there today. The 333 lieutenant colonels in Southeast Asia are filling 16 percent of the rated jobs for pilots of all grades.

Of the 23,545 Air Force majors, 89 percent have been to Southeast Asia, 39 percent have completed a full tour. There are 1,054 majors there today and 18 percent of the pilot jobs are being filled by the 389 pilots in this grade.

By comparison, 70 percent of the Air Force captains and 18 percent of the Air Force lieutenants have served in the combat zone.

I point these figures out to show who we would affect if we failed to pass this bill—primarily those who have given a career to the military forces and who may still be serving in the combat area.

But equally important if we do not extend the present authority, we would reduce Air Force colonel authorizations by 1,000 and lieutenant colonel authorizations by 4,500 while not changing total officer requirements for the Air Force. This would mean, even with a cessation of all field-grade promotions during fiscal year 1973, the Air Force would be over the statutory limitation by some 100 colonels and 3,000 lieutenant colonels on June 30, 1973.

To accomplish a reduction of 1,000 colonels and 4,500 lieutenant colonels in fiscal year 1973, about 200 Reserve lieutenant colonels would have to be RIFed. Approximately 1,600 regular lieutenant colonels would have to be demoted to their permanent grade, and this would create an overage of approximately 800 majors so approximately 800 Reserve majors would be forced out.

In addition to this, it is estimated that the threat of demotion would precipitate the "voluntary" retirement of 100 colonels and approximately 1,200 lieutenant colonels.



In toto, nearly 2,200 officers would leave the Air Force through unplanned early retirement or RIF actions during fiscal year 1973. Of these 2,200 officers who leave, it is expected that at least 1,100 would be pilots.

This would result in the need for the training of 1,100 new pilots and even at the rate of 220 additional pilots each year for 5 following years to build back the required inventory as determined by national security policy, the additional cost to the Air Force would be \$26,000,000 annually for each of the next 5 years. The cost to train a pilot is approximately \$120,000. And these figures do not take into account any additional unprogrammed losses which undoubtedly would result from reduced retention which would be encountered from the demotion or RIF actions.

I point this out to show that failure to enact this legislation would result in a much greater cost to the Air Force than its enactment—at a ratio of about 6½ to 1.

So since we have eliminated dollars as a reason to object to this bill, what is left is philosophy as to career patterns and opportunity vis-a-vis the desired shape of the military structure. We could pontificate on this subject for days and perhaps never reach agreement, but in my opinion, what the Armed Services Committee and the Department of Defense need to do is to reexamine the officer structure and come to grips with the many hard decisions that will have to be made in this area—designing a realistic program for the decade ahead. We have been assured that the Department of Defense is in the midst of such a study at this time and will have a program ready to unveil about the middle of next year.

In the meantime, we really have no practical alternative but to approve the legislation before you today not only because failure to do so would completely shatter Air Force morale but also it would practically destroy any hope of obtaining an all-volunteer Air Force.

Gentlemen, I urge your support.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic with these officers who would be passed over and will not get promoted, but when I was in the service a generation ago it was common knowledge that the Air Force was the best place to be if you wanted to get promoted fast. Nobody objected at that time in the Air Force to the fact that the officers were getting overpromoted, and were becoming majors and colonels and generals at a very early age.

Some of this represents just the hazards of the job.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question. We are not telling the Air Force which individuals to retire, we are merely saying that this is the largest number of officers it can have in the service. It is up to the Air Force to select out those colonels or those majors or captains that they do not believe are very good. Why then is it going to cost a lot to cut down on those promotions? It is up to the Air Force to let go the people

who are not very promising officers. This could result in a very efficient operation.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland. The only way I could answer his question is to simply say, as I said in the beginning, that I do not see why we should pick on the Air Force, and why we should not treat them in exactly the same fashion as we treat the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. That is what this bill proposes to do. That is the best way that I can answer the gentleman's question.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am very glad to yield to the able gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. PIKE. On the business of treating them equally, is it not true that by and large the officers in the Army do not get flight pay, and by and large the officers in the Air Force do get flight pay? Have not the officers in the Air Force gotten a great big leg up right away?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes.

Mr. PIKE. So right there the Air Force is already at an advantage; is it not?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I might answer that question?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New York that the ones who fly do get flight pay in the Army, the Air Force, or wherever they may be.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I would say that there is another difference, and that is out of the 1,500 or 1,600 prisoners that are being held by the North Vietnamese, that you should take a look at the rank of those individuals, take a look at who they are; they are majors, they are lieutenant colonels, and they are colonels. The casualties of officers in the type war we are fighting in southeast Asia is much different from that of any other war that we have engaged in in the past. There is a larger attrition than there has been in the average war among these ranks.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Just as a statistic on that matter in the war in Vietnam, 15 percent of the Air Force casualties were majors, 3 percent were lieutenant colonels, less than 1 percent were colonels, 20 percent were enlisted men, and all the rest were lieutenants and captains.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the comment by the gentleman from Maryland might unnecessarily mislead some people here. I do not think he intended to indicate that the job of the Air Force in Southeast Asia is not dangerous.

But to try to compare Members of Congress who are going to Southeast Asia on inspection tours with those pilots who are flying dangerous missions into North Vietnam and into the combat areas and who are actually fighting—I have seen them, I have talked to them—

I have been at many Air Force bases in Southeast Asia and have seen them taking off and returning on various missions, and I do not think that is the sort of comment that should be left unchallenged.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I may reply to the gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland for the purpose of a reply.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I did not mean to imply that a Member of Congress visiting Southeast Asia could be compared with somebody who has been asked to fly over North Vietnam. That is a dangerous mission.

I am saying that I suspect that vast numbers of officers want to load their record with a visit to Vietnam—that is why you have the statistics approaching 100 percent. I would be very suspicious, that large numbers of those people who went to Vietnam were not in great danger and in no greater danger than I was as a visiting Congressman.

That is why I do not think those statistics are very valid. These people who fought over Vietnam and who were in danger of getting shot down did go on a very hazardous mission. I have enormous respect for them.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In commenting on the statistics quoted by the gentleman from New York on casualties, the overall statistics of all the services.

However, I would like to point out that eighty percent of the Air Force casualties were in the officers' rank.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That answers the question of the gentleman.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. Eighty percent, as I said, were officers—but only 15 percent of them were colonels. Fifteen percent were majors and 3 percent were lieutenant colonels. Less than 1 percent were colonels and all the rest were second lieutenants or first lieutenants or captains.

This is not a bill for the benefit of combat pilots—this is a bill for the benefit of colonels and lieutenant colonels.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In closing, I just want to say that the committee is not happy with this situation. We know that we have a problem. We have been discussing this matter from every conceivable angle and we just came to the conclusion that in spite of the fact we are not satisfied with the conditions that exist among all the services, we reported this bill as a temporary measure to await broad recommendations for a remedy.

But, for the time being, because of the peculiar situation, we have a majority of the members of the subcommittee and of the whole committee, by a substantial majority, who are of the opinion

that we have no alternative for the present except to go along with this bill.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the statistics just quoted by my colleague, the gentleman from New York, which are also repeated in his minority views, I had already asked for time to point out something with regard to those statistics.

After all, this legislation is for lieutenants—it is for the captains. That is exactly whom it is for.

The statistics that are referred to here show—and I will add them up again—the statistics show that 54 percent of all the casualties—and this is on page 10 of the report, and were cited again by the gentleman from New York—54 percent of them are lieutenants and captains. That is what a military career is. Where are they going to go? This is a career. A man enters the Air Force to become a pilot or an Air Force officer, looking forward to some promotion or to some opportunity. So this is that opportunity.

This is not a thing for generals or lieutenant generals or something of that type. This bill is primarily to help these lieutenants and these captains who are seeking a career or who are willing to have a career in the armed services.

I would like to summarize by saying some of the things that have been said already here, but I would like to repeat them. I did not intend or expect to speak on this bill because I am not on the subcommittee, but I really do believe it is necessary for us to give at least the same opportunities to the people in the Air Force that we give in the Army, the Marine Corps, and the Navy—and that is all that this does—and, in fact, it falls a little short of that.

There is no magic to the 1954 law that this would put us back in. If that was a mistake, then perhaps this Congress has made the mistake, but the responsibility is on the shoulders of Congress. The responsibility is not on the Department of Defense or on the Air Force to provide for the laws of this country with regard to the defense of this country. The responsibility is on you from New York and me from Florida and other Members of Congress to come forth with good law in this field. We cannot say we have been waiting for 13 years for the Department to come up with a better answer. Perhaps they think the law we passed in 1954 was not a particularly good answer. That is what they were saying to us. It is not a good answer; the 1966 law was a better answer.

The law we have before us today is a continuation of that law. It is our fault here in Congress if we are not living up to our responsibility as outlined in the Constitution. We are the ones who ought to be doing that. We have a better suggestion that follows along with another comment made in the minority report. That is about the flight pay. Whose fault is flight pay? If there is something wrong about flight pay and the people sitting behind desks today are drawing flight pay, whose fault is it? It is the fault of the U.S. Congress of America. It is our fault if there is something wrong about

it, and we ought to change it if there is something wrong. We ought to bring witnesses in to see why we have it.

Perhaps we have it because we want to continue a career for these men. Maybe it is necessary to do it. Maybe there is good logic behind it. Maybe it ought to be looked into. I thought the gentleman from New York was heading a committee to look into this. Perhaps he was not. But certainly it is the duty of Congress to look into the situation. If there is something wrong about flight pay, we should be doing something about it. We should do it ourselves. You should never ask anybody else to do something when you have the power to do it.

Are the military services overloaded with chiefs? Whose fault is that? That is not the fault of the Department of the Air Force and the Department of Defense, but again it is our fault.

In summary I will say this is the best law we have before us. If we repeal the law, if we do not pass the law that is before us, we will just be going back to our 1954 law that Congress was not very proud of, because it extended exceptions to it through the years. The Air Force is not very proud of it; the Department of Defense is not very proud of it; but it is not their responsibility; it is our responsibility.

