

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1972:

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Howard Bayer, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ralph Longwell Foster, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Morgan Garrott Roseborough, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Robert Edmondston Coffin, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Henry Blakefield, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Bruce Smith, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Donald Harry Cowles, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Mayo, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Robert Clinton Taber, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Howard Elder, Jr., **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Warren Cobb, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin I. Donley, **xxx-xx-xxxx**, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Erwin Montgomery Graham, Jr.,

xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Daniel McLaughlin, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Sammet, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Alden Burke, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Warren Kennedy Bennett, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Harris Whitton Hollis, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Washington Putnam, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Paul Young, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis Paul Koisch, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Russell Kraft, Jr., **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr., **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Edgar Shedd III, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Edward Pleklik, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Bennison Fulton, **xxx-xx-x...** Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. David H. Bagley, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. David H. Bagley, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and

other duties of great importance and responsibility determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Dougals C. Plate, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Robert S. Salzer, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 4231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Stansfield Turner, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Robert L. Townsend, U.S. Navy for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Donn J. Robertson, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Godfrey D. Adamson, Jr., to be colonel, and ending Raymond E. P. Zimmerman, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Jan. 21, 1972.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Fausto Acosta-Natal, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Thomas F. Zuck, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Jan. 21, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 2, 1972

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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1794. An act to authorize pilot field-research programs for the suppression of agricultural and forest pests by integrated control methods.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

January 31, 1972.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 4:05 p.m. on Monday, January 31, 1972, and said to contain the President's Report of Study and Surveys of the Hazards to Human Health and Safety from Common Environmental Pollution.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-241)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President

of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Environmental Protection Agency have jointly studied the health effects of environmental pollution in accordance with Title V of Public Law 91-515. Their findings, which appear in this report, deserve the attention of the Congress and of all Americans who are concerned about environmental quality and its impact on the health of our people.

This study gives further evidence of the need for new legislation in this vital field. I have forwarded to the Congress a number of recommendations for meeting this challenge, and I again urge that they be given early and favorable consideration. My proposals include:

Toxic Substances Control Act of 1971
Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1971

The Department of Human Resources Act

The Department of Natural Resources Act

Marine Protection Act of 1971
Noise Control Act of 1971

Health Maintenance Organization Assistance Act of 1971

These measures, together with proposals which were contained in my Health Message of February 18, 1971, and my Environmental Message of February 8, 1971, and other actions which I will propose to the Congress this year, would, in my view, provide the essential tools for dealing with the health effects of environmental pollution in the years ahead.

This report identifies important needs concerning the determination of hazards to human health and safety resulting from common environmental pollution. It also sets forth a number of specific recommendations for meeting these problems. I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to see that these needs are promptly and thoroughly addressed.

As I take this action, I would also note that impressive progress has already been made in coordinating the efforts of these two agencies. For example, the joint establishment of the National Center for Toxicological Research will do much to improve our knowledge in this area. I would also point out that the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, in cooperation with the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, has established a new interagency panel to improve the coordination and utilization of environmental health research, and that we have been taking a number of other steps to improve the surveillance and monitoring of environmental hazards.

The problems which this report discusses cannot be addressed effectively without the full attention and cooperation of both the legislative and executive branches. I pledge that this administration will continue to give a high priority to the task of preventing hazards to

human health arising from environmental pollution, and I look forward to working closely with the Congress in achieving this goal.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1972.

THE PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-240)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

From the very beginnings of our history, the vitality of rural America has been at the heart of our Nation's strength. It is essential that we preserve and expand that vitality in the years ahead. For America will not be able to look eagerly to the future with a sense of promise and hope unless those who live in its rural areas are able to share in this vision. To help improve the quality of life in the American countryside, I am today presenting a series of proposals designed to marshal more effectively the energies of the private sector and of government at all levels in a cooperative program of rural development.

THE PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA

All Americans have a high stake in rural development. For the problems which many rural areas are now experiencing are directly linked to those of our cities and suburbs. Changing patterns of life in rural America have changed the pattern of life in all of America.

A central cause of these changing patterns has been the increasing mechanization of agriculture and of other natural resource industries such as mining and lumber—a process which has resulted in a substantial reduction in jobs in these occupations in recent years. While employment opportunities in other occupations have more than offset these declines, the overall growth of economic opportunity in rural America has lagged far behind that of our urban areas. Today, dramatic disparities exist between metropolitan and rural areas in such indices as per capita income, housing standards, educational attainment and access to medical care.

At the same time, political institutions designed to deal with simpler problems in simpler times have frequently been unable to cope with these new challenges. The Federal Government often finds that it is too remote and too unwieldy to respond with precision to State and local needs. State and local governments are frequently too impoverished or too fragmented to undertake the necessary planning and development activities. Their problems are accentuated by the fact that widely dispersed rural population inevitably means a higher expenditure per person for most government programs.

One result of all these factors is that semi-deserted country towns—once cen-

ters of life for the surrounding countryside—stand today as stark reminders of unused and abandoned rural resources. In each of the three decades since 1940, half of our counties (not always the same ones) have lost population. Two out of every five of our counties lost population in all three decades. As I said in my State of the Union Message two years ago, many of our rural areas are being emptied of their people and their promise.

In many cases, those who have left the countryside have simply taken their problems with them. Indeed, many have seen their problems intensify as they have settled in over-crowded urban areas.

It is striking to realize, as I noted in this year's Message on the State of the Union, that even if we had a population of one billion—nearly five times the current level—our area is so great that we would still not be as densely populated as many European nations are at present. Our problems are not so much those of numbers as of distribution. And their solution requires the revitalization of the American countryside.

CHANGING OUR APPROACH

In seeking to solve the problems of rural areas, we must not simply seek more money from the Congress and the taxpayers. In the past decade we have seen the folly of pouring money into projects which were ill-considered and lacking in local support. What we must now seek instead is a fundamental change in the way government approaches the entire developmental challenge.

The Federal Government has spent considerable sums on rural development. Programs which we have recommended for inclusion in our rural development revenue sharing plan alone are spending almost \$1 billion this year and this is only a small part of our overall rural development spending. And yet, despite this substantial funding, the problems have continued to grow. What is it that has been missing from our rural development programs?

MORE CONTROL AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL

I believe that a major missing ingredient has been effective control of development programs at lower levels of Government. Because we have relied so exclusively on Federal funds—handed out through bureaucratic processes and through narrow categorical grants—too many decisions have been made in Washington and too few have been made in rural America. I believe this is wrong. I believe we should return power to officials who are selected at the State and local levels.

As long as the Federal Government sets rigid rules, both through legislative and administrative guidelines, there is little room for local initiative. Under our present system, a project that does not meet Federal standards does not get funded. This means that the talents of local government officials, of leaders in the private sector, and of public-spirited citizens cannot be fully utilized. Almost all of the success stories that can be found in rural economic development have occurred because local officials

and private leaders have entered into a public-spirited partnership and have taken the initiative. We must do all we can to encourage such partnerships.

IMPROVED PLANNING

Even as we seek to decentralize, we must also work to improve planning. In many respects these goals represent two sides of the same coin. For plans which are developed at levels close to the people are likely to be more realistic, more imaginative, and more useful than abstract blueprints which are drawn up far away from the scene of the action or which are altered to meet rigid Federal rules. Effective development does not require plans that can survive the scrutiny of Washington. Effective development requires plans that people believe in and will work to accomplish.

MORE ADEQUATE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RESOURCES

More adequate development also requires more adequate resources. This does not simply mean more Federal money; it also means that Federal funds now available must be freed from the inhibiting restrictions within which they are now entangled. Funds which are free of these restrictions can be used in each locality where the needs are greatest, eliminating a great deal of inefficiency and waste.

But Federal grant money provides only a part of the Federal contribution to rural America. Adequate credit resources can also be extremely important in developing community facilities and in attracting private investment. In the end it is not Federal money, nor even the vast sums spent by State and local governments, which hold the key to rural development. The private sector has an enormous role to play and public efforts must keep this fact centrally in mind.

HELPING THE FARMER AND PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

Rural America cannot move forward effectively into the future unless it respects those elements which have been the base of its strength in the past. We cannot build a stronger rural economy, for example, unless we also build a stronger agricultural economy. While we must work to change the American countryside, we must never do so at the expense of those who produce our food and fiber. We must work to create a better life for American farmers even as we provide an expanded range of opportunities for those who are no longer needed on the farm.

Even as we do more to promote agricultural prosperity, so we must do more to protect the rural environment. Just as development must not come at the expense of the farmer, so it must not come at the expense of environmental concerns. We cannot fully develop the American countryside if we destroy the beauty and natural resources which are so much a part of its essential value.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

These then are the basic principles which should guide our new approach to rural community development:

We must treat the problems of rural America as a part of a general strategy for balanced growth.

We must reverse the flow of power to the Federal Government and return more power to State and local officials.

We must fight the rigidities of narrowly focused categorical grants.

We must facilitate more adequate advance planning.

We must reorganize the Federal Government so that it can more effectively support planning and execution at the State and local level.

We must provide adequate resources and credit, in ways which attract greater private resources for development.

We must develop rural America in ways which protect agriculture and the environment.

On the basis of these principles, we have prepared the following recommendations for action—including proposals which have been submitted earlier and a number of new initiatives.

PROPOSALS ALREADY SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

One of the most significant barriers to effective planning and coordination in rural areas has been the fragmentation of Federal efforts. Too many programs which should be closely related are operating as very separate entities. As a result, State and community leaders must often run a complex obstacle course in order to obtain development assistance. Frequently there is poor coordination and wasteful duplication and in some cases the action of one Federal agency actually conflicts with that of another.

The principal reason for this fragmentation has been the failure of the Government to recognize the inter-relationship among rural, suburban and urban problems and the need to strengthen the essential social and economic partnership between rural America and our great metropolitan centers.

I believe the proper solution to this problem is to gather the principal Federal programs which support community development within a single new Department of Community Development.

This new department would both simplify and expedite the tasks of State and local governments through a broad range of program and technical support efforts. Because fewer questions would have to be resolved in Washington at the inter-agency level, the new department would also expedite the decentralization of Federal decision-making which this administration has already begun. The new Department of Community Development would take over most of the functions now performed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; some of the functions of the Department of Transportation, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration; and the responsibilities of the Department of Commerce with respect to the Title V regional commissions.

Under our revised plan for executive reorganization, the Department of Agriculture would remain as a separate department focusing on the needs of farmers. But a number of present Department of Agriculture development functions would be moved to the new Department

of Community Development, including the Farmers Home Administration loan and grant programs for rural community water and sewer systems and for rural housing; the Rural Electrification Administration loan programs for electric and telephone systems; the recently established Rural Telephone Bank; research programs related to rural community development conducted by the Economic Development Division of the Economic Research Service; and the programs of the recently established Rural Development Service.

Comprehensive reorganization would mean that every Federal dollar spent on rural development could have a far greater impact. I again call on the Congress to establish this new department, which would be uniquely capable of launching a well-developed, well-coordinated campaign to achieve the nation's community development goals.

A REVENUE SHARING PLAN FOR RURAL AMERICA

Our revenue sharing plan for rural America proposes to unite the funding for a number of existing programs into a single more flexible resource for rural community development. Our proposed program would add \$179 million to the various programs to be consolidated, bringing the total annual program to a level of \$1.1 billion. Each State would receive at least as much under revenue sharing as it receives under the current system of categorical grants. The program would take effect at the beginning of Fiscal Year 1974.

Rural community development revenue sharing funds would be paid out to the States and to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam according to a formula which takes three factors into account, the State's rural population, the State's rural per capita income in comparison to the national average, and the State's change in rural population compared to the change in population in all States. In addition, every State would receive a minimum amount to assure that all States participate in the program.

The revenue sharing proposal incorporates a requirement for statewide development plans to ensure that activities carried on under the rural community development revenue sharing program could be coordinated with activities under the other general and special revenue sharing proposals, including those for urban community development and for transportation. Each year the States would prepare a comprehensive statewide development plan which would outline spending intentions for programs in rural areas and smaller cities, as well as in metropolitan and suburban areas. It would be the responsibility of the Governor of each State to draw up this statewide plan. This process would be supported by another major administration initiative, our proposed \$100 million planning and management grant program.

The development plan would be formulated through a consultative process which would consider plans submitted by multi-jurisdictional planning districts, which the Governors could establish with rural revenue sharing funds. These local planning organizations would be com-

posed of local elected officials and would be established in all areas of the State. One member from each of these district planning bodies would sit on a panel to assist the Governor in the comprehensive planning process.