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

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Would not the gentleman agree if this legislation is not enacted that the necessary personnel action will be forced upon the Air Force, which will be tragic with respect to the careers certainly of various officers we are here commending.

Mr. BENNETT. It certainly would. I would say it is a whole lot analogous to what we have in medical doctors in the Air Force. We have a group of men who have a specialty which is at a premium today in American society where they are getting good salaries for comparable work, and better pay than in the armed services. We ought to be glad we have these fine men who give that much time and effort and energy. They get more money by doing the same thing less dangerously outside.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON).

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill and would like to respond specifically to the views of the gentleman from New York which have been expressed on this floor today, and in his minority views in the committee report. I share his concern about the problem of utilization of manpower in the armed services. I served on the subcommittee he chaired which looked into that matter. Frankly, I was disappointed in the conclusions reached by that subcommittee and I filed my brief statement of additional views to that effect. I do not believe that a real effort was made to do an in-depth study of the problem. To draw the drastic conclusions Mr. PIKE did on the basis of this study, which touched only the surface of the problem, was unjustified.

I believe this same incomplete approach is reflected in Mr. PIKE's minority views on the bill now under consideration. Look for a moment at some of what he says and what he does not say:

Mr. PIKE talks about 124,124 officers to fly 9,676 planes, but he does not talk about the fact that most of today's aircraft require more than one pilot, or the fact that Air Force officers also manage 1,054 ICBMs, 221 strategic, tactical, airlift and general purpose squadrons and many hundreds of installations around the world.

Mr. PIKE suggests that the Air Force has flight pay as an incentive for its officers and therefore does not need these additional authorizations. He does not tell you however, that over half of the Air Force officers draw precisely the same pay as the nonrated officers of the other services, nor does he tell you that officers of other services who fly also receive flight pay.

Mr. PIKE asserts that the Air Force compares unfavorably to the Army in that the Air Force has 37 percent field grade officers versus 29 percent in the Army. However, he fails to tell you that 37 percent of the Navy officers are field grade also.

Mr. PIKE also asserts that there has been an increase in the numbers of field grade officers since 1954. However, he ignores the fact that this was permitted by the five relief measures provided by the Congress and that they were designed to do precisely this as the Air Force officer force matured.

Mr. PIKE talks about officer participation in Vietnam, but then reports casualty statistics. The facts on participation which he neglected to point out are that all but 57 of the 3,700 Air Force pilot colonels have served there, and that 97 percent of the lieutenant colonels and 89 percent of the majors have also been there.

Mr. PIKE's discussion of "grade creep" is very interesting, but if we look at the percentages of general and field grade officers authorized under the 1947 Officer Personnel Act, and project that to the 125,000 officer force in today's Air Force, we would find an authorization for 937 generals rather than the 418 indicated in the minority views; 10,000 colonels instead of 6,307; 17,500 lieutenant colonels rather than the 15,228 on board; and 23,750 majors compared to the 23,962 reported in the minority views. Perhaps the "grade creep" we have been hearing about may not have developed to quite the "gallop" we have been led to believe. This comparison suggests that the creep has been downward, in contrast to what Mr. PIKE has suggested.

I have had the benefit of the same look at the problem as the gentleman from New York. To the limited extent that we got into the problem, I believe that the Air Force grade structure was adequately justified, but I nevertheless share the view of many of you that further in-depth study needs to be done when the DOD proposal gets here. But let us not now reject this measure on the basis of hasty conclusions drawn from a shallow look at the problem. This would have a severely demoralizing impact on the Air Force which would be significant and long-lasting.



I join with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) in urging your support of H.R. 14542 and the temporary continuation of authority for Air Force officer grades.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman. I am not going to take 5 minutes. But I would add this: The gentleman from New York developed some very interesting figures that we have got 9,600 airplanes and 124,000 officers, and that is 12 officers for every airplane, and there must be something wrong with that. I think if you look over on page 4 of the report you will see we have got 68,000 officers in the Navy and 680 ships operative, and that means we have got 100 officers for every ship in the Navy; therefore, there must be something wrong with that.

I think this is an area that the chairman has said we are going to have to look at very carefully. I think part of our problems are being compounded due to the fact that we have had a million-men reduction in our military service over the past several years. We have indicated that we are going to study and revise this, but I think to capriciously play with a very, very large number of the careers of our Air Force personnel by rejecting this bill out of hand is not the way to fairly play with our national defense.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt we have put ourselves in a box. Our armed services have too many high-ranking officers. We have more generals and admirals today than we had in World War II, when the size of our fighting force was several times larger.

We should not have let ourselves get into this condition. But now that we are in it, what is the best way out?

My good friend OTIS PIKE says we should get out by rejecting the bill before us, thus forcing the Air Force to reduce substantially its complement of majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels to 1954 levels.

Congressman PIKE is one of our most distinguished Members. I do not doubt that, were he Secretary of Defense, we would have a tighter, cheaper, and more effective military establishment than we have today. But in this case, I must disagree with him.

The field grade officers in question here today include some of the Air Force's most capable men. The Air Force is a technological, sophisticated business. Almost all of its most critical jobs are performed sitting down and have not only relation to airplanes, but ICBMs intelligence training, R. & D. The Air Force does not need the lower level gunbearers that the Army requires.

The Air Force requires judgment that comes only with experience. Most of the most successful and highly regarded pilots in the world fall into this age group. Robin Olds was a full colonel at the time he shot down 4½ Mig fighters over North Vietnam.

The same practice is followed in

civilian life. The men the airlines put in the driver's seats of their 747's and other large airplanes are in their very late thirties, forties, or early fifties—exactly the age group we are discussing.

If we turn these men out of the service, we will lose in more ways than one. Under the present administration, government support for economic conversion to peacetime purposes is zero. Unemployment is high and it is not going to get lower. It is particularly high among fortysix men with high technical training. If we throw these men out of the service, either they will join the ranks of the unemployed or they will force somebody else to do so. This is the last thing we need. We will also lose a critical part of our fighting force.

Moreover, we are going to have to pay them retirement benefits while receiving no services from them.

I believe that we must reduce the size of our military establishment. But this is not the way to do it.

Neither can we simply retain these senior men while reducing overall force strength. This would close off the possibility of promotion for lieutenants and captains for many years to come, which would be both unfair and a morale disaster.

So it seems to me our only course is to reduce the number of new junior officers we take in. We can become more selective, improving quality while decreasing quantity. If this means reduction of the ROTC program, so be it.

Congressman PIKE points out that the majority of colonels are excused from flying but continue to draw flight pay. This is a ridiculous practice which should stop immediately.

But the bill itself is highly desirable, and required by the predicament in which we find ourselves. I urge its passage.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to our mutual friend and able colleague (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is essential that we try to get the total concept of what this bill intends to do and put it into proper perspective. I think all of the discourse has been most interesting and indeed valuable and it has evolved the fact that certainly we have been errant in our responsibilities, as has the Department of Defense and the Air Force under the limitations with which they work.

Specifically, enactment of the bill before the House Committee today would increase for four additional years the Air Force limitations applying to and only to the grades of colonel and lieutenant colonel. The permanent limitations applying to major would not be changed.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this bill is the only way that young field grade officers can survive in a competitive atmosphere.

Quite to the contrary to statements that have been made that this is a bill for colonels only or for nonrated officers only, the issue before us, as I view this bill, is very simple and is simply the

question of: Do we want to continue to provide Air Force officers approximately the same promotion opportunities that are provided to other officers of the defense forces, namely the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps? That is what we should bear in mind when we vote on this bill.

Of course there are more field grade officers and officers of high rank than there are lieutenants and captains who have come into the service under the effect of the draft, and are trained expensively and go right out to take jobs with commercial aviation and others. This is a turnover factor vis-a-vis a career factor of dedicated officers. I think it is folly to pass it off as otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14542, a bill which is necessary to avoid severe turbulence in the Air Force officer structure, and to avoid greater inequities in the career progression patterns between the Air Force and the other services. And in rising in support I do so not only because I have been a close observer of the total military picture since I came to Congress but also because I was a personnel officer of the Army Medical Department during World War II, before the U.S. Air Force became a separate defense force. I know this bill is fair and just. It recognizes that the 1954 Officer Grade Limitation Act treated the Air Force differently than it treated the other services because it was then such a junior service, at that time just 12 years old. This bill is merely a recognition that as the officer force in the Air Force matured, the Air Force limitations would have to be increased accordingly, and in five separate congressional actions we have provided such relief. Now after these five congressional actions, some are suggesting we return to the 1954 law. I cannot comprehend this reasoning—particularly at a time when the Air Force is bearing the major brunt of the action in Southeast Asia.

This simply came about because the Army Air Corps was converted into the third armed services relatively a few years ago, at a time when the Officer Grade Limitation Act was applied, when they had only 1,200 officers in field grade at that time. Now they have the numbers we are considering today and they must be considered as a like service. This was not brought on by the Air Force or their lack of action.

We are not providing for any increase in promotional opportunities for Air Force officers. Rather we are merely extending the same promotional opportunities they have had for the past 6 years—less than other services, but livable.

Only 6 weeks ago was this committee advised and did the Defense Department advise the Air Force that for the first time they were not going to be coming up with the total overall solution we need. I think passage of this legislation is necessary in order to enable the Air Force to continue its long-term promotion program.

The bill represents a continuation of

the promotion program the Congress approved for the Air Force in Public Law 89-606—a program which has functioned over the last 6 years as it was designed to function: to meet the needs of the Air Force as it has matured from a young service and to keep officer career progression in the Air Force from falling further behind that of the Army and Navy. The bill provides authority necessary to maintain current promotion service points and opportunities for active duty field grade officers, both Regular and Reserve. In general, "promotion service points" may be defined as the year of promotion list service, or active commissioned service, in which the average officer in each grade category is promoted; while "promotion opportunity" is a percentage computed by dividing promotion selections in each grade category by the number of first-time eligibles.

As was pointed out by Mr. PRICE, field grade officers in the Air Force are promoted from 1 to 3 years later than their comrades in the other services. These Air Force officers understand this system and accept the promotion points now in being. If this bill is not passed, the disparity with the Army and Navy would increase, pushing the Air Force promotion from 3 to 5 years later than those of the sister services.

It is seen, therefore, that the effect of this legislation is an equitable one within our congressional concepts of dealing fairly with all branches of the service pending the eventual consideration of permanent legislation which would equalize career and promotion opportunities in all the services through a comprehensive officer management system.

Of equal importance at this time is the fact that company grade officers in the Air Force, as well as the other services, are making their decisions relating to our all-volunteer force, and by and large are basing their decisions on the stability, visibility, and equitable treatment offered by the Air Force promotion program.

Passage of this legislation is necessary to enable the Air Force to continue its long-term promotion program and to enable its officers to be promoted at approximately the same promotion points and with the same promotion opportunities as have been provided in the Air Force program for the past 6 years. Otherwise the "hump" will cause the greatest of all "RIF's" and rapid deterioration of a great and vital service.

I join with Mr. PRICE in support of this bill, H.R. 14542, and strongly recommend its approval by the Members of the House.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard all kinds of various comments as to whose fault it is that we are in the situation we are in. I want to subscribe fully to the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) that it is in fact our fault.

All I am suggesting is that right now is an opportunity for us to do some-

thing about it. Instead of that, we are not doing anything about it; we are doing, for the umpteenth time, precisely what the Pentagon asked us to do, which is to continue to have more colonels, more lieutenant colonels, and more majors.

We have heard the views from the official side of the Pentagon. I should like to read a letter which came absolutely unsolicited to my office yesterday from a lieutenant colonel serving overseas with the Air Force, a 30-year career man in the Air Force.

DEAR MR. PIKE: I was glad to see you are against the "grade gallup" of the armed forces evident in the Air Force Grade Relief Bill now before Congress. We certainly have no need for 1000 extra Colonels or 4500 extra Lt. Colonels, or any other number asked for.

In contrast, we could use less who would work harder and spend less time "working" for themselves on getting ahead. Most Colonel "Deputy" slots could be adequately covered by a Lt. Colonel.

Our promotion system in the Air Force is completely idiotic.

This is not the party line coming out of the Air Force via the Pentagon. This is an unsolicited letter from an Air Force career colonel. I suggest that we pay a little bit of attention to some of the people who are overseas on the firing line. I urge the defeat of this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I am sure the gentleman from New York did not place too much reliance on the letter he just read a part of to the House, because his subcommittee has just completed a study on the manpower problems within the services, and after weeks of study his main recommendation on this particular phase of the manpower problem is that it should have further study.

I do not believe we should penalize the Air Force while we are continuing a further study. We all agree this whole problem needs study.

The letter the gentleman read indicated an increased number of officers. That is entirely nonfactual. There is no increase authorized in this pending legislation at all. It will merely hold the Air Force where it is at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill for the continuation of the promotion program the Congress approved for the Air Force in 1966, by Public Law 89-606.

At a time when the brunt of the conduct of the war in Vietnam has been shifted so dramatically on the Air Force it would be less than reasonable to force a calamitous return to the field grade strengths established for a young Air Force as it existed in 1954.

These grade strength authorizations for Air Force colonels and lieutenant colonels provide not only the Air Force promotion program for these grades but also the existing promotion structure for the entire field grade range, and the ca-

reer promotion program for company grade officers as well.

Field grade officers in the Air Force are promoted from 1 to 3 years later than their comrades in the other services. Air Force officers understand this system and accept the promotion points now in being. If this bill is not passed, however, the disparity with the Army and Navy would increase, pushing the Air Force promotion from 3 to 5 years later than those of the sister services.

Of equal importance at this time is the fact that company grade officers in the Air Force, as well as the other services, are making their decisions relating to our all-volunteer force, and by and large are basing their decisions on the stability, visibility, and equitable treatment offered by the Air Force promotion program. Passage of this legislation is necessary to enable the Air Force to continue its long-term promotion program and to enable officers in the Air Force to be promoted at approximately the same promotion points and to continue with the same promotion opportunities as have been provided in the Air Force program.

I urge the passage of this very necessary and very equitable legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER).

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I believe we all recognize it has been well developed during the debate here today that this entire career promotion program, probably for all the services, needs overhauling. That is generally recognized by all, including those who have made special studies of it in committee work.

That should be forthcoming. It was indicated it will be studied further, and hopefully a package arrangement of legislation will be afforded on the subject that is comprehensive and permanent.

It is absolutely imperative under present conditions that this bill be enacted into law. Otherwise we would create a chaotic situation in the promotion ranks of the Air Force.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted by the House, let me state for the RECORD that I will vote with considerable reluctance for H.R. 14542 extending the period during which the Air Force would be authorized to exceed the 1954 Officer Grade Limitation Act. Failure to pass this legislation would place the Air Force officer in an unfair position with regard to promotions and time in grade when compared with officers in the other military services. However, the problem of "grade creep" or the increase in the average grade level is serious and must be dealt with on a permanent Department of Defense wide basis and our failure to do so at this time prompts the reluctance which I have toward this bill. With respect to grade creep in the Air Force, note this example. In fiscal year 1964 the Air Force had 5,350 colonels in a force of 130,626 officers. At the end of fiscal year 1973, the Air Force will have nearly 1,000 more colonels despite a reduction in the total



officer force of over 10,000 personnel to 120,522.

I am concerned with this bill in that it would extend Public Law 89-606 for 4 years, which when originally passed in 1966 was supposed to be temporary legislation. An extension of another 4 years will serve as an excuse for further delaying a permanent revision to the Officer Grade Limitation Act when action should be taken within the next year to revise the officer grade structure.

The dramatic increase in the cost of military manpower is the most important factor in shaping the fiscal year 1973 defense budget, and probably will remain so for some time in the future. Permanent legislation is urgently needed. The Department of Defense and the Armed Services Committee should work diligently in the drafting of legislation that will provide reasonably equal promotion opportunities for officers in all the military services and address this problem of grade creep.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14542, a bill which is necessary to avoid severe turbulence in the Air Force officer structure and to allow the Air Force to move into an all-volunteer environment.

The current draft authority expires in June of 1973. All of the ramifications of an all-volunteer force are therefore upon us. The decision that we make on this bill can have a drastic effect on the success or failure of achieving this goal. The foremost question is whether or not the services will be able to achieve not only sufficient quantity, but sufficient quality of men needed to sustain our current force capability. We cannot afford to lose quality; we cannot lower standards; we cannot accept anything but the best. The quality of today's officer force has never been higher. The potential being developed throughout all grades and in all services today is credible testimony of the intelligence, leadership, and judgment ability of today's officer. Failure to enact this measure would certainly not foster an all-volunteer force, and could seriously jeopardize the efforts of the Air Force to properly manage its officer force.

The dedicated men of the Air Force deserve equitable treatment with respect to the other services. Since 1959, this has required legislative relief for the Air Force from the restrictions of the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954. This body has repeatedly recognized the need to provide equitable treatment in the past. It is obvious that relief is just as urgently required at this time if we are to avoid unfair treatment of Air Force officers. Passage of this bill will simply assist the Air Force to continue its current officer programs without delay, prevent widening of interservice disparity, and avoid internal turbulence and disillusionment.

I share the view of many of you who believe that a comprehensive study of this problem of grade structure is required. We cannot allow the Air Force officer to fall further behind his fellow officers in the other services while we await this study. I therefore support this measure and urge each of you to join me in its passage.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

H.R. 14542

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Act of September 28, 1966, Public Law 89-606 (80 Stat. 849), is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1972," and inserting in place thereof "June 30, 1976."

(2) Section 2 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. For the period specified in section 1 of this Act, the authorized strength prescribed by section 8202 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1 of this Act, may be exceeded by 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel, and 1,500 for the grade of major. However, the authority to exceed the authorized strengths by 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel, and 1,500 for the grade of major authorized by this section may be used only in the event that reductions or increases in the authorized strength of the commissioned officers on active duty in the Air Force occur within a short period of time and that such changes impede promotions to the grades of major and lieutenant colonel as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, who shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 60 days following the utilization of any of the numbers covered in this section."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, add the word "drastic" before the word "reductions".

Page 2, line 10, add the word "seriously" after the word "changes".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONOVER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONOVER: On page 1, line 6, strike "1976" and insert in lieu thereof "1974".

Mr. CONOVER. Mr. Chairman, I think we have heard all of the various explanations about the bill and the statement by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) and the pros and cons as to why this bill must be passed. I must say I think it has to be passed but with my amendment.

What has bothered me—and as many of you know, I am the newest member of this committee and therefore it is somewhat presumptuous on my part to offer an amendment, but what has bothered me is that we are giving the Air Force another 4-year period to come up with a plan.

All my amendment does, as I have indicated, is to let them know our displeasure and ask them to come up with a proposal in 1974 rather than 1976.

I think in some way we must get their attention. In some way the concern that has been expressed here on the floor must be expressed to them. I think cutting it down to a 2-year period, in my opinion, would accomplish this.

I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I certainly am going to support the gentleman's amendment. I think it is entirely proper that he bring it here at this time. I do not think he needs to make any apology for doing so.

For the past 2 years now in the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations we have been pleading and urging and demanding that the Defense Department do something about the merging of the high-ranking officers, particularly many of them who have achieved that higher rank and are being paid at the higher rank on a temporary basis. I think to put this matter off for another 4 years would be failing in making known to the Defense Department the fact that we expect some action along this line. I think 2 years is going to be adequate, and my feelings are so strong in that regard that I will be willing to concede the 2 years, but I am not willing to concede the 4 years.