This process for developing a statewide plan would ensure that public officials and the general public itself would focus attention on the inter-relationships between rural and urban development within each State. The plan would identify potential growth areas and development sites as well as areas which are of special environmental concern. The plan could also take into account interstate projects and programs developed through the regional commission mechanism.

The rural community development revenue sharing program represents a reaffirmation of faith in State and local governments. It is based on the concept that local people have the best understanding of local problems and on the belief that they have the will and the ability to move vigorously and intelligently to solve them. The revenue sharing approach removes the often stifling and always frustrating strictures which require that Federal grants be used for narrow purposes. It provides the flexibility which State and local governments need in order to fund those projects which they themselves believe would best ensure rational development in their areas and most effectively enhance the quality of life.

The development plans drawn up under this program would cover an entire State. Rural revenue sharing funds would be spent largely outside metropolitan areas while urban revenue sharing funds would be used within those areas. It is important to note, however, that rural areas include almost 2,800 of the more than 3,100 counties in the United States.

Last March, when I submitted the rural community development revenue sharing proposal for the first time, I said that "the major challenge facing rural America is to diversify its economy and to provide full opportunity for its people to enjoy the benefits of American life." I still believe that revenue sharing can do a great deal to help rural America meet that challenge.

NEW PROPOSALS

Revenue sharing and reorganization can have a great long-range significance for rural America. But we must also take a number of other steps which I am outlining today, including two major new proposals. The first involves a new approach to rural financial assistance. The second concerns added authorities for improving the environment and attaining conservation objectives in rural America.

EXPANDED CREDIT FOR RURAL AMERICA

I am recommending today a new rural community development credit sharing authority which would give the Secretary of Agriculture and the State Governors new tools to help revitalize rural areas. Under this proposal, a new Rural Development Credit Fund would be established to provide loans, loan insurance and loan guarantees to the States

for their use in assisting development. This credit would be made available through the Farmers Home Administration for up to 80 percent of the cost of establishing or improving businesses which help create economic growth in rural areas. This fund would also make loans and guarantees for sewer and water facilities and other public works and community facilities, such as industrial parks and community centers, which work directly or indirectly to improve employment opportunities.

Loans and guarantees would be made in accordance with the State development plan required under rural revenue sharing. The States would select specific projects which are consistent with this development plan.

A significant new feature of this credit-sharing proposal is the requirement that most of the authorizations be divided among the States according to the same formula established for rural community development revenue sharing. Specifically, 80 percent of the loan funds for commercial and industrial development and for community facilities would be allocated to the States on a formula basis. The remaining 20 percent of loan authorities would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. A large portion of the authorization—65 percent in each fiscal year—would be reserved for commercial and industrial development uses and the remainder would be available for community development purposes. Each State would know in advance the amount of grants and credit it could commit according to its plan each year.

This proposal would involve private lending institutions as fully as possible in the rural revitalization effort. Financial assistance would not be provided under the program unless it was clear that firms and communities could not obtain credit elsewhere. Fully three-quarters of each year's authorization would have to be in the form of a guarantee of loans made by private financial institutions. Hopefully, almost all loans could be made by this sector of our economy. In addition to the direct involvement of private banks, this program would also emphasize loans to private entrepreneurs for job creation through commercial and industrial development. Since some equity would be required, these business decision-makers would be far more likely to make realistic, workable development decisions than far-removed Federal bureaucrats can now do. It is also likely that these market-oriented decisions would provide sounder, long-term employment opportunities. This combination of Federal funding, local initiative and statewide planning utilizing the private market economy should produce a far more productive use of our resources.

I am proposing an authorization level for this credit-sharing program, which includes the existing Farmers Home Administration water and sewer program, of \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1974.

My new proposals also involve additional features and technical improvements which would streamline and improve the effectiveness of farm and rural loan programs now administered by

the Department of Agriculture. Among these are proposals to increase the farm operating loan limit to \$50,000 and to increase the limit on new loans to be held in the agricultural credit insurance fund from \$100 million to \$500 million. This latter provision would provide adequate levels to ensure that the expanded loan and guarantee program would have a substantial impact on rural areas.

In summary, this new approach to credit assistance contains several advantageous features:

(1) It would establish a direct link between credit assistance and revenue sharing since both programs would be administered according to the same statewide plan.

(2) It would expand the role of private lending institutions. Firms otherwise unable to obtain credit would have a chance to mature under this plan so that they could borrow from private lending institutions at a later time without Federal guarantees.

(3) The plan could work through a delivery system for servicing loans which is already in operation—the Farmers Home Administration, which has offices in more than 1,700 counties. There is an office within a relatively short distance of practically every rural community in the United States. This whole system, moreover, could be readily transferred to a new Department of Community Development.

(4) Projects could be jointly financed by a number of Federal agencies, such as Small Business Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as by other private and public State and local agencies.

(5) Improved planning and program coordination would be possible under statewide plans which grow out of the needs and suggestions of multi-jurisdictional planning districts already established in more than half of the States. These planning bodies would also provide expertise for communities that are too small to employ their own development experts.

IMPROVING THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT

To help carry out our environmental concerns, I propose that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to share the costs of long-term conservation in watershed areas. Such an authorization has worked most successfully under the Great Plains program. This measure would foster the orderly establishment of needed land treatment measures within the small watershed areas of the country.

In addition, technical and cost-sharing assistance should be authorized within watershed areas for the improvement of water quality. This would mean that, for the first time, Federal cost-sharing would be made available to improve water quality on a year-round basis. Such technical and cost-sharing assistance should also be provided in Resource Conservation and Development Project areas.

Finally, the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to inventory and to monitor soil, water, and related resources and to issue a national land inventory report at five-year intervals. Such data could be used at all levels of

government in land use policy planning. All these proposals would broaden the dimensions of Federal service and would give new impetus to the entire rural development task. But I would emphasize again that this task must be one in which the people themselves are directly involved—and it must begin in rural America. Our proposals would provide rural people and communities with the tools they need to achieve their goals and I hope these recommendations will receive early and favorable consideration.

RESULTS OF OUR INCREASED EMPHASIS ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

These essential steps now depend on action by the Congress. But while action on past proposals has been pending, we have also been taking a number of administrative steps to improve our rural development programs and have substantially increased program funding. For example:

- The funding of principal rural development programs in the Department of Agriculture this year (\$2.8 billion) is more than four times that of fiscal year 1961 and twice that of fiscal year 1969. Twenty-nine of the thirty-four rural development programs in that department have been expanded since 1969.
- Since 1969, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has nearly tripled its grants for non-metropolitan planning districts. It funded 155 districts which received \$3.4 million in grants in the last complete fiscal year.
- Rural housing assistance, with an emphasis on low and moderate income families, has reached a record level of \$1.6 billion under the Farmers Home Administration program—more than triple the 1969 level.
- Research on rural development and housing is estimated at \$9 million this year, more than double that of 1969.
- Funding for community sewer and water facilities has reached a record high level of \$300 million in loans, plus \$42 million in direct grants. This represents an increase of almost 80 percent over the level provided two years ago.
- Soil Conservation Service resource conservation and development, flood prevention, and watershed programs have expanded from \$103 million in fiscal year 1969 to an estimated \$156 million this year.
- With the recent release of an additional \$109 million in funds for rural electrification, total available funds for the Rural Electrification Administration have been increased to \$438 million for the current fiscal year. REA loans from 1969 to 1971 totaled more than \$1.4 billion. Since 1969, REA-financed systems connected 700,000 new electric services and 420,000 telephone users—the largest three-year growth since the 1950's.
- The Rural Telephone Bank, with an initial Federal subscription of \$60 million in the first two years, has been established to provide new credit resources for telephone co-

operatives seeking to improve rural communications.

- Extension Service community development activities this year attained a funding level estimated at \$12.7 million, an increase of \$3.7 million over 1969 levels.
- To broaden the role of the employment service in serving our rural population, a Rural Manpower Service has been established in the Department of Labor.
- A cooperative program called Concerted Services in Training and Education has involved several Federal agencies as well as local organizations in helping individuals better utilize Federal programs.
- A special office has been created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to focus on special problems of human resource development in rural areas.
- This expansion of Federal efforts to stimulate the development of rural communities has been paralleled by the increased efforts of individual citizens, civic organizations, private enterprise and government at the State, county and municipal level. There are many evidences of the resulting overall progress.
- Outmigration from rural communities slowed from 4.6 million during the 1950's to 2.4 million during the 1960's. Most of the population losses during the 1960's occurred in the Great Plains and inter-mountain areas of the West, but gains were realized in parts of the Southern Piedmont, the middle Tennessee Valley, eastern Oklahoma, and northern and western Arkansas. This is evidence that the migratory tide can be slowed—and in some instances even reversed.
- Income per capita in rural America is growing faster than in metropolitan America, though it still remains below the urban level.
- While the incidence of poverty is greater in rural than in urban America, its reduction rate is nearly twice as fast.
- Non-farm employment outside the metropolitan centers has generally grown at a slightly faster rate than employment in metropolitan areas. Manufacturing employment is expanding more rapidly in rural areas than in the large cities.
- Although rural America still contains about two-thirds of our inadequate housing, the ratio of inadequate to adequate rural housing units has been reduced from one-third to one-seventh in recent years. Rural electric and telephone services have improved; more than 98 percent of America's farms are now electrified.
- During the past three years, per capita farm income has averaged about 75 percent that of non-farm workers. This is still too low, but it represents a significant improvement over the past decade.
- The median years of school completed by persons 25 to 29 years of age is now about the same—12 years

plus—in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

All of these signs of progress are most encouraging. But this record is not something to stand on—it is something to build on. Much significant work has already been done—but the most important tasks are still before us.

The longer we put off these tasks the more difficult they will be. With the cooperation of the Congress we can promptly take up this work, opening new doors of opportunity for all who seek a better life in rural America.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 1972.

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

In transmitting this Sixth Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities, I particularly commend to your attention the new programs begun by the Endowment during fiscal year 1971. These programs, created in order to broaden the uses of the humanities by the American public, include an experimental program on a statewide basis for informal adult education in the humanities and the Jefferson Lecture on the Humanities, a national series which will bring humanistic learning directly to bear on public affairs.

These new programs and the expansion of existing programs described in this report were made possible by the strong support in increased funding given by the Congress to the Endowment at my request. Both the executive and legislative branches have now recognized that the humanities—languages, history, philosophy, literature and ethics among others—are an essential tool for restoring contemporary problems and that the Endowment can eventually place this tool within the grasp of more Americans than ever before.

Federal support of the National Endowment for the Humanities has had the desired effect of stimulating private giving and private initiative. I am therefore happy to report that in fiscal year 1971 the Endowment received a total of 517 separate gifts, about four times the number received the previous year. These gifts or pledges, amounting to \$2.5 million, made it possible for the Endowment for the second year in a row to draw the full amount of Federal matching funds appropriated for that purpose.

It is my pleasure, too, to note that the Humanities Endowment's Sixth Annual Report is printed on recycled paper as a part of this Federal Agency's effort to make use of the Nation's natural resources.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 1972.

PERMISSION FOR THE 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.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

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

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

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. May I ask which calendar number this is?

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar No. 69.

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

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

There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

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

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

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

There was no objection.

FRANK J. McCABE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUÑOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5586) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz De Wyss (nee Lopez).

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

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

There was no objection.

VITO SERRA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Vito Serra.

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

H.R. 5586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vito Serra shall be deemed to be an immediate relative within the meaning

of section 201(b) of that Act and may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the words "shall be deemed to" strike out the remainder of the bill and substitute the following: "have a priority date of October 12, 1960, on the fifth preference foreign state limitation for Italy."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

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

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

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

There was no objection.

ANTONIO BENAVIDES

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CONCEPCION GARCIA BALAURU

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

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

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

There was no objection.

ALBINA LUCIO Z. MANLUCU

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

RABBI SAMUEL ROSENBLATT

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened with reverence to the prayer by Rabbi Samuel Rosenblatt, spiritual leader of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation in Baltimore since 1927.