If this amendment is adopted, I can vote for this. If it is not adopted, I cannot vote for this legislation.

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

Mr. CONOVER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLOREY. I want to commend the gentleman on this very wise amendment that he is offering.

I am aware too of the dilemma which exists in the Air Force. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman in the well (Mr. CONOVER) can provide a solution and enable us to support this legislation, and have the dilemma overcome within a 2-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for offering his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered proposing a 2-year rather than a 4-year extension of this authority. This same question was raised during consideration by the Armed Services Committee and rejected.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense has been working with the services to develop a comprehensive officer management system which will produce a higher degree of similarity and equity of treatment for all officers throughout the Department of Defense. This system is designed to encompass all of the fundamental aspects of officer retention, promotion, tenure, separation, and retirement as well as the establishment of new grade structures for the services.

Even if the legislative proposal related to officer tenure and grade structure were to be enacted within the next year, it would still take several years for the officer grade mix to change sufficiently to permit the Air Force to operate without the continuation of relief granted by Public Law 89-606. Thus, a 4-year extension would preclude the need for another temporary extension. The Department of Defense assures me that their proposal on grade structure will be drafted so as to supersede H.R. 14542 or any other existing statute in conflict with it.

Because of the magnitude and complexity of making changes in all of these areas, the new system will permit an incremental and evolutionary shift from today's management practices so as to preclude breaking of faith with the officers on board today. The sequence of actions required by the Defense proposal involves changes in tenure concepts and transition to an all regular career force before the grade structure could be implemented to replace the 1954 Officer Grade Limitation Act. It is evident, then, that the transition will be somewhat time consuming—and I remind you that the proposal is not yet here for our consideration. By any realistic estimate of when the initial proposal could get to the Congress and be enacted, a 2-year extension of the law would mean that there would be little time remaining—well less than a year—before the relief would again expire. A 4-year continuation of this authority, on the other hand, should provide the transition period needed to accomplish the changes I have just discussed and to achieve the new configuration of the career officer force.

We considered this matter carefully in committee and rejected it. For the reasons I have just stated, I urge you to vote against this amendment.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CONOVER).

Mr. Chairman, as has been stated here, time and time again, we have examined this matter in committee very carefully, and we have found no other alternative other than to ask for the pending bill. To reduce it to 2 years would scuttle it. We are working toward the concept of a volunteer Army and a volunteer Air Force. If we reduce this to a period of 2 years rather than what is provided for in the bill before us, you are going to kill the concept of a Volunteer Air Force as far as the voluntary aspect is concerned.

They need more than 2 years to bring their house in order. Not only that, but here again we would be discriminating against the Air Force, and I, for the life of me, cannot understand why we are picking on the Air Force.

All we are asking for in this bill is that we have equity between all of the branches of our Armed Forces. Again I say why should we pick on the Air Force? Let us have the same standards for the Air Force as we have for the other branches of our armed services. That is all that we are asking for. As I said, and let me repeat, to reduce it to a 2-year period as provided in this amendment will mean scuttling the bill, and it will mean scuttling the program. As far as trying to achieve the volunteer aspect for the Air Force, you may as well forget about it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and

the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McFALL, 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. 14542) to amend the act of September 26, 1966, Public Law 89-606, to extend for 4 years the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Air Force may be increased, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1048, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. PIKE. 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 268, nays 128, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

YEAS—268

Abbott	Chamberlain	Galifianakis
Anderson, Ill.	Chappell	Garmatz
Andrews, Ala.	Clancy	Gaydos
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clark	Glaimo
Annunzio	Clausen, Don H.	Goldwater
Archer	Clawson, Del.	Gonzalez
Arends	Cleveland	Goodling
Ashbrook	Colmer	Grasso
Aspinall	Corman	Green, Oreg.
Baker	Cotter	Griffin
Baring	Crane	Gross
Barrett	Curlin	Gubser
Belcher	Daniel, Va.	Gude
Bell	Danielson	Haley
Bennett	Davis, S.C.	Hall
Betts	de la Garza	Hammer-
Bevill	Delaney	schmidt
Blaggi	Dellenback	Hanna
Blester	Denholm	Hansen, Idaho
Blackburn	Dent	Hansen, Wash.
Boggs	Devine	Harsha
Boland	Dickinson	Harvey
Bow	Diggs	Hays
Brinkley	Donohue	Hébert
Brooks	Dorn	Henderson
Brotzman	Downing	Hicks, Mass.
Brown, Mich.	Dwyer	Hicks, Wash.
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Hillis
Broyhill, Va.	Eilberg	Hogan
Buchanan	Eshleman	Hollifield
Burke, Fla.	Evans, Colo.	Horton
Burke, Mass.	Fascell	Hosmer
Burleson, Tex.	Fish	Howard
Byrne, Pa.	Fisher	Hull
Byrnes, Wis.	Flood	Hunt
Byron	Flowers	Hutchinson
Cabell	Foley	Ichord
Caffery	Ford, Gerald R.	Jarman
Carlson	Forsythe	Johnson, Calif.
Carney	Fountain	Johnson, Pa.
Casey, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Ala.
Cederberg	Frey	Jones, N.C.
Celler	Fuqua	Jones, Tenn.

Karth	Patten	Spence
Kazen	Pelly	Staggers
Keith	Pepper	Stanton.
Kemp	Perkins	J. William
King	Pettis	Stanton,
Kluczynski	Peyster	James V.
Kuykendall	Pickle	Steed
Kyl	Pirnie	Steele
Kyros	Podell	Steiger, Ariz.
Landrum	Poff	Steiger, Wis.
Latta	Powell	Stephens
Leggett	Preyer, N.C.	Stubblefield
Lennon	Price, Ill.	Symington
Lent	Price, Tex.	Talcott
Link	Pryor, Ark.	Taylor
Lloyd	Pucinski	Teague, Calif.
McCloskey	Purcell	Teague, Tex.
McCollister	Quillen	Thompson, Ga.
McCulloch	Railsback	Thone
McFall	Randall	Vander Jagt
McKay	Rhodes	Veysey
McKevitt	Robinson, Va.	Waggonner
McKinney	Robison, N.Y.	Ware
McMillan	Rogers	Whalen
Mahon	Roncalio	Whalley
Mailliard	Rooney, Pa.	White
Mann	Roussetot	Whitehurst
Martin	Roy	Whitten
Mathias, Calif.	Runnels	Widnall
Mayne	Ruppe	Wiggins
Meeds	Ruth	Williams
Melcher	Sandman	Wilson, Bob
Miller, Calif.	Sarbanes	Wilson,
Mills, Ark.	Satterfield	Charles H.
Mills, Md.	Saylor	Winn
Minshall	Scherle	Wolff
Mizell	Schmitz	Wright
Mollohan	Scott	Wylder
Montgomery	Sebelius	Wyllie
Morgan	Shipley	Wyman
Moss	Shoup	Yatron
Murphy, Ill.	Shriver	Young, Fla.
Murphy, N.Y.	Sikes	Young, Tex.
Natcher	Skubitz	Zablocki
Nichols	Slack	Zion
O'Konski	Smith, Calif.	Zwach
O'Neill	Smith, Iowa	
Passman	Smith, N.Y.	

NAYS—128

Abourezk	Findley	Moorhead
Abzug	Ford,	Mosher
Adams	William D.	Myers
Addabbo	Fraser	Nelsen
Anderson,	Frenzel	Nix
Calif.	Gibbons	O'Bye
Ashley	Green, Pa.	O'Hara
Aspin	Griffiths	Patman
Badillo	Grover	Pike
Begich	Halpern	Poage
Bergland	Hamilton	Quile
Bingham	Hanley	Rangel
Bolling	Harrington	Rees
Brademas	Hastings	Reid
Brasco	Hathaway	Reuss
Bray	Hawkins	Riegle
Broyhill, N.C.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roberts
Burlison, Mo.	Heckler, Mass.	Rodino
Burton	Heinz	Roe
Carey, N.Y.	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Carter	Hungate	Rostenkowski
Chisholm	Jacobs	Roush
Coilier	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Collins, Ill.	Keating	Scheuer
Conable	Koch	Schneebell
Conover	Landgrebe	Schwengel
Conte	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Conyers	Lujan	Snyder
Coughlin	McClory	Stokes
Culver	McCormack	Stratton
Daniels, N.J.	McDade	Sullivan
Davis, Wis.	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Mass.	Thomson, Wis.
Dennis	Madden	Tiernan
Derwinski	Mallory	Udall
Dingell	Mathis, Ga.	Ullman
Dow	Mazzoli	Van Deerin
Drinan	Metcalfe	Vanik
Duncan	Michel	Vigorito
du Pont	Miller, Ohio	Waldie
Eckhardt	Minish	Wampler
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Wyatt
Erlenborn	Mitchell	Yates
Esch	Monagan	

NOT VOTING—36

Abernethy	Collins, Tex.	Gettys
Alexander	Davis, Ga.	Gray
Anderson,	Dowdy	Hagan
Tenn.	Dulski	Kee
Blanton	Edmondson	Long, La.
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	McClure
Broomfield	Flynt	McDonald,
Camp	Fulton	Mich.
Clay	Gallagher	McEwen



Matsunaga	Rooney, N.Y.	Springer
Mikva	Roybal	Stuckey
Nedzi	Ryan	Terry
Rarick	Sisk	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Broomfield.  
 Mr. Mikva with Mr. McClure.  
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Springer.  
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Collins of Texas.  
 Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Camp.  
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Terry.  
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.  
 Mr. Fulton with Mr. McEwen.  
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Clay.  
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Kee.  
 Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Abernethy.  
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Gallagher.  
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Rarick.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Ryan.  
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Roybal.

Messrs. ABOUREZK and VANIK changed their votes from "yea" to "nay." Messrs. FOLEY and KEITH changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### ARMED SERVICES LEAVE ALLOWANCES

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I call up the bill (H.R. 3542), to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of travel and transportation allowances to certain members of the uniformed services in connection with leave, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3542

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended:*

(1) By inserting the following new section:  
 "§ 411b. Travel and transportation allowances: Travel performed in connection with certain leave

"(a) Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member stationed outside the forty-eight contiguous

States and the District of Columbia who is ordered to make a change of permanent station to another duty station outside the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia, may be paid travel and transportation allowances in connection with authorized leave from his last duty station to a point approved by the Secretary concerned or his designee and from that point to his designated post of duty.

"(b) The allowances prescribed under this section may not be at a rate more than the rate authorized under section 404(d) of this title. Authorized travel under this section is performed in a duty status."

(2) By inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"§ 411b. Travel and transportation allowances: travel performed in connection with certain leave."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended:

(1) By inserting the following new section:

"§ 411b. Travel and transportation allowances: travel performed in connection with certain leave

"(a) Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member stationed outside the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia who is ordered to make a change of permanent station to another duty station outside the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia may be paid travel and transportation allowances in connection with authorized leave from his last duty station to a place approved by the Secretary concerned, or his designee, or to a place no further distant than his home of record if he is a member without dependents, and from that place to his designated post of duty; provided, however, that either his last duty station or his designated post of duty is a restricted area in which dependents are not authorized.

"(b) The allowances prescribed under this section may not exceed the rate authorized under section 404(d) of this title. Authorized travel under this section is performed in a duty status."

(2) By inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"§ 411b. Travel and transportation allowances: travel performed in connection with certain leave"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 3542, is to provide to members of the Armed Forces payment for travel and transportation back to the continental United States between consecutive overseas assignments. The great majority of military personnel who serve consecutive overseas assignments do so as volunteers. Exceptions occur when there are particular requirements for specific skills in specialties which are undermanned. In these cases it is necessary to direct consecutive overseas assignments. It was also necessary to do so in order to rectify imbalances in troop levels in Europe to meet requirements of multiple tours in Vietnam.

The benefits to which this bill refers include transportation provided in kind aboard military, chartered, or commer-

cial carriers, or reimbursement in lieu of such travel. While awaiting such transportation and while traveling overseas, a per diem allowance is authorized at an amount dependent upon the established rate for the particular location involved. Within the continental United States the reimbursement policy provides either reimbursement for actual costs of transportation via commercial carriers or a mileage allowance if privately provided transportation is utilized. It is important to realize that this bill does not affect the existing transportation or travel allowances. It merely adds to the list of those eligible for such allowances, those service members who serve consecutive tours of duty overseas.

There is a committee amendment which limits the benefits only to those service members who are ordered to consecutive overseas assignments when at least one of those assignments is to a duty station where the member will not be accompanied by his dependents. In addition, the committee amendment limits the entitlements of bachelor personnel to an amount not to exceed the cost of such benefits had the single person returned to his or her home of record.

The obvious intent of the bill is to provide to service members the opportunity to return to the continental United States for the purpose of either relocating their families from an overseas duty station to the place of residence where the family will await the member's return from an accompanied tour, relocating a family from a CONUS base to the overseas duty station, or visiting with the family between two unaccompanied tours overseas.

In the case of bachelor personnel, the bill provides an opportunity for the member to return to visit family and friends between consecutive overseas assignments. Since the family or friends may have moved from the entry point of the member onto active duty—that is, from the member's home of record—the bill, while not limiting the options of the member as to the location at which leave may be taken, does limit the Government's liability for the costs involved.

Existing travel and transportation entitlements between consecutive overseas assignments are computed on the basis of the most direct route between such duty stations. Thus, if a member desired to return to the 48 contiguous States or the District of Columbia for the purposes listed previously, he or she would have to do so at great personal expense. Your Committee on Armed Services feels that this is improper in these cases and seeks, through this bill, to correct that deficiency.

In addition, the bill provides that such time as is consumed in the actual travel to and from the continental United States, including any time consumed awaiting transportation, be considered as being in a duty status, thus insuring that the member's accrued annual leave is not wasted.

The Department of Defense estimates that the costs associated with this bill will approximate \$2,414,000 per year. While it is not possible to accurately pre-

dict the situation over the next 5 years, it is fair to say that should present force levels and overseas obligations remain as they are now, the above figures should represent the maximum cost for each of the next 5 years. Should the number of overseas assignments be reduced, the costs associated with this bill will diminish accordingly.

In addition, since it is quite possible that this new benefit may induce more volunteers for consecutive overseas assignments, additional savings will accrue to the Defense budget in that fewer personnel relocations will be required to fill billet vacancies overseas from servicemen stationed within the continental United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense supports this legislation and the Office of Management and Budget has interposed no objection to its consideration.

It is the opinion of your Armed Services Committee that this is a good bill and rectifies a deficiency in the personnel management capabilities of the Defense Department.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3542 is to provide the means whereby a member of the armed services may assist his family in their relocation between overseas assignments or, if the member is without dependents, to return to the United States to visit with family and friends between consecutive overseas assignments.

I am certain that each of us is aware of the difficulties involved in moving a family and its household goods and personal effects. These problems are compounded when the movement involves transportation to or from foreign countries. It is made even further difficult when the movement must be made either without the service member himself, or with him but at personal expense. This bill would resolve these sorts of problems.

It also provides an additional benefit to the service as a whole. In the case of both bachelor and married personnel, the bill makes it economically feasible for the members to return to the United States for the purpose of taking annual leave between overseas assignments. The tremendous boost to the morale of those concerned can be easily imagined. As a matter of fact, although no firm estimates are possible, the Department of Defense believes that this legislation will provide a real inducement to military personnel to volunteer for consecutive overseas assignments. This will undoubtedly assist in maintaining a higher morale among military personnel overseas since they will be volunteers and the frequency of involuntary consecutive overseas tours can be reduced.

It will also effect certain cost savings, based upon the number who volunteer, since it will not be necessary to reassign other personnel to fill the vacancies these volunteers will be assigned to.

The benefit which this bill provides to

military personnel is similar, though not quite as broad, as the benefits presently afforded to civil servants assigned overseas. Civilian employees are provided Government transportation and additional leave time in order to return to the United States every 2 years. The committee has amended the bill to limit the benefit to military personnel to those instances wherein at least one of the overseas assignments is without the family. We did so in recognition of the fact that most military personnel are aware of the fact that some portion of their career will be served unaccompanied and are thus better prepared, and indeed, in many cases, desirous of the more mobile life style. The nature of military service overseas and the remoteness of some of the bases makes unaccompanied service inevitable. The committee felt, however, that a return trip to the United States was desirable and fully justified when one of the consecutive overseas assignments was served without the member's family.

In addition, when a bachelor service member, male or female, is ordered to, or volunteers for, consecutive overseas assignments, the bill provides for Government transportation and travel allowances back to the States for the purpose of leave. Since we would not want to dictate to our service personnel where they might take their annual leave, the committee amended the bill to limit the Government's cost liabilities for the benefit. Thus, if a serviceman desires to take leave at some other place than his home of record, the Government's costs would be limited to only that amount which did not exceed what it would have cost to go to the home of record.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

#### LEAVE FOR ARMED SERVICES MISSING PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I call up the bill (H.R. 14911), to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status to accumulate leave without limitation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

#### H.R. 14911

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 701 of title 10 United States Code, is amended—*

(1) by inserting "and subsection (g)" after "subsection (f)" in subsection (b); and

(2) by adding the following new subsection:

"(g) A member who is in a missing status, as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, accumulates leave with regard to the sixty-day limitation in subsection (b) and the ninety-day limitation in subsection (f). Notwithstanding the death of a member while in a missing status, he continues to earn leave through the date—

"(1) the Secretary concerned receives evidence that the member is dead; or

"(2) that his death is prescribed or determined under section 555 of title 37.

Leave accumulated while in missing status shall be accounted for separately. It may not be taken, but shall be paid for under section 501(h) of title 37."

Sec. 2. Section 501 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "section," in the first sentence of subsection (d) and inserting in place thereof "section and for accumulated leave under subsection (h) of this section,"; and

(2) by adding the following new subsection:

"(h) Payment shall be made for leave accumulated under section 701(g) of title 10 as soon as possible after the name of the person concerned is removed from a missing status, as defined in section 551(2) of this title."

Sec. 3. This Act becomes effective as of February 28, 1961.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Armed Forces are considered to be in a "missing" status when they are officially determined to be missing in action; interned in a foreign country; captured, beleaguered, or besieged by a hostile force; or detained in a foreign country against their will. H.R. 14911, therefore, applies to those servicemen who are missing in action as well as to those who are believed or known to be prisoners of war.

At the present time military personnel accumulate annual leave at the rate of 2½ days per month of active service. Such leave may be accumulated in amounts up to 60 days computed at the end of each fiscal year. There is, however, an exception to this policy. When a member has served in a hostile fire zone for a continuous period in excess of 120 days, or is hospitalized as a result of injuries received while in a hostile fire zone, the accumulated leave limitation is raised to 90 days in order to recognize the fact that the member has not been afforded an opportunity to utilize that leave which may have accumulated.

All military personnel, including those who are carried in a missing status, are subject to these limitations. As a result, those who are POW's or MIA's lose all entitlements to whatever leave they might have accumulated in excess of those limitations.

The problem we are faced with is that 90 days of accumulated leave represents that amount of leave to which the serviceman is entitled as a result of 3 years of active duty.

Unfortunately, and I know all Members of Congress share our concern in this matter, there are some military personnel who, as a result of actions in Vietnam, have been in a missing status for over 8 years.



The purpose of this bill is to recompense these men in but one small way for the leave which, because of their missing or prisoner status, they have not been able to enjoy. They have earned their leave just as much, if not more, than others who have been fortunate enough to serve without being subject to such cruel fate.