Rabbi Rosenblatt graduated magna cum laude from City College of New York, and earned his Ph. D. from Columbia University at the age of 25. He has a long and illustrious career of service as a religious and civic leader, and is highly respected in both religious and lay circles in Maryland and in the Nation. He has written 10 books, and is associate professor of oriental languages at the Johns Hopkins University. In fact, I recall my service with him on the Johns Hopkins faculty in the years before I was elected to Congress. Dr. Rosenblatt is honorary president of the Baltimore Board of Rabbis and board member of the Associated Jewish Charities of Baltimore.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to welcome Rabbi Rosenblatt to the House of Representatives. He has honored us with his presence and inspired us with his words.

I include the following biographical material:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Dr. Samuel Rosenblatt, the oldest son of the world renowned Cantor Josef Rosenblatt and Taube Kaufman, came to the United States from Hamburg, Germany at the age of ten. When he was 19 years old he obtained his A.B. from the College of the City of New York, magna cum laude, heading the Phi Beta Kappa list for the year and carrying off prizes for distinction in English, French, Latin, German, Spanish, mathematics and oratory. At 23 the Jewish Theological Seminary of America conferred upon him the title of rabbi "with distinction". The award of the Hazard Fellowship of the American Schools of Oriental Research enabled him to spend a year of further study at the American School of Archeology in Jerusalem and attend classes simultaneously at the Hebrew University and the rabbinical school of Chief Rabbi A. I. Kook, who together with two associates bestowed upon him the traditional ordination (Semicha).

Upon returning to the United States he was appointed lecturer in Semitic Languages at Columbia University, where he secured his Ph. D. on May 5, 1927, the date of his 25th birthday. In the fall of that same year, after having served for twelve months as rabbi of the Adath Israel Congregation of Trenton, New Jersey, he accepted the call of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation of Baltimore, Maryland to become its spiritual leader, a position he holds today. He joined the faculty of the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University in February, 1928 and since 1947 he has been serving as Associate Professor of Oriental Languages.

Dr. Rosenblatt is the author of the following books:

The High Ways to Perfection of Abraham Maimonides (N.Y. 1927)
The Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishnah (Balt. 1935)

The High Ways to Perfection of Abraham Maimonides II (Balt. 1938)
Our Heritage (New York 1940)
This Is the Land (New York 1940)
The People of the Book (New York 1943)
The Book of Beliefs and Opinions of Saadia Gaon (New Haven 1948)
The History of the Mizrachi Movement (New York 1951)
Yossele Rosenblatt (New York 1954)
Hear, Oh Israel (New York 1958)

In 1961 he made a recording of a complete Passover Seder service entitled "This Night Is Different" featuring four generations of Rosenblatts, including his illustrious father.

Dr. Rosenblatt has travelled and lectured in the United States, Canada, Latin America, North Africa, Europe and Israel. There is hardly a phase of Jewish or communal life in which he has not been active. A champion of Orthodox Judaism, he has stood for understanding and cooperation with all religious denominations as well as the furtherance of the cause of democracy. He is at present honorary president of the Baltimore Board of Rabbis and a member of the board of the Associated Jewish Charities of Baltimore. He served for two years as president of the Baltimore Branch of the American Jewish Congress and for seven years as president of the Mizrachi Organization of Baltimore.

On October 3, 1926 he married Miss Claire Woloch, and is the father of three sons, David, Judah and Josef.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include a resolution.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow a very distinguished former Member of this House and chairman of the House Rules Committee will observe his 89th birthday in his beloved State of Virginia.

The House Rules Committee has seen fit—and appropriately so—to pass a resolution in the committee commemorating this happy occasion, the birthday of this distinguished American and distinguished Virginian, Howard W. Smith.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the resolution unanimously adopted by the Committee on Rules.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE 89TH BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Whereas, Howard W. Smith served with allegiance to the principles of democracy for thirty-six years as a Member of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas, he served with dedication and untiring concern for the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States; and

Whereas, he served with distinction on the Committee on Rules for thirty-four years and as its Chairman for twelve years; and

Whereas, he served in the United States Congress longer than any other Virginian; and

Whereas, he is a warm, cordial, helpful man; a man of indefatigable labors; a man of varied interests and eminent accomplishments; and

Whereas, he is one of the most dedicated, respected, and beloved Members ever to serve in the Halls of Congress; and

Whereas, he has been sorely missed by us in his retirement; and

Whereas, it is the Nation's good fortune that he has been with us and in good health for so long; and

Whereas, February 2, 1972, will mark the eighty-ninth anniversary of the birth of Howard W. Smith: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Members of the Committee on Rules, extend to Judge Smith our heartiest congratulations and best wishes on the occasion of his eighty-ninth birthday and congratulate him on achieving this landmark in life; and, be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be entered in the journal of the Committee, an engrossed copy be sent to Howard W. Smith, and that arrangements be made to include a copy in the proceedings of the House of Representatives on February 1, 1972.

Unanimously adopted by the Committee on Rules this 27th day of January, 1972.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for voluntary agreements between ministers and their churches to treat ministers as employed persons thereof.

Prior to taking this step I contacted over 300 clergymen in the congressional district I represent, the Fourth District of Indiana. Many of them responded fully to my request for their advice and counsel on this legislation and a great variety of denominations were represented.

Some of the clergy who responded offered specific suggestions about the form the bill should take. Others recommended problems to be avoided in drafting the legislation. Some few opposed the proposal altogether; the vast majority welcomed the idea. I have given careful attention to all the suggestions.

Of major importance in the proposal I introduce today is the fact that the change in classification from self-employed to employed for social security purposes will only come about through voluntary decision on the part of both the church and the clergyman.

I do not believe that this change would bring undue expense to the churches and I do believe that ministers deserve this consideration. I am convinced that most congregations would be willing to make provision for this additional expense and it would be their choice whether to do so or not.

Certainly the ministry is one of the most highly respected professions in this Nation and has been since the colonists first landed on this shore in search of a place to practice their religion freely. But the clergy, like everyone else, have to meet certain expenses of day-to-day living; they have families and the resultant expenses; they have to be provided for when they retire. While in no way can they be fully compensated for the kind of work they do and the dedication and sacrifice they experience, we should not ignore the material needs of the clergy and their families.

I hope that this legislation I introduce today will in a small way indicate a recognition of these facts.

DIRECTOR OF VA LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM RETIRES

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John M. Dervan, the director of the Veterans' Administration's guaranteed home loan program retired at the end of January after 6 years of very distinguished service with the Veterans' Administration.

John Dervan headed the Veterans' Administration's home loan program for the past 11 years and is probably more responsible than anyone for the great success and popularity that this outstanding program has enjoyed over the past 25 years. Because of men like John Dervan, hundreds of thousands of veterans and their families now enjoy the benefits of low-cost, no-downpayment mortgages without which most of these families would never have been able to own their own home. John is one of those unsung heroes of the Federal Establishment without whom so much good could never have been accomplished.

I was pleased to note that John has been recently awarded the Veterans' Administration's distinguished career certificate, and certainly he deserves every honor that the Veterans' Administration can bestow on him. I certainly hope that he will keep close to the housing scene in the future in order that his great knowledge and experience will not be lost to the American public.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL SUB-COMMITTEE ON LABOR TO MEET THIS AFTERNOON

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Labor may be given permission to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE REPORT ON OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS, UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until Friday midnight to file a report on the Office of Economic Opportunity amendments and notwithstanding there may be no session on Friday.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 748, INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 784 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 784

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 (S. 748) to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the United States contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. 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 Banking and Currency, 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.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 784 provides for consideration of S. 748, which, as reported by our Committee on Banking and Currency, would provide for certain amendments to the Inter-American Development Bank Act. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, with the time being equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee. After general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, after which the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall then be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the bill S. 748 is the first of three measures scheduled for consideration today which are designed to meet U.S. commitments in the field of multilateral lending and development agreements. Each of the three measures relates to a different international banking institution, each with a different geographic scope of operations. S. 748 contains a major funding authorization and what might be called two ancillary provisions with respect to our commitments to the Inter-American Development Bank, the major instrument in our own hemisphere for development financing. The measure would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to pay to the Fund for Special Operations two annual installments of \$450 million for each of the next 2 years. Loans from the Fund for Special Operations, one of two separate and distinct funds administered by the Bank, are generally made to developing Latin American nations to help finance their programs in such areas of need as agriculture, transportation, communication, housing, sanitation, and education. These loans are made for periods

from 15 to 30 years and bear interest at the rate of 3 percent or 4 percent per annum, depending on the nature of the project.

The two ancillary provisions in effect are instructions to U.S. officials who are concerned with the operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. The first of these provisions would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to agree to the proposed Board of Governors resolutions which provide for an expansion of the Bank's membership and for changes in the number of Executive Directors.

Under the second ancillary provision, which was adopted as a committee amendment, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to instruct the U.S. Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan by the Bank to a country that expropriates property owned by, or violates contracts with, U.S. citizens, unless compensation arrangements have been made, the dispute submitted for international arbitration, or good faith negotiations are in progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 784 in order that S. 748 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply say that the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has explained the rule and the bill in detail, and I concur in his remarks and urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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 S. 749, ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 785 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 785

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 (S. 749) to authorize United States contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank. 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 Banking and Currency, 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 Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 785 provides for consideration of S. 749, which, as reported by our Committee on Banking and Currency, would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his capacity as U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank, to enter into an agreement with the Bank providing for a U.S. contribution to the Bank's consolidated special funds of \$100 million, payable in unequal annual installments of \$60 million and \$40 million, commencing in fiscal year 1972. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, with the time being equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee. After general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, after which the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall then be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, S. 749, contains built-in safeguards in connection with the use of the proposed contribution which is to be called the U.S. special resources. These special resources, together with contributions of other developed Bank member nations, will be used to finance high priority development projects and programs in developing member countries, particularly those in the Southeast Asia region. Loans from special funds are for periods as long as 40 years, and at annual interest rates ranging from 1.5 to 3 percent.

The U.S. special resources will be provided to the Bank in the form of non-negotiable, non-interest-bearing letters of credit on which withdrawals will be made only as funds are required to meet the costs of eligible goods and services, or to defray certain administrative expenses. The U.S. contribution will be applied to purchases of U.S. goods and services, but sufficient flexibility is provided to permit procurement outside the United States if it is compatible with the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

As in S. 748, the House committee has amended the Senate-passed version of the legislation by adding a provision which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the U.S. Executive Director of the Asian Development Bank to vote against any loan by the Bank to a country that expropriates property owned by, or violates contracts with, U.S. citizens, unless compensation arrangements have been made, the dispute submitted for international arbitration, or good faith negotiations are in progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 785 in order that S. 749 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speak-

er, I concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Hawaii and urge the adoption of House Resolution 785.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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 S. 2010, AMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 786 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 786

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 (S. 2010) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association. 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 Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now printed on page 2, line 6 through page 3, line 10 of the bill, and all points of order against said committee amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, Rule XVI are hereby waived. 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.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 786 provides for consideration of S. 2010, the last of three bills scheduled for today and reported by our Committee on Banking and Currency to provide for the fulfillment of U.S. commitments to multilateral development loans. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, with the time being equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee. After general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, following which the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall then be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2010 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his capacity as the U.S. Governor of the International Development Association, to agree on behalf of the United States to

contribute to the International Development Association three annual installments of \$320 million each. The International Development Association provides long-term, low-interest loans to finance high priority development projects and programs of the least developed of its member countries. The total membership now consists of 107 nations, representing a substantial increase from the original 68.

The U.S. share to the International Development Association's third replenishment, as it is called, will elicit \$3 of contributions from other nations for every \$2 of the U.S. contribution. The participating donor countries include almost every major industrial nation in both the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. Recipients of the loans, the developing countries, called part II members, as distinguished from the wealthier countries which are in the category of part I members, may be found throughout the world. These part II countries urgently need capital, but they cannot depend entirely on private capital or official financing at essentially commercial rates of interest.

As in the case of S. 748 and S. 749, S. 2010 also contains an expropriation amendment that was adopted in committee. The amendment directs the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the U.S. Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association to vote against any loan to a country that expropriates property owned by, or repudiates contracts with, U.S. citizens, unless compensation arrangements have been made, the dispute submitted for international arbitration, or good faith negotiations are in progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 786 in order that S. 2010 may be considered.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of two groups. Was that the category he used to grade countries—group 1 and group 2—or what was it?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I mentioned the categories of countries which are members of the association, group 1 including those that are less in need, and group 2, those who are in dire need of assistance.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman referred to group 1 as the wealthier or wealthy countries.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Group 1 includes those member countries which are in less need of assistance, such as the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say "wealthy countries"? I believe that is what the transcript would show.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I might say to the gentleman the term "wealthy" was used in a relative sense, as compared to poor countries.