The bill provides that personnel in a missing status would be permitted to accrue annual leave at the normal rate, but without any limitation as to the amount which may be so accumulated. Then, when these soldiers, sailors, and airmen are removed from that missing status—hopefully through their return to the United States and to their families but possibly through a determination of death—they or their families would receive reimbursement for unused leave.

Your Armed Services Committee initially questioned the provision which provides for reimbursement for the unused leave as opposed to granting an opportunity to take such leave. It decided to agree with the proposal of the Department of Defense that provides reimbursement since that provision affords equal treatment to all those who return from a missing status.

According to the estimates provided by the Department of Defense, this bill will cost \$13,399,000 provided that all those who are in a missing status are removed from that status in fiscal year 1973. If such is not to occur until fiscal year 1974, the estimate rises to \$15,837,000 due to the additional leave time which would be accumulated during that period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense supports enactment of this bill and the Office of Management and Budget interposes no objection to its consideration. In addition, your Committee on Armed Services unanimously recommends enactment of the bill.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which initially considered this legislation and as a cosponsor of the bill, it is a pleasure for me to rise in support of H.R. 14911.

It is always both painful and frustrating to consider the plight of American military personnel who are known to be prisoners of war or who are listed as missing in action. I believe it is necessary, however, for us to consider how many soldiers, sailors, and airmen are carried on the rolls as missing—including the POW's as well as the MIA's.

In testimony received during the subcommittee hearing on this subject, we learned that the number of Americans listed as missing or as prisoners was 1,693.

Of that number, seven are in their 8th or 9th year in a missing status; 135 have been missing more than 7 years; 436 have been missing more than 6 years; 841 for more than 5 years; 1,230 for more than 4 years; and 1,419 have been either missing or captured for more than 3 years.

Under present law, a serviceman may accumulate up to 90 days of annual leave if he has served in a hostile fire zone in excess of 120 days. All of the 1,419

Americans I mentioned have far exceeded that requirement.

My point is that, under the existing laws, each of these 1,419 men have lost all entitlement to earned leave above the 90-day limit. We can correct this if the bill is favorably considered and enacted.

Indeed, there are many others who would benefit from the provisions of the bill. Since the bill provides that the effective date of the bill would be February 28, 1961, the date the first member entered a missing status since the commencement of the Vietnam conflict, there have been some personnel who were carried in a missing status for varying periods of time since then and have either been returned to military control or confirmed as being deceased. The exact number of such personnel cannot be confirmed and only by submission of claims by those members, former members or their survivors will an exact determination be possible.

In addition, as each long day, week, and month passes for the members who are lost or captured, and as each heart-breaking moment passes for their families, additional leave time accrues to the servicemen concerned.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, as Chairman BYRNE has clearly stated, is that without enactment of this bill any leave time accumulated in excess of 90 days is lost and cannot be repaid. I do not claim that by reimbursing those men who will eventually be returned to their families we will be totally repaying them for the misery they have each experienced. Nobody has the capability to do so, no matter how much we might wish we could.

What I do claim, however, is that by permitting the present law to stand without amendment, we are not even doing what little is within our power to accomplish toward repayment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will permit the American people to provide to our POW's and MIA's some small repayment. It will provide reimbursement for something that each of these men has earned. It is no gratuitous contribution—it is a payment of a just and binding debt—and I urge that the Members recognize that debt and provide the means for its repayment.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I call up the bill (H.R. 14538), to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities

thereunder, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14538

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.), is further amended—*

(1) by striking the date "June 30, 1972" where such appears in the second proviso of subsection 201(e), the fourth proviso of subsection 201(h), and subsection 205(h) and substituting in lieu thereof the date June 30, 1976";

(2) by striking the figure "\$25,000,000" in the second proviso of section 408 and substituting in lieu thereof "\$35,000,000".

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, today we are presenting H.R. 14538, a bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to extend the expiration date for financial assistance programs currently authorized by the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. These are:

First, the program to make payments for travel and per diem expenses of trainees at civil defense schools;

Second, the program to produce and maintain radiological equipment and to donate the same to States by loan or grant; and

Third, the program to provide financial assistance to State for necessary and essential State and local civil defense personnel and administrative expenses.

Additionally, the bill increases the per annum authorization for financial assistance for personnel and administrative expenses from \$25 to \$35 million.

Financial assistance authorized by these programs expired on June 30, 1972. However, pending the passage of this legislation, the program is operating under the authority of the continuing resolution granted by Congress in Public Law 92-334.

Public Law 928, 84th Congress—1956—amended subsection 201(e) of the Federal Civil Defense Act to authorize payment of travel expenses and per diem of students attending the civil defense schools authorized by the subsection. Public Law 85-606—1958—limited these payments to one-half the cost thereof and limited the amount to be appropriated therefor to \$300,000 annually, also this law limited the amount to be appropriated for personnel and administrative expenses to \$25 million and for radiological equipment to be donated or loaned to States for civil defense use to the amount of \$35 million. This bill will not increase the present limitation on appropriations for travel and per diem expense of trainees at civil defense schools or the limitation on appropriations for the procurement of radiological equipment, but

only increase the authorization for personnel and administrative expenses.

The objective of the personnel and administrative expenses program conducted under section 205 of the act is to assist States and their political subdivisions to develop and maintain an emergency preparedness capacity to cope with enemy caused, manmade, and natural disasters. The Federal Government's program for providing funds on a 50-50 matching basis has led to the establishment of professionally staffed State and local organizations and provided thereby a nationally coordinated capability for conducting civil defense operations during an emergency. Specific actions undertaken by these trained State and local organizations include the development of operational plans for civil defense and natural disaster, marking and stocking shelters, the establishment of warning and communications systems, organizing and training disaster plans. The ability of local political subdivisions to deal with all types of disasters is significantly enhanced by these actions.

To receive Federal matching funds, applicants must submit a program paper which details the major activities and projects to be accomplished during the year. Each employee whose salary is matched by Federal funds is subject to appointment under an approved merit system established in conformance with Federal merit system standards.

The authority for this program was granted by Public Law 85-606 enacted in 1958. However, funds were not made available until January 1961. The number of participating municipalities has been increasing over the years, and it is anticipated will continue to increase.

I urge your unanimous support of this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1047, the Committee on Armed Services is discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3772) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

#### S. 3772

An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.), is further amended—

(1) by striking the date "June 30, 1972" where such appears in the second proviso of subsection 201(e), the fourth proviso of subsection 201(h), and subsection 205(h) and substituting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1976";

(2) by striking the figure "\$25,000,000" in the second proviso of section 408 and substituting in lieu thereof "\$35,000,000".

CVXIII—1585—Part 19

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 14538) was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include therewith extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACT

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

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

This bill would remedy a major statutory deficiency to which Congress should carefully direct its attention in view of the pending expansion of trade with the Soviet Union and with other Communist nations. The central purpose and policy of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act is—in the words of the statute itself—to prevent a "dangerous and costly dependence" of the United States upon Communist dominated countries or areas for strategic and critical materials. In other words, as far as U.S. defense and mobilization capabilities are concerned, we not only want to have an adequate supply of strategic and critical materials on hand, but we also want to make certain that our sources of supply are maintained and not endangered.

The bulk of trade between the United States and Communist nations is normally conducted on a barter basis. Just last year a significant barter arrangement was made under which sizable amounts of Communist bloc nickel will be imported from Russia into the United States—some 55 million pounds of nickel over the next 3 years. These imports will have a substantial impact on established producers and suppliers of the U.S. nickel market.

I use this nickel barter transaction only as an illustration, Mr. Speaker, because it is just the kind of transaction—whether with nickel or any other stockpiled commodity—which carries the potential for serious damage to our defense and mobilization capabilities. The President does not now have sufficient authority to protect the United States against the "dangerous and costly dependence" upon Communist countries for strategic and critical materials, referred to in the Stock Piling Act. This legislation gives him that authority and the means to implement it. At the same time, I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, it is

not the purpose of this legislation to curtail to the point of closing off trade with Communist bloc nations in these strategic and critical materials. On the contrary, the legislation assumes there will be a fairly substantial growth in this trade, and is intended only to provide a mechanism by which the President can avert the "dangerous and costly dependence" with which the Stock Piling Act is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must have a prudent regard for its own defense and mobilization requirements. It must balance this consideration with its program for expanding trade with Communist bloc nations. This legislation gives the President important tools he does not now have. This bill will enable him to deal with a situation where imports of strategic or critical materials may reach levels that are likely to create the dependence the Stock Piling Act seeks to prevent. This legislation gives him the tools with which to act when in his judgment that point of dangerous dependence is at hand. At the same time, it permits him the flexibility to permit continued imports when in his judgment the overall interests of the United States commend that course of action.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this legislation gives the President a flexible set of tools he does not now have. These are tools which will be very necessary to the United States as our trade with Communist bloc countries expands in the months and years immediately ahead of us.

I hope this legislation will be given early attention by the House. In the national interest it should be enacted into law with the least possible delay.

#### ONE VICTORY FOR SOBRIETY IN THE HOUSE

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of July 25, 1972.

The editorial referred to follows:

#### ONE VICTORY FOR SOBRIETY IN THE HOUSE

Last week the House of Representatives, in a flash of good sense, voted down a bill to pump \$5 billion into community water and sewer projects this year. While the decision of the House is heartening, the message for beleaguered taxpayers is somewhat ominous—first, because this unnecessary bill was considered seriously by the House at all, and second, because the margin of decision on the crucial amendment was a slim three votes.

The bill, with the beguiling title of "The Emergency Community Facilities and Public Investment Act of 1972," was devised by Chairman Wright Patman and the House Banking and Currency Committee, aided and abetted by the House Democratic leadership. The gist of the bill was simple: it authorized the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to commit up to \$5 billion for water and sewer projects in communities with substantial unemployment. This largesse, supporters of the measure claimed with appropriate earnestness, would at one swoop save the environment, put people back to work, give cities and towns essential pub-



lic works, and lift financial burdens from the budgets of those struggling little town.

Aside from the detail that HUD's backlog of pending water and sewer grant requests is only about \$2 billion, the major objection to the bill was that it seemed slightly redundant, since the House had already passed several other measures to meet the same needs—including the \$18-billion, three-year water pollution control package now in conference, and the \$29.5-billion revenue-sharing bill now in the Senate. Rep. George H. Mahon, Appropriations Committee chairman, and other procedural purists were also troubled because the bill had received only one short day of hearings, without any administration witnesses, and because the proposed \$5 billion in building blocks was totally unbudgeted. Representative Patman's team seemed to consider these aspects mere technicalities.

After a typical House debate between the champions of generosity, mostly Democrats, and the watchdogs of the treasury, mostly Republicans, the House reached a rather surprising result: the treasury won. By a teller vote of 197 to 194, an amendment was added providing that grants could not be made in any year when the projected federal deficit exceeds \$20 billion. That amendment, Representative Patman conceded, ensured that the program "would never be used," and indeed the House ended the day by killing the entire proposition, 206 to 189.

Reassuring as the ultimate outcome was, the episode shows that the silly season has opened once again on the Hill. Wildly inflationary and simplistic bills such as this, which would never reach the floor so quickly in March, are likely to pop up on the calendars of both houses quite frequently between now and adjournment. Those 197 members of the House should be commended for recognizing that the Patman play served no legitimate "emergency" at all. But as sessions lengthen, tempers shorten and partisan games increase, the cause of sobriety in government may be hard put to maintain its majority.

#### REMARKS OF MAYOR DALEY ON REBUILDING AND RENEWAL OF CITIES OF AMERICA

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Senate Finance Committee continued its hearing on H.R. 14370, the State and Local Assistance Act of 1972. This legislation, which passed the House on June 22, 1972, will hopefully provide much-needed financial assistance to many of our Nation's beleaguered metropolitan areas. One of today's scheduled witnesses was the mayor of my own city of Chicago, the Honorable Richard J. Daley.

In his remarks, the mayor strongly endorsed the regulation by stating that—

There is nearly universal recognition that the central cities are vital to the future of our nation. With the passage of this long-needed legislation, a giant step will be taken toward the rebuilding and renewal of the cities of America.

Hopefully, strong support such as this from leaders of our Nation's key urban areas will encourage the Senate to act with all due speed on this legislation in order that it may be enacted in the upcoming months.

I would at this point in the RECORD, like to insert the mayor's remarks as I

am sure they will be of considerable interest to all my colleagues:

#### TESTIMONY OF MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY

Chairman Russell B. Long, I'd like to express my appreciation to the Senate Finance Committee for this opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 14370, the State and Local Assistance Act of 1972, and urge its expedient passage.

The recommendation of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities to strengthen this bill have been submitted to this committee and they have my full support.

This legislation recognizes the tremendous changes and the increasingly growing responsibility of local government. Twenty-five years ago cities were primarily responsible for housekeeping services, for police, fire, water, prevention of contagious diseases, building codes and for those matters relating to them. Today, however, cities are faced with a complex range of problems of a different order of magnitude and of a different intensity directly involving the personal lives of people. Cities are concerned with health care, welfare, equal opportunity employment, manpower training, education, day-care services, poverty, family services and the like.

These services involve individuals, homes and neighborhoods all with a great variety of particular local needs which can not be administered by nationwide or statewide regulations or inflexible administration. Priorities differ from neighborhood to neighborhood and it is local government which, under the direct influence of its residents, can best evaluate and determine what programs should get the greatest emphasis. It is only local government which has the know-how, the coordination, and the understanding to meet these imperative needs.

Certainly the programs of public safety, environmental protection and public transportation given priority by the bill are of the greatest importance. But I urge the committee to give the deepest consideration to the recommendation to allow greater freedom to local communities to spend funds only limited by state law and municipal charter authority.

I also urge the committee to give favorable consideration to the other basis recommendations; that the amount of entitlement be related to the local tax effort as now is proposed for the states, the elimination of the provision which allows the state to augment its existing regional programs at the expense of the local government's share; and that there should be an effort to exempt from the provisions of this bill, municipalities which are now non-viable because of size. There also should be a three-year period before recognizing new incorporations.

These amendments are important and will make a good bill better. H.R. 14370 represents a significant break-through in financing state and local bodies in an effort to permit them to meet the challenges of our urban society.

Many new constitutions are being written across the country granting to municipalities broader home rule authority. This legislation is in keeping with that philosophy of home rule for municipalities and has the advantage of this legislation also is that it removes layers of bureaucracy and speeds up the entire process of getting programs into operation and carrying them out efficiently.

Similarly, the bill represents a tremendous contribution to continuity and planning for no longer will a city be dependent upon appropriations each year by Congress but will have the assurance of being able to carry out plans on a continuous basis.

There is nearly universal recognition that the central cities are vital to the future of our nation. With the passage of this long-

needed legislation a giant step will be taken toward the rebuilding and renewal of the cities of America.

#### IT'S UP TO YOU

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which is particularly timely in this Presidential election year. The editorial, "It's Up to You," which was broadcast on KMOX radio, St. Louis, Mo., on December 29, 1971, follows:

Uncle Sam needs you. And he needs you in '72.

This may sound like an announcement urging enlistment in the Armed Forces. But we're asking you to serve your country in a different way.

The form of service we're talking about doesn't require the strength to undergo basic training. It doesn't take the endurance to march ten miles. It doesn't mean putting on a uniform and going to live on a military base.

But it's more vital to the strength of our nation than all the armies and all the military hardware in our arsenal.

For America needs the help of every qualified adult. It needs the honest, sincere effort of men and women to become informed citizens to take part in our democratic process. And it needs this participation more than ever in 1972 . . . a Presidential year.

Being an informed and active citizen takes some effort on your part. You will need to study the candidates and issues on the local, state and national level. You will need to learn about airports and wage rulings, school bonds and Supreme Court decisions. You'll need to be concerned about the Middle West . . . and the Middle East.

But being informed is much easier for today's Americans than ever before in history. You don't have to travel by horse to the county seat to get the news. The electronic media . . . radio and television . . . provide instant, immediate information at the touch of the dial. Newspapers, magazines and books are available at every public library and on every newsstand. Meetings, forums, discussion groups are all around . . . for those with the initiative to take part.

Democracy depends on education. But it also depends on action. It depends on your expressing your opinions at the ballot box.

Tragically, most Americans don't bother to be active citizens. Less than half the electorate turns out for the average election. This is the worst voting record of any major democracy. In fact, it's a real cop-out.

With our nation facing some of the most complex problems in its history, such apathy is a shocking act of disservice to America. But we can change this record. We can change it in '72. It's up to you.

#### EXPANDING DRUG TESTS TO MILITARY DEPENDENTS OVERSEAS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Post pointed out that a proposal is circulating in the Pentagon which would require the use of urine tests to detect heroin among children of military personnel overseas.

During the last several weeks, I have

released statistics showing that Army and commercial drug testing laboratories are doing a poor job in this program. The accuracy rates of almost all of the laboratories have been well below the 90 percent requirement established by the Department of Defense. In this regard, the commercial laboratories doing the Army's drug testing program in the United States were achieving only about a 71 percent accuracy rate while the military services' own laboratories were correctly identifying only about 62 percent of the urine samples. According to the statistics, the laboratories were having the greatest difficulty in detecting heroin and barbiturates in urine samples.

I believe it is patently ridiculous to extend the use of the drug tests until the accuracy of the tests has been vastly improved. So far, the Defense Department has failed to show that it has improved the accuracy of its drug detection program. Until it can prove that the laboratories are consistently meeting at least the 90 percent accuracy requirement, then any expansion of the drug testing program to children of military personnel overseas should not be considered. I also believe that forcing nonmilitary personnel to take urine tests raises very serious constitutional questions concerning self-incrimination.

#### A TRIBUTE TO PUERTO RICO ON THE OCCASION OF CONSTITUTION DAY 1972

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to extend congratulations to the people of Puerto Rico and to the Puerto Ricans living on the American mainland, on the occasion of Puerto Rican Constitution Day.

Over 2 million of her people, by birth or parentage, are living on the mainland—which is more than one-third the number remaining on the island. Whenever Puerto Ricans have settled in American communities, Spanish language and culture has rapidly assumed a position of importance.

The significance of Puerto Rico and of her relationship to the United States is paramount on this occasion, calling to the attention of the world the progress of personal liberty, prosperity, and economic freedom in a land once plagued by the forces of tyranny and the horrors of poverty.

The Spanish-American War, and the consequent occupation of Puerto Rico by the U.S. Army in 1898, ended Spanish misrule but did not at once provide democracy. The first Organic Act created a civil government under the direction of American officials appointed by the Federal Government. However, remaining limitations on the exercise of self-government proved unsatisfactory. Congress therefore passed the second Organic Act of March 2, 1917, further extending the political power of the Puerto Rican people.

From the beginning there was a considerable amount of injustice, persecu-

tion, exploitation, and the like; but, to the same extent, the forces of justice organized and, as time has elapsed, the forces of justice in Puerto Rico have grown stronger.

If 1898 was a milestone in the history of Puerto Rico, 1940 proved to be a year of destiny. Throughout the 1930's, the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal administration had encouraged a mood of social change in Puerto Rico, and Rexford Tugwell, a leading New Dealer, had governed the Commonwealth with vigor and high resolve. In 1940, a liberal political organization—the Popular Party, secured its first limited success at the polls, campaigning on a reform ticket calling for bread, land, and liberty. Successful in its initial programs, under the impressive leadership of Luis Muñoz-Marín, the Popular Party rose to a position of political dominance. In the first popular election of a Governor, in 1948, Marín was nominated by his party and overwhelmingly elected.