Mr. GROSS. My question is, which country was the gentleman referring to as being wealthy? Was he by any chance referring to the United States as being wealthy?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The United States is considered as being relatively wealthy, as compared to group 2 countries, and I was including the United States within group 1, yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What do you mean by "relatively?" By comparison with Timbuktu, Guam, or some other outlying territory, state, or country?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman's perception is keen and accurate, except for his inclusion of Guam, which is a part of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. You say we are relatively wealthy, although the President's budget indicates that we will be very close, at the end of the next fiscal year, to a \$500-billion Federal debt, and the President's economic message just released a week ago indicates that this country has a net public and private debt of approximately \$2 trillion.

I wonder again what wealthy nation or nations the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I believe the question has been answered, that relatively, despite the national debt, we are considered a wealthy nation in this world. Insofar as going further into debt is concerned, I would suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he discuss the matter with President Nixon who is the one who recommended the deficit budget and under whose administration we have gone deeply into debt, as we have never gone into debt in the history of our Nation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, then I will be through.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman from Hawaii was merchandising this rule, and therefore making in order this bill, I had assumed he was supporting the rule and the bill from the way he talked.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman is correct. I am supporting the rule, and I will support the bill when we resolve ourselves into the Committee of the Whole. I hope the gentleman from Iowa with all his power and wisdom will also come to the support of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. That is a vain hope, I would say to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in view of our financial situation—in fact, we will have a bill before us before too long to increase our national debt ceiling by possibly \$50 billion—I doubt that I will support this bill or the previous two. However, I believe the Members have a right to consider this measure, and accordingly urge the adoption of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HOSMER. 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 335, nays 30, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]
YEAS—335

Abbitt	Dulski	Link
Abourezk	du Pont	Lloyd
Abzug	Eckhardt	Long, La.
Adams	Edmondson	Long, Md.
Addabbo	Edwards, Ala.	Lujan
Anderson, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	McClory
Anderson, III.	Erlenborn	McCulloch
Anderson, Tenn.	Eshleman	McDade
Andrews	Evans, Colo.	McDonald, Mich.
Annunzio	Fascell	McFall
Archer	Findley	McKevitt
Arends	Fisher	McKinney
Aspin	Flood	McMillan
Aspinwall	Flowers	Macdonald, Mass.
Badillo	Flynt	Madden
Baker	Ford, Gerald R.	Mahon
Barrett	Ford,	Maillard
Begich	William D.	Mallary
Belcher	Forsythe	Mann
Bergland	Fountain	Martin
Betts	Fraser	Mathias, Calif.
Bevill	Frelinghuysen	Mathis, Ga.
Blaggi	Frenzel	Matsunaga
Blester	Frey	Mayne
Bingham	Fulton	Mazzoli
Bianton	Fuqua	Meeds
Blatnik	Gallagher	Melcher
Boland	Garmatz	Metcalfe
Bolling	Gettys	Michel
Bow	Giaimo	Mikva
Brademas	Gibbons	Miller, Calif.
Brasco	Goldwater	Mills, Md.
Bray	Gonzalez	Minish
Brooks	Goodling	Mink
Broomfield	Grasso	Minshall
Brotzman	Gray	Mitchell
Brown, Mich.	Green, Oreg.	Mollohan
Brown, Ohio	Green, Pa.	Monagan
Broyhill, N.C.	Griffin	Montgomery
Broyhill, Va.	Griffiths	Morgan
Buchanan	Grover	Morse
Burke, Fla.	Gubser	Mosher
Burke, Mass.	Halpern	Moss
Burleson, Tex.	Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.
Burlison, Mo.	Hammer-	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton	schmidt	Myers
Byrne, Pa.	Hanley	Natcher
Byron	Hanna	Nedzi
Cabell	Harrington	Nelsen
Carey, N.Y.	Harsha	Nichols
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	Nix
Cederberg	Hastings	Obey
Chamberlain	Hathaway	O'Neill
Chappell	Hays	Patman
Chisholm	Hechler, W. Va.	Patten
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Pelly
Clark	Heinz	Pepper
Clausen, Don H.	Helstoski	Perkins
Cleveland	Henderson	Pettis
Collier	Hicks, Mass.	Peyser
Collins, Ill.	Hicks, Wash.	Pickle
Collins, Tex.	Hillis	Pike
Colmer	Hollifield	Poage
Conable	Hosmer	Poddell
Cotter	Howard	Poff
Coughlin	Hull	Price, Ill.
Curlin	Hungate	Pucinski
Daniel, Va.	Hunt	Quie
Daniels, N.J.	Jarman	Railsback
Danielson	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Pa.	Rangel
Davis, S.C.	Jonas	Reid
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
de la Garza	Jones, N.C.	Rhodes
Delaney	Karth	Riegle
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Roberts
Dellums	Keating	Robinson, Va.
Denholm	Kee	Robison, N.Y.
Dennis	Keith	Rodino
Devine	Kemp	Roe
Dickinson	King	Roncalio
Diggs	Kluczynski	Roosey, N.Y.
Dingell	Koch	Roosey, Pa.
Donchue	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Dow	Kyl	Rostenkowski
Downing	Landrum	Roush
Drinan	Leggett	Roy
	Lent	Royal
		Ruppe

Ruth	Stanton, James V.	Ware, Whalen
St Germain	Steed	Whalley
Sandman	Steiger, Ariz.	Whitehurst
Satterfield	Stephens	Whitten
Saylor	Stubblefield	Witten
Scherle	Stuckey	Widnall
Scheuer	Sullivan	Wiggins
Schneebeli	Symington	Williams
Schwengel	Talcott	Wilson, Bob
Scott	Taylor	Wilson, Charles H.
Sebellus	Teague, Calif.	Winn
Shipley	Teague, Tex.	Wright
Shoup	Terry	Wyatt
Shriver	Thomson, Wis.	Wyder
Sisk	Udall	Wylie
Skubitz	Ullman	Wyman
Slack	Van Deerlin	Yates
	Smith, Calif.	Yatron
	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Fla.
Spence	Vander Jagt	Zablocki
Springer	Veysey	Zion
Stanton,	Vigorito	Zwach
J. William	Walde	
	Wampier	

NAYS—30		
Abernethy	Gaydos	Mizell
Ashbrook	Gross	Price, Tex.
Bennett	Hagan	Quillen
Brinkley	Haley	Rarick
Camp	Hall	Rogers
Crane	Hutchinson	Rousselot
Dent	Ichord	Runnels
Dorn	Landgrebe	Schmitz
Dowdy	Latta	Snyder
Duncan	Miller, Ohio	Thompson, Ga.

NOT VOTING—66		
Alexander	Galifianakis	Passman
Ashley	Gude	Pirnie
Baring	Hansen, Idaho	Powell
Bell	Hansen, Wash.	Preyer, N.C.
Blackburn	Hawkins	Pryor, Ark.
Boggs	Hébert	Purcell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hogan	Rees
Caffery	Horton	Sarbanes
Carter	Jacobs	Seiberling
Celler	Kazan	Sikes
Clawson, Del	Kyros	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Lennon	Staggers
Conte	McCloskey	Steene
Conyers	McClure	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	McCullister	Stokes
Culver	McCormack	Stratton
Derwinski	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	McKay	Thone
Edwards, La.	Mills, Ark.	Tierman
Esch	Moorhead	Waggoner
Evins, Tenn.	O'Hara	Wolff
Foley	O'Konski	Young, Tex.

So the resolution was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Waggoner with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Passman.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Steele.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Stratton with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. McCullister.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Tieren with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Preyer of Arkansas with Mr. Thone.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Galifianakis.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Kazan.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. McKay.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Seiberling.

Mr. SCOTT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

INTER-AMERICAN BANK ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PATMAN. 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 (S. 748) to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third instalments of the U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

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 S. 748, with Mr. Nedzi 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 Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Banking and Currency Committee has favorably reported out a bill authorizing a U.S. contribution of \$900 million to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. I fully support this bill and urge that it be given prompt House approval.

My distinguished colleagues will recall that Public Law 91-599, December 30, 1970, authorized only \$100 million, a fraction of the \$1,000 million FSO authorization request put forward by the administration. The House gave its approval in 1970 to that full request. The present bill now asks for the balance of \$900 million. It is not, therefore, a new request. To the contrary, it represents an integral part of an overall replenishment agreement, which has already been approved by virtually every other member of the Bank. The replenishment agreement, which was negotiated in 1970, also provided for an increase in the ordinary capital of the Bank, and those funds have been authorized.

What remains is the full authorization of the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations. The amount of this contribution has been based on the resource needs of the Latin American countries and on the proven capability of the Bank to expand its lending for appropriate projects. Currently, FSO projects totaling more than \$300 million are being considered by Bank management. Other projects, also totaling more than \$300 million, are under preliminary review. As of December 31, 1971, the

Fund for Special Operations had about \$160 million available for commitment. This will run out by June 1972.

Assuming all of the \$100 million we have already authorized is appropriated, the resulting \$260 million in resources would still fall considerably short of both Latin American needs and the demonstrated capacity of the Bank to produce effective assistance. For example, in 1970 \$443 million was committed and in 1971 \$400 million was committed. I do not believe these lending levels can be reduced without seriously affecting the economic growth of Latin America. Useful projects are already in the FSO pipeline and the Bank must have the means to carry them out. This will not be possible unless we approve the bill now before us.

The \$900 million herein requested would be appropriated over a 2-year period. It is expected that an appropriation request for \$450 million will be submitted for fiscal year 1973 and the remaining \$450 million will be requested during fiscal year 1974. I want to emphasize that these funds will not add to the liquid balances of the Inter-American Development Bank. They will be made available in the form of non-interest-bearing letters of credit which will not be drawn down until actually needed by the Bank to cover its disbursements. As a result, their budgetary impact will be spread out over a much longer period. In fact, there will probably be no budgetary impact as a result of this legislation in fiscal year 1972 and the impact is projected to be only \$10 million for fiscal year 1973.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I again urge rapid and favorable action on this bill. The funds are needed by the Bank to make commitments and this can only be accomplished by our approval here today. Already 20 of the 23 members have completed legislative actions. The House approved this request in 1970; today I ask that that decision be reaffirmed.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman. The purpose of this legislation is to allow the Inter-American Development Bank to continue its operations and expand them. This bank is the most important source of development capital in the hemisphere; its importance is beyond question and its achievements warrant our full confidence and support.

At the outset, I want to say that in this matter we ought to lay partisanship aside. The Inter-American Development Bank had its beginnings under the Eisenhower administration. It made its first loan at about the same time John F. Kennedy became President. It grew to full stature during the Johnson Presidency. Now President Nixon has reaffirmed his belief in this institution and committed the United States to its continued support. This institution has known its beginnings and had its growth under four Presidents—two Democrats and two Republicans. All have endorsed its concept, all have supported it, and all have found it worthy of their confidence.

Eleven years, almost to the day, have passed since the Inter-American Development Bank made its first loan commitment. In that time it has made more than 666 loans totaling \$4.5 billion. Slightly fewer than half those loans—307—have been made from the soft-loan window, the Fund for Special Operations, and these soft loans have a total value of \$2.3 billion. During the past year the Inter-American Development Bank made some 46 commitments totaling \$475 million, of which 30 were from the Fund for Special Operations, totaling \$333 million.

The bill before us today would authorize the United States to pay in \$900 million that remains of a \$1 billion pledge to replenish and expand the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank soft-loan facility. This would be two-thirds of the total replenishment—the Latin American countries themselves are providing \$500 million. I want to point out that the Latin American countries have substantially increased their share of the burden. Whereas in the original replenishment the United States has contributed at rates of 11 to 1, then 8 to 1 in the present proposal, the developing countries themselves would provide one dollar for each two we contribute.

I want to point out that the House has previously approved this legislation. The question before us today is therefore not a new one. Nothing in the interim has happened that would impeach our judgment, and indeed much has happened to confirm it.

As matters now stand, the Congress has approved \$100 million of our \$1 billion pledge. The other body insisted on closer study, and now has gone ahead and approved this remaining \$900 million authorization. In other words, both the House and Senate have previously approved this full \$1 billion contribution. Our action today would merely reaffirm the earlier judgment of the House and complete the final action on this matter.

This is a loan program—first, last, and foremost. The loans from this fund are repayable in 15 to 20 years, and they carry an interest rate of 3 to 4 percent, including service charges. These are by no means the easiest terms in the world.

Among other things, if this U.S. commitment is made, the Inter-American Development Bank has agreed that loans from the Fund will be repayable in dollars rather than local currency. Moreover, the Bank is committed to give priority for these loans to the lesser developed countries, thereby assuring that those who most need these soft loans will have first call on them. The proof of this is in the pledge of the larger Latin countries themselves, who have agreed to let the Fund apply a substantial part of their resources to projects outside their own borders; these countries are not merely "buying in" to the Fund in order to enhance their own prospects, but are contributing, at considerable self-sacrifice, to the good of the whole hemisphere. We could ask no greater evidence than this of the maturity of the Bank, or of the importance it has for every country in the hemisphere.

The interest of Canada in joining the Inter-American Development Bank is

further proof of the importance and vitality of the organization. This bill would, in addition to providing the \$900 million authorization requested for the Bank's soft-loan window, allow the United States to support the entry of Canada into the Bank.

This legislation is necessary because the Bank charter restricts membership to those countries that are in the Organization of American States. Canada is not a member, but obviously shares the interest of the United States in the progress of our hemisphere. The entry of Canada would not change the relative voting strength of the members of the Inter-American Development Bank in any material way, but it would bring into the Bank a country that is fully industrialized and which can provide considerable impetus to the Bank and its programs. The interest of Canada in the Inter-American Development Bank is eloquent testimony of the progress the Bank has made, and of its promise for the future.

I believe that I should also point out to the House that this bill provides a definite U.S. policy in the matter of expropriation.

I am the author of the expropriation amendment. No one, myself included, would say that a country has no right to undertake expropriation. There may be cases where expropriation is in the interest of the country concerned, and there may be compelling reasons for such action. But at the same time, I believe, and the majority—the overwhelming majority—of my colleagues on the committee agree with me, that expropriation should involve fair compensation. Any government that assumes the control or ownership of individual or corporate property owes that individual or firm a fair compensation for it. We expect no less of our own government, and should expect no less of others.

Briefly, my amendment provides that when there has been an expropriation, the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the U.S. executive director of the Inter-American Development Bank to oppose any loan or other assistance from the Bank to the expropriating country, unless prompt, adequate and effective compensation has been paid, or unless the matter has been submitted to impartial arbitration under the provisions of the International Convention for Settlement of Investment Disputes, or there are in progress good-faith negotiations leading to a fair settlement.

In the case of the fund for special operations, a two-thirds majority is needed before a commitment can be made. The U.S. voting strength is 44.05 percent of the total, so that if the United States opposes, or merely abstains, from supporting a soft-loan project of the Inter-American Development Bank, no favorable action is possible. Should my amendment become law, the clear policy of the United States would be spelled out, and so would the policy of the Bank itself, inasmuch as the United States maintains presently a voting strength amounting to full veto power in soft-loan projects.

My amendment would leave it within the power of the administration to determine when an expropriation has taken

place, and spells out the conditions under which the Secretary of the Treasury could waive the penalty provisions. But at the same time it makes plain the intention of Congress that expropriation, while the right of any country, requires fair treatment of our citizens, if that country is to receive assistance from other resources.

This amendment is in line with the policy of the President, and supports his position. I believe that the need for the amendment is clear, and urge that it be adopted.

The Inter-American Development Bank has come a long way in just a few years. Today it has a billion dollars in projects, and if we approve this legislation today the Bank can expand its current lending by a very considerable amount. If we fail to approve this legislation the Inter-American Development Bank will shrink and shrivel, and we will have gone back on a clear commitment of our Government.

This legislation is vital to our interests. It maintains the support of our country for the principle of international development. It recognizes the validity of self-help, for it is our partners in the Bank who have sacrificed most to help themselves and each other, under the aegis of the Bank. This bill has the support of the President. It has fully earned his respect and support, and ours as well. I join him in supporting the Inter-American Development Bank's expansion and continuation, and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the House will have before it today legislation to authorize U.S. contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the International Development Association. Passage of this legislation, which has already been passed by the other body, would allow these institutions to carry on the task of promoting economic progress in the developing world. This legislation is in the vital interest of the United States and I urge its adoption by the House.

The legislation authorizing a \$900 million U.S. contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank is fully familiar to the Members of this House. It passed the House in 1970 by an overwhelming vote. It was held up by the other body in the closing days of the 91st Congress. However, the Senate passed it last session and it is now again before the House.

In the intervening period, the Banking and Currency Committee has had an opportunity to review the operations of the Inter-American Development Bank under the management of its new President, Antonio Ortiz Mena, the former Finance Minister of Mexico. The committee is well pleased with the work that he has been doing and wishes him well in the management reforms that

have already begun. Moreover, the Bank has a new Executive Vice President, Mr. Henry Costanzo, who was formerly U.S. Executive Director of the Bank. Mr. Costanzo is a man of deep knowledge of development finance problems and a man of high integrity. The committee believes that under the management of these men the Bank deserves the continued confidence of the Congress.

We are again late in meeting this contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank. We were supposed to have pledged our share of \$1 billion to the Fund for Special Operations, and the Latin countries their share of \$500 million, in June 1971. Because the U.S. contribution was not fully authorized by Congress, the date for pledging was postponed to December 30, 1971. However, because this date could not be met, the time for pledging and for payment of the first installment of \$100 million has been put off to June of this year. Thus, there has been an effective year's delay in the initiation of a program agreed upon by all member countries of the Bank.

I think it is important that we delay no longer. I think it is important that we act today to authorize our contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Second, we are considering today a contribution to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank. The House is also fully familiar with this contribution. Like the Inter-American Development Bank bill, this Asian Bank legislation was passed by the House in 1970, the final action being delayed in the other body. Again, as in the case of the IDB bill, the Senate acted late last year and now the Asian Bank contribution is before us.

Again, we are late in making this contribution. In various forms, this proposal has been before the House since 1967. In that time, the Asian Bank has proved itself to be an effective development institution which has the confidence not only of bond markets in the United States and overseas but also of its developing member nations. It has shown that it has the capability for sound and effective planning of development. A special fund which will enable the Bank to finance desperately needed projects which cannot be financed on hard lending terms is urgently needed.

Other countries have already contributed \$179 million to this special fund of which Japan has to date contributed \$100 million. Thus a form of burden sharing has already developed in this special fund operation.

I strongly recommend that the House now authorize a \$100 million contribution to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.

As to the third bill before the House today, the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association is part of a larger replenishment of the resources of that institution by 18 developed countries. The U.S. contribution will be \$960 million payable in letters of credit in three equal installments of \$320 million each. Our share is 40 percent of the total contributions and other countries will contribute almost \$1½ billion, making a total replenishment of \$2.4 billion. This is, indeed, the type of burden

sharing that eases the job of providing development assistance.

Unfortunately, the United States is far behind in making its contribution. By June of 1970, IDA had committed all of its funds from the second replenishment. It was expected that the third replenishment would become effective by the middle of 1970. Since Congress had not acted to authorize the U.S. contribution, the replenishment could not go into effect, and it was only because of advance contributions totalling \$314 million, as well as \$110 million from transfers from World Bank earnings, that IDA has been able to remain in business since the middle of last year.

In a few weeks all of IDA's resources will have been fully committed. Unless the third replenishment becomes effective, IDA will have no more resources available.

Thus, we are faced with an urgent situation. By fulfilling U.S. commitments we can act to keep IDA in business and to bring forth almost \$1½ billion of development contributions from other countries.

The criticism has been raised that a large part of IDA resources go to India and Pakistan. Although it is true that India and Pakistan were the major recipients of assistance from IDA during the first years of its operations, their percentage share of total loans—called credits—has dropped 15 percent from 1967 to 1971. Your committee has been assured that it is settled IDA policy to provide a substantially lower portion of IDA credits to India and Pakistan with a consequent increase in the volume of funds available to other developing countries. IDA is truly a worldwide institution; 274 loans—credits—in the total amount of \$3.34 billion have been made to 58 countries.

I wish to make it clear that these contributions are fully consistent with our fiscal requirements. First, all of the contributions are made in letters of credit which will be drawn upon over a period of years as the funds are actually needed for disbursement. Until then, no funds leave the U.S. Treasury. Moreover, disbursements will be quite limited in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 and are not expected to exceed \$100 million for all three programs.

For similar reasons, these contributions are expected to have only a very limited impact on our balance of payments. Provision is made in the case of the Inter-American Development Bank FSO contribution for procurement to be made only in the United States and in other members of the Bank, and the United States has received on a cumulative basis over half of all FSO procurement. The ADB special fund contribution will be initially tied to U.S. goods and services and will be untied only if this is consistent with the U.S. balance-of-payments position. Finally, in the case of IDA, which is based on the principle of worldwide competitive bidding, there is only expected to be \$30 million in balance-of-payments cost to the United States in fiscal year 1972-73 as a result of this contribution. An improved U.S. competitive position in the world

as a result of recent monetary agreements should help to improve the U.S. share of procurement.

Finally there is the question of lending by these institutions to finance projects in countries that have expropriated U.S.-owned property without compensation. The President has recently announced a new policy in which he declares that it would be the intention of the United States to withhold its support from loans in multilateral institutions in cases where there has been expropriation of significant U.S.-overseas interest without compensation. The committee welcomes this policy but believes that it would be useful to embody this policy in a legislative direction. Thus, the committee has amended the administration bill by requiring a negative vote on loans to countries that expropriate U.S.-owned property without compensation unless the Secretary of the Treasury finds: First, that arrangements have been made for compensation; second, that the dispute has been submitted to arbitration; or third, that good faith negotiations are in progress. We believe this amendment should lay to rest any fears that by voting for funds for multilateral financial institutions we may be voting to finance countries that expropriate U.S.-owned property without compensation.

In conclusion, I have often emphasized before the House the benefits that we receive from multilateral development institutions. The shared contributions, the high expertise and effective use of the funds available to them are a great advantage for the United States. I strongly recommend that the contributions under consideration here today be authorized by the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, S. 748, the Inter-American Development Bank Act amendments, which we are now considering is of great importance to our country and its relationship to the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. The details and effects of this measure have been fully explained by the very able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

I would like to point out that this bill will enable the U.S. Governor of the IDB to meet our pledge, made to the Bank in April 1970; that is, to increase the Fund for Special Operations. As the only major industrial nation with membership in the Bank, we agreed to two-thirds of the amount of the increase with the Latin American countries providing one-third.

What is important to note in this regard is that this method of aid to developing nations is through a multilateral organization. A mechanism which is more and more being advocated as the preferable mode of assisting other countries.

To safeguard American interests in these nations the committee has added an amendment which directs the U.S. Governor of the Bank to cast a negative vote on any loan to a country that expropriates property or violates contracts

with U.S. citizens or corporations half-owned by U.S. citizens unless compensation arrangements have been made or the dispute submitted for international arbitration or good faith negotiations are in progress.

I urge the House to approve this measure as a continued sign of our concern for the countries of Latin America and for our hemisphere prestige.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) such time as he may use.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, vigorously support the legislation before us.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the leadership on both sides: the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN); and our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ); and the ranking minority leader, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL); and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON), the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, for their responsible leadership in bringing the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, we consider today three bills to support the lending activities of the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, and the Asian Development Bank. I support these bills, and the administration's policy for greater U.S. reliance on multilateral development institutions. These institutions should be the cornerstone of our efforts to help the two-thirds of the world population living in developing nations to advance economically. They should also be the cornerstone for such efforts by every nation. I applaud the farsightedness of this approach to foreign aid.

The United States—in a fair proportion with other nations—should increasingly channel its foreign development assistance through these institutions. At the same time, it is right and timely that other nations bear an increasing share of the cost of economic development assistance to the poorer nations.

Nations once recipients of foreign aid are now providing assistance in steadily increasing amounts. This is appropriate and should be encouraged by the Congress. Other nations now promote our concept of sharing together the burden of development aid as well as other kinds of assistance.

The pooling of resources and know-how of the more affluent and the less developed countries of the world is essential to assure that each country does its share in an effective and systematic effort to bring about orderly and enduring world prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, the burden-sharing benefits in both monetary and technical contributions of a multilateral approach to foreign assistance fully justifies the bills we are considering today.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in light of recent growing concern on the part of many Members of Congress and the business community in general, I for one am pleased to learn of the President's recent statement out-

lining the administration's approach to the problem of expropriation or nationalization without adequate compensation of private U.S. investment holdings overseas. The full text of the January 19, 1972, statement is included at the end of my remarks.