The reform policies of Luis Muñoz-Marín established a government dedicated to liberal reform and to the present status of Puerto Rico as a "free associated state" or Commonwealth, and led to the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution, on this day—July 25—20 years ago. Under the provisions of the constitution, an elected legislature now passes and provides for the enforcement of the laws of Puerto Rico, which in turn are subject to review by the Federal courts, in the manner of all State laws. Significant advances have been made.

The economy has been diversified and education and health care have been improved. In this world of torment and man-made catastrophe, the magnificent progress of the Puerto Rican people, since the adoption of their Constitution 20 years ago, is one of the brighter stories of our times.

The people of Puerto Rico are working hard, probably as hard as any people have ever worked, to improve their standard of living. But their primary goal is not merely material wealth. Rather it is a way of life with economic and social and political freedom combined.

Under the constitution of the Commonwealth, the government formally operates under these democratic principles, and constantly expounds them. People of all religions are free to worship as they choose. Racial discrimination is prohibited. The public schools are modeled primarily upon the North American pattern, and children are taught the rights and duties of citizens living in a democratic country. Finally, other instruments that shape the mind of citizens, such as newspapers, radio, and television, enunciate the democratic ideology as loudly as they repudiate the alternatives. Explicitly, the Puerto Rican culture is overwhelmingly devoted to the virtues, the slogans, and the spirit of democracy.

The value of our country to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico can be measured not only in terms of enthusiastic response to our national principles, but in the effect of that response upon the peoples of Latin America, who sense in

the satisfaction of the Puerto Rican experiment the success and glory of the American way of life.

Yet, important questions and problems remain to be solved. The future of the Commonwealth status is a subject of much discussion and controversy. It is an issue which the people of Puerto Rico should resolve themselves. Meanwhile, these people are valued citizens of the United States and the obstacles which they encounter daily must be removed.

While the cost of living is extremely high, it is reported that almost half of the families on the island earn less than \$3,000 annually. The per capita income is far below that of any of our 50 States. Much remains to be done.

Residents of Puerto Rico not only suffer from low per capita incomes, but the island is also specifically excluded from a number of Federal programs such as the school milk program and some aspects of the social security program. It is the responsibility of this Congress and this Government to take steps to alleviate these problems.

All America hails the progress and achievement of the Puerto Rican people on the occasion of Constitution Day 1972, but we must also at this time affirm our determination that this Congress and Nation must strive to eliminate the inequities which still exist on this remarkable island.

#### INCREASING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE OLDER CITIZEN

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to increase employment opportunities for a segment of our population faced with chronic unemployment—the older citizen. Even in times of relatively high employment, the older worker faces job hardships that the younger worker, merely because of his age, does not experience. Present social security payments, often the only means of support available to these people, are not sufficient to meet the financial demands of everyday life.

An increasing number of older citizens are living at the poverty level. An estimated 5 million persons 65 years of age and older live on incomes of less than \$3,000, below the national poverty level. Over 2 million older Americans are forced to live on public assistance pensions under the Old Age Assistance Act and the increasing unemployment rate, presently at 3.6 percent, contributes to this already dismal picture.

In order to survive, the older citizen must either do without or seek additional revenue through employment. The Older Workers Community Service Act would provide the older worker with the opportunity to supplement his meager income. The act would authorize the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with private and public nonprofit agencies for the implementation of community service programs employing the older worker.



Recognizing the handicaps of the older worker, the act stipulates that community service employment must be in the worker's resident community; a worker employed under this program must be paid either the Federal minimum wage, the State minimum wage, or the prevailing wage for that occupation, whichever is the highest; necessary training must be afforded the older worker; and a safe and healthful working environment must be provided. Furthermore, Federal funding would cover 90 percent of the cost of development of any older worker program.

Discrimination in employment is not just confined to sex, race, or national origin. Often, the most subtle and yet most pernicious form of discrimination is based on age. The experience, maturity and skills of the older worker are wasted because he has, according to present definition, passed prime productivity. The tragedy of this situation is heightened when we realize that much-needed public services go unfilled because of a shortage of qualified personnel.

Possibly more important than an increase in income, employment beyond retirement offers new responsibilities, challenges and goals for those whose age limits alternatives. Old age is that arbitrary cutoff point which somehow separates the older citizen from the main stream of society. Such inflexible obstacles foster resentment, bitterness, and worse resignation. Human potential in a productive society cannot be measured in terms of age. Ability and willingness are the only necessary criteria.

As the author of the House version of the Emergency Employment Act, I have seen the double-edged benefits of public service employment programs. With the swift passage of the Older Workers Community Service Act, the Congress would again recognize its responsibility to the unemployed of this country and most especially the Congress would seek to remedy unemployment which will not improve with time and more favorable economic conditions.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI), for today, on account of personal reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, July 26.  
Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, July 26.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extra-

neous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds five pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$850.

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 3½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$595.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHITEHURST) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOW.  
Mr. MILLS of Maryland.  
Mr. PETTIS.  
Mr. HILLIS.  
Mr. ESHLEMAN.  
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.  
Mr. HUNT.  
Mr. CONTE.  
Mr. MICHEL in five instances.  
Mr. KING.  
Mr. SCHWENGEL.  
Mr. GROVER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.  
Mr. JACOBS in three instances.  
Mr. DOW in four instances.  
Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.  
Mr. MINISH.  
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
Mr. BARING.  
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.  
Mr. DOWNING.  
Mr. RANGEL in two instances.  
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.  
Mr. PATMAN.  
Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama.  
Mr. KARTH in two instances.  
Mr. ROE in two instances.  
Mr. CLARK.  
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.  
Mr. LONG of Maryland.  
Mr. MCKAY in two instances.  
Mr. DANIELSON.

#### SENATE BILLS 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. 1991. An act to assist in meeting national housing goals by authorizing the Securities and Exchange Commission to permit companies subject to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 to provide housing for persons of low and moderate income; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2411. An act to establish the Cumberland Island National Seashore in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1152. An act to facilitate the preservation of historic monuments, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 26, 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:

2193. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, covering the quarter ended June 30, 1972, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2194. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the statistical supplement to the Commission's report on Cigarette Smoking Act; to the Committee cigarette labeling and advertising, pursuant to the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### 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. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13201. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, to establish the John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1037. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of prices of lumber and plywood; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-1240). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1053. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12807, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government (Rept. No. 92-1241). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1054. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11128, a bill to authorize the partition of the surface rights in the joint use area of the 1882 Executive Order Hopi Reservation and the surface and subsurface rights in the 1934 Navajo Reservation between the Hopi and Navajo Tribes, to provide for allotments to certain Paiute Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1242). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1055. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 440, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations (Rept. No. 92-1243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1056. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7060, a bill to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government

employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations (Rept. No. 92-1244). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2575. An act for the relief of William John West (Rept. No. 92-1238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2704. An act for the relief of Rita Rosella Valleriani (Rept. No. 92-1239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:  
H.R. 16009. A bill to amend Public Law 91-508 to prescribe procedures pertaining to the disclosure of certain financial information by financial institutions to State and Federal governmental departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDABBO:  
H.R. 16010. A bill to establish National, Regional, and Local Awareness Advisory Councils in order to facilitate communication between the President and the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ARCHER:  
H.R. 16011. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to promote public confidence in the legislative branch of the U.S. Government by requiring financial disclosure by Members of Congress, candidates for Congress, and certain employees of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. McCURE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 16012. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain various Federal Reclamation Projects and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:  
H.R. 16013. A bill to amend section 13(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide that nothing in such act

shall prevent States or local public bodies from prohibiting the right to strike; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:  
H.R. 16014. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide that certain meat food products are adulterated; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONABLE:  
H.R. 16015. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 20-percent increase in annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONOVER:  
H.R. 16016. A bill to provide for the establishment of safety standards for mobile homes in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:  
H.R. 16017. A bill to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DU PONT:  
H.R. 16018. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to require the approval of adjacent coastal States prior to the construction of certain offshore facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. Gross, and Mr. SCHERLE):

H.R. 16019. A bill to require that before import quotas on meats may be suspended or increased under subsection (d) (1) and (2) of the act, the Secretary of Agriculture must estimate that the average price expected to be received by producers for beef cattle will equal or exceed parity during the period of the suspension or increased quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCOLLISTER:  
H.R. 16020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELCHER:  
H.R. 16021. A bill to encourage and support the dissemination of news, opinion, scientific, cultural, and educational matter through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 16022. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the authorization of means other than stamps on containers of distilled spirits as evidence of tax payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:  
H.R. 16023. A bill to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the char-

acter "Woodsy Owl," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H.R. 16024. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ULLMAN:  
H.R. 16025. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the establishment of standards related to rear mounted lighting systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:  
H.J. Res. 1263. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 30, 1972, as "National Sokol USA Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONOVER:  
H. Con. Res. 649. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, and Mr. ROBISON of New York):

H. Res. 1051. Resolution calling on the President to propose an expansion of the nuclear test ban treaty to include underground testing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:  
H.R. 16026. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Taormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:  
H.R. 16027. A bill for the relief of Yelena B. Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:  
H.R. 16028. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Aguirre-Santini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:  
H. Res. 1052. Resolution commending the New York State Volunteer Firemen's Association for its 100th anniversary, commemorated in 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,  
262. The SPEAKER presented petition of the annual conference, Church of the Brethren, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE—Tuesday, July 25, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m. 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, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose word bids us to lift up our eyes to the everlasting hills and assures us that our help comes from the Lord who made heaven and earth, we lift up the eyes of our faith to Thee, beseeching Thee to keep us strong and calm amid all change. In days of tension and contention help us to keep our direction

sure and our purposes pure. Teach us the higher truth that all things work together for good to them that love the Lord and keep His laws. Give us the grace to hold fast that which is good, to strengthen the fainthearted, to support the weak, to encourage the strong, to follow the ways of peace, to honor all men, and in serving this Nation to serve Thee.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the

Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.