Clearly a principal objective of foreign economic assistance programs whether bilateral or multilateral, is to assist developing countries in attracting private investment. A nation's ability to compete for this scarce and vital development ingredient is improved by programs which develop economic infrastructure, increase literacy, and raise health standards. Private investment, both domestic and foreign, is critical to economic development as it brings with it technology, trade opportunities, and capital itself, all of which in turn become major factors in promoting industrial and agricultural development. However, from the investor's point of view, foreign private investment must have a good chance of yielding financial benefits to him over time, or it ceases to be available.

In recent and important instances, the concept of this mutually beneficial relationship has apparently been lost sight of. U.S. enterprises and those of other nations operating abroad under valid contracts, negotiated in good faith and within the established legal codes of certain foreign countries have found their contracts revoked and their assets seized with either inadequate compensation or none at all.

As a result of the President's statement, therefore, I am pleased to see that in the future when a country expropriates a significant U.S. interest without making a reasonable provision for such compensation to U.S. citizens, it will be presumed that the United States will not extend new bilateral economic benefits to the expropriating country, unless and until it is determined that the country is taking reasonable steps to provide adequate compensation; I also welcome the President's statement that the U.S. Government will withhold its support from loans under consideration in multilateral development banks to such countries under these circumstances.

With this clarification clearly enunciated, Mr. Chairman, I urge rapid and favorable action on the bills presently before us. With this new and clear direction given to our representatives in the various international financial institutions, we should now be prepared to give our full and encouraging support to these agencies in their attempts to assist responsible developing nations throughout the world.

The statement referred to follows:

POLICY STATEMENT: ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AND INVESTMENT SECURITY IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

We live in an age that rightly attaches very high importance to economic development. The people of the developing societies in particular see in their own economic development the path to fulfillment of a whole range of national and human aspirations. The United States continues to support wholeheartedly, as we have done for decades, the efforts of those societies to grow economically—out of our deep conviction that, as I said in my Inaugural Address, "to go forward at all is to go forward together;"

that the well-being of mankind is in the final analysis indivisible; and that a better-fed, better-clothed, healthier, and more literate world will be a more peaceful world as well.

As we enter 1972, therefore, I think it is appropriate to outline my views on some important aspects of overseas development policy. I shall discuss these matters in broader compass and greater detail in messages to be transmitted to the Congress in the coming weeks. Nineteen seventy-one saw great changes in the international monetary and trade fields, especially among the developed nations. A new economic policy was charted for the United States and a promising beginning was made on a broad reform of the international monetary system—starting with a realignment of international exchange rates. Now, in 1972, the problem of how best to assist the development of the world's emerging nations will move more to the forefront of our concern.

Any policy for such assistance is prompted by a mutuality of interest. Through our development assistance programs, financing in the form of taxes paid by ordinary Americans at all income levels is made available to help people in other nations realize their aspirations. A variety of other mechanisms also serve to transfer economic resources from the United States to developing nations.

Three aspects of U.S. development assistance programs received concentrated attention during the past year. These were:

Continuing a program of bilateral economic assistance.

Meeting our international undertakings for the funding of multilateral development institutions.

Clarifying the role of private foreign investment in overseas development and dealing with the problem of expropriations.

As to our bilateral economic program, it is my intention to seek a regular and adequate fiscal year 1972 appropriation to replace the present interim financing arrangement which expires February 22. I urge that this be one of the first items addressed and completed by the Congress after it reconvenes. Looking beyond this immediate need, I hope the Congress will give early attention to the proposals which I submitted last year to reform our foreign assistance programs to meet the challenges of the '70s.

In regard to our participation in multilateral institutions, I attach the highest importance to meeting in full the financial pledges we make. In 1970, the U.S. agreed with its hemispheric partners on replenishing the Inter-American Development Bank. Our contributions to this Bank represent our most concrete form of support for regional development in Latin America. While the Congress did approve partial financing for the Bank before the recess, it is urgent that the integrity of this international agreement be preserved through providing the needed payments in full.

These Inter-American Bank contributions—together with our vital contributions to the International Development Association, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank—are the heart of my announced policy of channeling substantial resources for development through these experienced and technically proficient multilateral institutions. These latter contributions also require prompt legislative action, and I look to the Congress to demonstrate to other nations that the United States will continue its long-standing cooperative approach to international development through multilateral financial mechanisms. . . .

I also wish to make clear the approach of this administration to the role of private investment in developing countries, and in particular to one of the major problems affecting such private investment: upholding accepted principles of international law in the

face of expropriations without adequate compensation.

A principal objective of foreign economic assistance programs is to assist developing countries in attracting private investment. A nation's ability to compete for this scarce and vital development ingredient is improved by programs which develop economic infrastructure, increase literacy, and raise health standards. Private investment, as a carrier of technology, of trade opportunities, and of capital itself, in turn becomes a major factor in promoting industrial and agricultural development. Further, a significant flow of private foreign capital stimulates the mobilization and formation of domestic capital within the recipient country.

A sort of symbiosis exists—with government aid efforts not only speeding the flow of, but actually depending for their success upon, private capital both domestic and foreign. And, of course, from the investor's point of view, foreign private investment must either yield financial benefits to him over time, or cease to be available. Mutual benefit is thus the *sine qua non* of successful foreign private investment.

Unfortunately, for all concerned, these virtually axiomatic views on the beneficial role of and necessary conditions for private capital have been challenged in recent and important instances. U.S. enterprises, and those of many other nations, operating abroad under valid contracts negotiated in good faith, and within the established legal codes of certain foreign countries, have found their contracts revoked and their assets seized with inadequate compensation, or with no compensation.

Such actions by other governments are wasteful from a resource standpoint, shortsighted considering their adverse effects on the flow of private investment funds from all sources, and unfair to the legitimate interests of foreign private investors.

The wisdom of any expropriation is questionable, even when adequate compensation is paid. The resources diverted to compensate investments that are already producing employment and taxes often could be used more productively to finance new investment in the domestic economy, particularly in areas of high social priority to which foreign capital does not always flow. Consequently, countries that expropriate often postpone the attainment of their own development goals. Still more unfairly, expropriations in one developing country can and do impair the investment climate in other developing countries.

In light of all this, it seems to me imperative to state—to our citizens and to other nations—the policy of this Government in future situations involving expropriatory acts.

1. Under international law, the United States has a right to expect:

That any taking of American private property will be nondiscriminatory;

That it will be for a public purpose; and

That its citizens will receive prompt, adequate, and effective compensation from the expropriating country.

Thus, when a country expropriates a significant U.S. interest without making reasonable provision for such compensation to U.S. citizens, we will presume that the U.S. will not extend new bilateral economic benefits to the expropriating country unless and until it is determined that the country is taking reasonable steps to provide adequate compensation or that there are major factors affecting U.S. interests which require continuation of all or part of these benefits.

2. In the face of the expropriatory circumstances just described, we will presume that the United States Government will withhold its support from loans under consideration in multilateral development banks.

3. Humanitarian assistance will, of course,

continue to receive special consideration under such circumstances.

4. In order to carry out this policy effectively, I have directed that each potential expropriation case be followed closely. A special inter-agency group will be established under the Council on International Economic Policy to review such cases and to recommend courses of action for the U.S. Government.

5. The Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce are increasing their interchange of views with the business community on problems relating to private U.S. investment abroad in order to improve government and business awareness of each other's concerns, actions, and plans. The Department of State has set up a special office to follow expropriation cases in support of the Council on International Economic Policy.

6. Since these issues are of concern to a broad portion of the international community, the U.S. Government will consult with governments of developed and developing countries on expropriation matters, to work out effective measures for dealing with these problems on a multilateral basis.

7. Along with other governments, we shall cooperate with the international financial institutions—in particular the World Bank Group, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank—to achieve a mutually beneficial investment atmosphere. The international financial institutions have often assisted in the settlement of investment disputes, and we expect they will continue to do so.

8. One way to make reasonable provision for just compensation in an expropriation dispute is to refer the dispute to international adjudication or arbitration. Firm agreement in advance on dispute settlement procedures is a desirable means of anticipating possible disagreements between host governments and foreign investors. Accordingly, I support the existing International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes within the World Bank Group, as well as the establishment in the very near future of the International Investment Insurance Agency, now under discussion in the World Bank Group. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation will make every effort to incorporate independent dispute settlement procedures in its new insurance and guarantee agreements.

I announce these decisions because I believe there should be no uncertainty regarding U.S. policy. The adoption by the United States Government of this policy is consistent with international law. The policy will be implemented within the framework of existing domestic law until the Congress modifies present statutes, along the lines already proposed by this administration. The U.S. fully respects the sovereign rights of others, but it will not ignore actions prejudicial to the rule of law and legitimate U.S. interest.

Finally, as we look beyond our proper national interests to the larger considerations of the world interest, let us not forget that only within a framework of international law will the developed nations be able to provide increasing support for the aspirations of our less developed neighbors around the world.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of S. 748 are familiar to virtually all of my colleagues and, therefore, I will not take their time by explaining in great detail its provisions. Briefly, the bill as passed by the Senate last session and reported favorably last week by the Banking and Currency Committee would authorize two installments

of \$450 million each for payment of the U.S. share in contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. The bill would also authorize the U.S. Governor of the IDB to agree to amendments of the articles of agreement of the IDB as provided in proposed Board of Governors resolutions which provide for the expansion of the Bank's membership and for changes in the number of Executive Directors. Finally, as reported to the floor by the Banking and Currency Committee, the bill contains a provision which directs a negative U.S. vote on any funds to countries that expropriate U.S. private investment without compensation, unless a compensation arrangement is reached, the dispute is submitted to the arbitration under the rules of the International Commission for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, or there are good faith negotiations in progress aimed at providing prompt, adequate, and effective compensation.

Mr. Chairman, much has already been said on the floor of this Chamber regarding the virtues and the shortcomings of the multilateral approach to foreign aid. However, I doubt that few, if any, other cases can be raised in the multilateral context where the need is so compelling and our responsibility is so clear as it is in the case of Latin America.

It should be emphasized that we are considering now increases in U.S. contributions only to the Fund for Special Operations, or the soft-loan window, of the Bank. The concessional loans provided by the FSA, and which are made on a long-term basis, are of particular importance to our Latin American neighbors since they do not exert excessive debt-service and balance-of-payments pressures on the debtor country. Furthermore, on the basis of revised Bank lending criteria, the poorer Latin American countries will have a first priority claim on the soft loan resources which will become available as a result of this replenishment, and the stronger borrower countries will hereafter rely on ordinary capital or hard loan financing. It is enough to note that FSO funds have traditionally been used to finance basic investments in agriculture, transportation and communication, as well as sanitation, housing, and education, to realize how indispensable these credit lines are for Latin America.

Whereas FSO resources, which represent the largest single source for Latin American development financing on concessional terms, have been provided to date in large part by the United States, the trend toward self-help within the Bank is an encouraging one. In 1964 the United States was putting in \$8 for every \$1 contributed by the Latin American countries for concessionary lending purposes. Under the current \$3 billion replenishment proposal, however, the Latin American countries together are putting up 50 percent as much for concessionary lending as is the United States, making the ratio 2 to 1 instead of 8 to 1. Greater participation by our Latin neighbors and reduction of our commitment has been this Nation's goal—the ratio of contributions refunded by this legislation shows we are accom-

plishing that objective. In addition dollar loans from FSO resources in the future are to be repayable in dollars instead of local currencies. It should be understood, in this connection that the United States holds over 40 percent of the voting power relating to approval of each and every project from the FSO. Since these projects require a two-thirds vote of approval before they can go forward, the United States retains a veto power over the operations of the Fund for Special Operations.

Mr. Chairman, the authorizations sought in S. 748 were actually first approved by the House in September 1970 when it passed H.R. 18306, which, if it had also been passed by the other body in the same form, would have authorized the U.S. Governor of the IDB to pay to the FSO \$1 billion in three annual installments of \$100 million, \$450 million, and \$450 million, respectively, as provided by the replenishment resolution. The companion legislation passed by the Senate, however, made payment of the second and third installments subject to further congressional authorization, and the House conferees subsequently receded to the Senate version in conference with the explanation that the delay in authorizing payment of the second and third replenishment installments would afford the House and the Senate an opportunity to review fully IDB operations after a year's experience with the current replenishment. Both the Bank's experience and Congress' review are history and a part of the record now. The Senate passed S. 748 in October of last year following hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Subcommittee on International Finance of the House Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on this bill in October of 1971, and has reported it favorably with the statement that it was fully satisfied that authorization for payment of the second and third installments to the FSO is totally justified and that serious damage might result from further delay.

Even though the replenishment funds are needed by the IDB for commitment now, the balance of payments impact of the U.S. contribution to the FSO can be expected to be substantially delayed. It is projected that none of the funds authorized by this bill will be disbursed in fiscal 1972 and that only \$40 million will be expended in fiscal 1973. Furthermore, the net impact on the balance of payments will be considerably less than our total contribution, since a major portion of the loans will be expended in U.S. procurement. Under Bank rules, resources from the FSO may be used only for external procurement in the United States and in other member countries of the Bank. The United States to date has accounted for in excess of 55 percent of all FSO procurement.

The amendment to S. 748 which has been added by the Banking and Currency Committee reflects the belief of many of us that Congress should make it abundantly clear what the U.S. position is with respect to illegal and confiscatory expropriations. Accordingly, the bill directs the U.S. Executive Director in the IDB to vote against any loan or other utilization of Bank funds for the

benefit of any country which has expropriated U.S.-owned property without prompt and adequate compensation. This amendment is, of course, entirely compatible with the President's January 19 expropriation policy statement.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot impress upon my colleagues too strongly how essential the proposed FSO replenishment is to the maintenance of an effective and sensible U.S. multilateral lending and development policy. The overall question of our relationships with our Latin American neighbors is at stake, and I urge the House to support this legislation.

At this time of uncertainty concerning the political and economic alignment of nations when traditional associations and antagonisms are being reexamined and reformed, it would be grossly unwise for us to leave any doubt about our willingness to cooperate with our Latin neighbors.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow).

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that at the time the Committee, operating under the 5-minute rule, offers the amendment in relation to the expropriation provision, I will oppose it because I think it is arrogant of the United States to impose an amendment of that kind on countries that are pretty much impoverished. They are in difficulty. At the proper time I will explain my position.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say that I support the bill, but more specifically I wish to speak on the subject just brought up by the gentleman from New York in relation to the expropriation provisions.

The expropriation provisions in our legislation are never inserted by choice. They come about in the natural sense of reaction and the desire on the part of our colleagues to fulfill the obligations owed to our citizens doing business abroad. Anyone who will take the time to plod through the foreign aid legislation, beginning with the Marshall plan, cannot help but notice the emphasis put on private investment overseas. This was encouraged and facilitated, sometimes despite opposition from the executive branch by the gentlemen who sit in this House.

Therefore, we in Congress have a special responsibility to the private sector of our economy operating overseas on that basis alone.

However, there is a far greater reason for congressional responsibility in this whole area, and that is the tremendous contribution that has been made by American private enterprise throughout the world. Too often this record is obscured by a few isolated cases of admittedly very poor performance. But on the whole, the record of the private sector has been very good. I have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that the private participation has been in our national interest and, on the whole, the mutual best interests of the recipient countries.

If this were not so, there would not have been so many inviting foreign investments.

Nevertheless, there are occasions when a country will expropriate for valid rational reasons and then proceed to a fair and equitable settlement within a reasonable time. There are some instances when a country will confiscate, an entirely different matter, and perhaps by some characterized as a reprehensible matter. In other cases, under the guise of expropriation and a pretended desire to settle, a country will offer ridiculous settlement terms or make exaggerated and untrue allegations so as to discredit the other side and thereby secure a one-sided settlement or no settlement at all. The devices are too numerous to mention here.

When we contemplate the magnitude of many of the projects performed by American companies and enterprises overseas, it is not surprising that the paperwork should be staggering. We lawyers know how even a simple contract can be the subject of honest difference of interpretation. How then can we expect large international projects always to be free of controversy?

It is therefore to the great credit of men of good will on both sides, who can get together and through the input of patience, perseverance, and understanding, bring about a settlement. This, for example, has been true in Peru, where one by one outstanding matters are being settled, the most recent being the Grace Lines' claim. According to my information this is a matter which Congress wrestled with during its consideration of the sugar bill. If Members will recall, there was an amendment attached to that bill. Now they have reached settlement on this matter, and it shows this can be done when approached in a constructive manner. There remains a few matters still to reach final settlement, it is admitted, and I am thinking in terms of the joint venture "Conselva" made up of four American construction companies and three Peruvian companies. That is on road construction, and it is being moved with a great deal of patience and perseverance. There is controversy involved, but I think if they move it on the basis we have described here, there can be a settlement.

We must criticize where this is warranted, and we should commend where it is merited. To all those involved in the Peruvian settlement negotiations, we can only offer our commendation and sincere hope for an early settlement fair to both sides. We hope that these will be the patterns more often than not.

Finally, I want to emphasize that this whole matter of expropriation, in all its variations, is a very serious subject which the Congress will deal with on every occasion in a very practical, fair and just way. Also, it will be a vital factor in what the United States will do in international financial forums and institutions. The language of the conferees in the conference report on the Sugar Act enacted last year serves as advance notice to sugar quota-seeking countries that this whole matter will be a factor when the act comes up again 2 years

from now. We are serving this notice now.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) such time as he may consume.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill (S. 748) as well as the other two bills. It has been 12 years since the concept of multilateral lending institutions first gained widespread acceptance in Congress. During this time span, they have become an integral and essential part of our country's foreign assistance program. We have made a strong and, I believe, very necessary financial commitment to their success, and today the House has the opportunity to continue its support of these organizations by approving additional contributions to the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank. I strongly urge my colleagues to approve these three pieces of legislation without delay. At a time when our own foreign policy commitments are undergoing serious review in the Congress, multilateral lending institutions become more important than ever, for they can provide the most effective vehicle for international cooperation and economic progress in the developing nations.

The decade of the 1960's saw the creation of several of these multilateral lending institutions. Their achievements, even in this short time, have been widespread and enormous. To the developing nations whose economic health is directly proportional to the availability of outside resources, multilateral lending institutions supply the much-needed capital and expertise that will result in economic development and an increased standard of living for all their people. Countless millions throughout the world have benefited directly from the agricultural projects, the transportation systems, and the electric power generators that have been created by funds from these organizations. The International Development Association, for one, has extended 274 credits totaling \$3.3 billion to 58 countries in its 11 years of service. The relatively newborn Asian Development Bank, only in operation for 5 years, has provided 15 countries with \$412 million for 53 technical assistance projects, a clear indication of the need and importance of multilateral lending institutions.

Multilateral financial institutions have many advantages over bilateral foreign aid. They permit a more equitable sharing of development assistance costs, and at the same time, they permit economic development without claims that particular donors are unduly influencing or restricting the development opportunities of particular countries. Through multilateral lending organizations, the world community can accumulate knowledge and expertise on development problems thereby permitting flexibility in particular situations for performance standards and repayment terms. In short, these institutions use the collective judgment and experience of numerous nations and experts to guide the development plans of member nations.

These organizations are successful, not only because they provide developing nations with the much-needed capital, but because their base of support is widening. As other nations can afford to contribute more to the fund, the U.S. percentage of the total contributions is declining. For example, the ratio of U.S. contributions for soft-loan operations in the Inter-American Development Bank has declined from 11:1 in 1964 to 2:1 for present contributions. This increase in developmental burdens assumed by other countries is also evident in the International Development Association. The initial U.S. contribution to this organization was 43.1 percent of the total; our share of this third replenishment request, however, has decreased to 39.3 percent. The concept underlying multilateral lending institutions is "sharing the financial burden." The success of these institutions, therefore, can be measured by broadened participation; the best evidence of this success is the declining percentage of American contributions to the total multilateral lending institution fund.

During the International Finance Subcommittee's hearings on multilateral lending institutions, Under Secretary of the Treasury Charles E. Walker pointed to eight advantages of the multilateral approach. Included in this list were: First, burden of sharing; second, multinational expertise; third, assistance on the basis of development need; fourth, collective judgment on development policies; fifth, flexibility in imposing performance standards; sixth, open economics and fair treatment of foreign investment; seventh, shielding devices; eighth, the encouragement of self-help. Certainly, multilateral lending institutions offer tremendous advantages to the developing countries, while providing the industrialized nations with a very efficient means of channeling their foreign assistance funds. I have long been an advocate of multilateral foreign aid, especially as provided by these multilateral institutions, and I urge this Congress to continue our commitment to these worthy goals by promptly passing the three bills under consideration today.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I hope this House will recognize the need of all mature countries to help the developing nations of the world achieve economic growth. For the past quarter century the United States has borne most of the burden of this responsibility. I look upon the support of these bills as an opportunity to bring other nations into taking a greater share of their responsibility in this development project. The multilateral lending institutions and these bills before us today are designed to do just that.

The Treasury Department has provided me with a graph illustrating the effect of this increased burden sharing, and at the proper time I will request permission in the House to insert this graph into the RECORD.

It illustrates the leverage or "multiplier effect" of U.S. financial assistance

through the multilateral development finance institutions over the past decade, and projected out through 1973.

Because other nations share the burden along with us, the international financial institutions in 1965, for example, were able to make about \$1.6 billion in new loan commitments, more than three times the \$500 million in support appropriated by Congress for that year. In that year only \$312 million was the actual cash commitment of U.S. "taxpayers' money." The rest was in callable guarantee capital, none of which has been called, and we hope it will never be called.

In 1970 the "multiplier" increased to 4.6 times our \$686 million input when the IFI's made over \$3 billion in loan commitments. And the U.S. taxpayers' cost was much less, \$480 million.

Mr. Chairman, the three bills before us today call for \$1.96 billion in authorization. I believe, however, we should consider that in fiscal year 1973 only about \$110 million will be required under the bills before us. This of course, lessens the impact on the balance-of-payments and balance-of-trade problems. And at the same time, our authorizations provide loans which stimulate expenditures for U.S. goods and services, which also tends to reduce the effect on our balance of payments.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely feel that these institutions should continue to play a major role in development assistance and we should make this possible by supporting the funding of these activities.

Direct foreign assistance now seems to be out of favor.

I hope that the multinational self-help approach, embodied in the Inter-American and Inter-Asian Development Banks and the International Development Agency will continue to enjoy the support of this body.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to applaud the committee for indicating its concern for the trend toward increasing expropriation without compensation of American-owned property overseas. I firmly support the provision that the United States votes will be cast against lending to countries which expropriate and fail to take appropriate steps for compensation.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that at the appropriate time, under the 5-minute rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) will offer an amendment. I believe that his amendment will provide in addition to the expropriation of property without compensation that likewise our American votes should be cast against any nation which seizes our fishing vessels illegally on the high seas.

I want to indicate I hope that this committee will support that amendment. I believe it deserves the support of this Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this Chamber has recently agonized much about foreign assistance. A sense of ingratitude has been felt, a sense

that foreign nations little appreciate what we have done for them. The idea that aid could "buy us friends" was probably never valid. The desire to turn societies around towards developed status in the space of decades has proved unrequited. Now we have come to a more sober view. We now know that we cannot achieve development for any country; that it has to spring from that country's own human and material resources. This awareness of our own limitations signals a welcome maturity but it should not extend so far as to deny the utility of any foreign assistance.

The President, in his policy statement of Jan. 19, 1972, on economic assistance, stated a rationale for development assistance which I think is valid:

The well-being of mankind is in the final analysis indivisible; and... a better-fed, better-clothed, healthier, and more literate world will be a more peaceful world as well.

We can still hope to make significant contributions to the world's development on a selective basis in those countries where, in the President's phrase, it makes a real difference.

The heyday of bilateral aid in the 1960's—and our subsequent disillusionment—has led to renewed consideration of multilateral lending programs. Multilateral loans for development have long been desired by the developing nations, and, more recently, donor countries have come around to see their benefits. Multilateral assistance presents a number of advantages over bilateral aid: multinational expertise, collective judgment, consistent burden sharing, relative freedom from political coercion, shared responsibility for assistance with the resultant diffused criticism from recipients.

The Inter-American Development Bank represents one of the soundest multilateral vehicles for the promotion of development. The U.S. contribution to the IDB signifies our continuing commitment to a viable lending institution with a proven record of growth and accomplishment in this hemisphere over more than a decade. It means moneys toward projects in vital sectors—agriculture, transportation, housing, education, sanitation—not trivial expenditures for Latin American rulers on ego trips. This is no giveaway; loans are given to priority projects defined by the Latin American countries themselves but subject to serious planning, solid documentation, and critical performance standards.

The bill before us also represents an American commitment we must meet. The authorization replenishes the IDB's Fund for Special Operations, the Bank's so-called soft window which offers loans on concessional terms. An IDB resolution of April 1970, concurred in by the American representative, established a new level of working capital for the Fund of \$1.5 billion. In September 1970 this House approved an authorization of \$1 billion as the U.S. contribution to the Fund, to be paid in three installments. The substance of this bill confirms that pledge.

The legislation contains safeguards. The balance-of-payments impact will be mitigated by procurement of items by the Latin donees in the United States and by the fact that funds will be disbursed over

considerable time. Further, the bill carries a firm statement on expropriation policy, calling for a negative U.S. vote on loans to countries which nationalize American property without compensation. It avoids rigidity, however, by admitting of international arbitration of expropriation disputes and of good faith negotiations toward a compensation agreement.

The President's aforementioned policy statement also specifically addressed the Inter-American Development Bank. He attached the "highest importance" to meeting the full financial promise we have made to the bank. Support for the IDB means far more than simple "aid"; it involves our most earnest pledge to peaceful hemispheric development. I urge House Members to back it.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I have always been a supporter of multinational aid to developing nations through a bank loan concept and have been hopeful that the needs of the developing countries of the world could be met to a continually greater degree by the cooperative efforts of all of the free industrialized nations, rather than to depend entirely on bilateral effort.

The bill before us today is a better bill than the one which passed the Senate because it has come to grips with the problem of expropriation of American investment without fair compensation.

I am amazed that the proposition would be offered here to relieve a borrowing country from its obligation to pay proper compensation for property expropriated from citizens of this country. The advantage of a bank loan concept is that it is better supervised, with greater chance for collection and it places the borrower in the responsible position of paying back his debts as he acquires the payback ability. For it to be seriously suggested on this floor that a bank should continue to loan money to a loan applicant who is deliberately causing the bank's principal supporter great damage is ridiculous. Through OPIC, money from the Federal Treasury is appropriated to help pay the losses of American private investors abroad. These insurance losses will probably be substantial. Through the expropriation of their properties, the capacity of these American investors to pay taxes into the Federal Treasury is reduced. These are just two of many reasons we are staring into the face of a \$25.5 billion deficit in the coming fiscal year. It is therefore right and proper and a position which should be respected by the borrowers from the international banks that loans shall be withheld on the basis of responsible business practices from those countries expropriating investments from this country without either paying or submitting to negotiation, appropriate compensation for the property so taken.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to add my support to the proposal of our colleague, GLENN ANDERSON, to inhibit loans by the Inter-American Development Bank to countries that interfere with our American fishing men.

Mr. ANDERSON has advised us that last year alone the Bank loaned \$30 million to Ecuador. Since the United States provides most of the operating capital for

the Bank, it seems cruelly ironic that Ecuador should have been dealt with so generously during a period when she was extracting more than \$2 million in illegal fines and other penalties from our fishing fleet.

The Anderson amendment would instruct the U.S. representative at the Bank to vote against any loan to nations which illegally seize American fishing boats.

In my view, this is a sound proposal which merits the enthusiastic support of our colleagues. Adoption of this amendment would also be a logical sequel to the House action of last December in voting to cut off all U.S. aid to Ecuador.

Since the Inter-American Development Bank is largely funded by the United States, the same principle of withholding aid from those who would make our fishermen political pawns should also be applicable to loans proffered by the Bank.

I think most of us here in the House are getting fed up with countries that try to have it both ways: shaking down our citizens on the one hand while taking in generous quantities of U.S. aid with the other.

Let's show these countries we mean business by adopting the Anderson amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to use further time?

Mr. WIDNALL. No.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 19. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized to pay to the Fund for Special Operations two annual installments of \$450,000,000 each in accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions of the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors on December 31, 1970, concerning an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations and contributions thereto.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, the amounts necessary for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the two annual installments of \$450,000,000 each for the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank.

"SEC. 20. The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized to agree to amendments to the provisions of the articles of agreement as provided in proposed Board of Governors resolution entitled (a) 'Amendment of the Provisions of the Agreement Establishing the Bank With Respect to Membership and to Related Matters' and (b) 'Amendment of the Provisions of the Agreement Establishing the Bank With Respect to the Election of Executive Directors'."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, line 18, strike out the quotation mark.

Page 2, insert immediately below line 18 the following:

"SEC. 21. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan

or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country which has—

"(1) nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens;

"(2) taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens; or

"(3) imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned; unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines that (A) an arrangement for prompt, adequate, and effective compensation has been made, (B) the parties have submitted the dispute to arbitration under the rules of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress aimed at providing prompt, adequate, and effective compensation under the applicable principles of international law."

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) the chairman of the new foreign give-away committee of the House.

I am surprised to read this report and find no departmental statement of any kind. Can the gentleman enlighten the House as to why there are no departmental or agency reports?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do.

Mr. PATMAN. The Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Walker, came up before the committee and supported the legislation for all the Cabinet members and the President unequivocally.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is just wonderful, but the fact remains that we who are not members of the committee have no knowledge whatsoever of their official position on this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The hearings disclose it. They are available to a Member. Any Member can call up the agency.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman has been here for several years at least, and he knows very well reports usually contain some statement on the part of the various departments and agencies of this Government with respect to their attitude and position on the legislation.

This report is utterly and completely bereft of any such information.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. GROSS. And, where are the tables showing the payments on the part of the U.S. taxpayers to the Inter-American Bank over the past 11 years? I believe it has been in operation for about 11 years.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Where is the information that we ought to have if we are to properly consider this legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. We have a volume here of 174 pages which contains the information that the gentleman would like.

Mr. GROSS. You put the tables in one of your reports on another bill but you left them out on this bill. What makes the report on this bill different from the others?

Mr. PATMAN. This is the same bill that passed the House 2 years ago.

Mr. GROSS. So, we are supposed to rely upon information that we can recall from 2 years ago in the consideration of this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. It is in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. The fact remains that the committee, insofar as some Members of this House are concerned—at least I can speak for myself—did not exactly do its homework in the handling of this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. GROSS. No; I do not want to yield any further at this time. Your report shows it is completely lacking information that we ought to have. Now, I would like to spend a little time discussing other matters in connection with this bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. I will have a question for the gentleman from Michigan in a minute, but for the time being I feel these should be asked of the chairman of the committee.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) says that we are considering this bill today with a "sense of urgency."

I am considering this bill with a "sense of urgency" in behalf of the taxpayers of this country.

We are today, all of us in this country, confronted with an admitted \$40 billion deficit at the end of this fiscal year on July 1. And, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee (Mr. MAHON) in a speech to the House the other day said he would put that figure more nearly at \$44.7 billion.

We are looking at a self-admitted, built-in deficit in the 1973 budget of \$25.5 billion, and I doubt that there is anyone in this Chamber who would stake a plugged nickel on the fact that it will not be far more than \$25.5 billion at the end of the 1973 fiscal year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; a sense of urgency, but somebody had better begin thinking in terms of a sense of urgency as to the financial situation of this country before you give another handout of \$900 million, almost \$1 billion to the Inter-American Bank. I do not care whether you describe it in English, Latin, or Pig Latin. That is a hell of a lot of money. The budget of this country, the fiscal affairs of this country, dictate to every one of us in this room that this kind of handout has got to stop. There is not a better time or place to stop it than here today.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, since he seems to want to answer a question, how much have we put into the Inter-American Bank through the 11 years? I have a few figures here. I will read you one.

The ordinary capital account, of which the U.S. share is \$1,173 million, or 37.3 percent of the total, could that be right?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Yes, that could be right.

Mr. GROSS. And the funds for special operations, and I guess that is what we are dealing with today—the funds for special operations, of which the U.S. share is \$1.8 billion, or 77.3 percent of the total; is that about right?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman knows that the ratio of our contribution has been regularly reduced. Is that the overall contribution you are saying?

Mr. GROSS. I am asking you to confirm or correct me, confirm or deny or correct the figure that I have given.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Would the gentleman restate the figure? Is that the total contribution for the funds for the special operations throughout the course of this program and is that the overall percentage?

Mr. GROSS. The Library of Congress tells me that the U.S. share is \$1.8 billion or 77.3 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. That would be approximately correct, I would say; yes.

Does the gentleman realize that the fund for special operations started out with the American share or the U.S. share at approximately \$8 to every dollar that the Latin Americans contributed? And that gradually through our effort to have the Latin Americans commit a greater proportion of their resources to this activity and for us to reduce our commitment, this ratio has been brought down to 2 to 1. This supports I am sure the very thing that the gentleman is urging and that is that we stop picking up a disproportionate share of the burden for assistance to underdeveloped and less-advantaged nations?

Mr. GROSS. Would it not be awfully nice if you and I could go back to our districts, you go back to Michigan and I go back to Iowa and tell the taxpayers in our districts that we were no longer putting up 1 for 1 or 1 for 3 or 77.3 percent of the money for this fund? Would it not be nice?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I agree there would be many who would applaud.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not think they would appreciate that in Michigan?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I am certain that is true for many.

Mr. GROSS. Possibly they would not in Texas, but I think they would in Michigan, and I know they would in Iowa.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the taxpayers in Iowa and in Michigan would much prefer to have their tax burden reduced across the board, not just in the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, but it would include farm subsidies and many other things. I am sure they would like to see their taxes reduced. But I am not sure we have made as much progress in proportionately reducing our commitments in those other areas as we have in these financial areas.

Mr. GROSS. Give me a little help because I am not on this committee, and I do not come easily by this information.

Then there is a social progress trust fund to which the United States contributed 100 percent, for a total contribution of \$525 million.

Could that be true; does the gentleman know?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Yes; that could be true.

Mr. GROSS. Then could the gentleman help me with where—

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would add if the gentleman will yield, that the fund to which he has referred, has been discontinued, and those activities to the extent they are carried out are financed through the special operations fund.

Mr. GROSS. It has now been absorbed.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. There is no longer that additional fund, it comes under the fund for special operations.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how much we have put into Latin America through this Inter-American Development Bank and its predecessor, how much we have put in, in 11 years?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I do know the 11-year total. I know it is a very substantial sum but I am sure it does not begin to compare with other funds that the gentleman from Iowa or others of his beliefs voted for, such as the Marshall Plan and some of the other international assistance efforts we have made.

Mr. GROSS. That I voted for?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I do not know that the gentleman voted for it—

Mr. GROSS. That I voted for? I suggest the gentleman examine my voting record.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. But I think the gentleman has been a Member of those Congresses which supported our extensive programs of bilateral aid. In my opinion, multilateral aid is so much better than bilateral aid, there is no comparison.

Mr. GROSS. Either way it is a matter of billions of dollars, is it not?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. This Nation has always been generous.

Mr. GROSS. Where did the \$10 million come from that the General Accounting Office says we gave to the Organization of American States because the members would not pay their dues and assessments?

Does the gentleman have any idea where I should address that question? I am sure it was brought up in your hearings.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. PATMAN. That is not under the jurisdiction of our committee.

Mr. GROSS. What is not under the jurisdiction of your committee?

Mr. PATMAN. The OAS is not under the jurisdiction of our committee.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not take this into consideration when you beef up these foreign so-called banks or lending institutions? Do you not inquire into how

much money they have gotten from all sources?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. So you have some idea whether they are deserving another \$900 million or a billion dollars? Do you not go into that?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, the gentleman is correct, if it is a banking institution, but the OAS is not a banking institution.

Mr. GROSS. All you are interested in is how much you can shovel out to them; is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I did not say that—those are the gentleman's words.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I see here we are spending \$10 million to pay dues and assessments for delinquent members of the Organization of American States, according to the General Accounting Office.

I just wonder perhaps if somebody could help me with some other phase of this wonderful, wonderful give-away.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. You know, these hearings have been available for about 5 months and we have had plenty of time to go into it and get all the information we wanted. Five months is an unusually long time and if the gentleman has not done it within 5 months, I do not think we ought to take just a few minutes and try to go through the whole thing here.

Mr. GROSS. I notice that earlier you were trying to shorten up the consideration of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. No, we will take all the time that is needed. Nobody has objected to the gentleman's extensions of time.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF CALIFORNIA TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments which I offer to the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California to the committee amendments: Page 3, line 7, strike out "or".

Page 3, line 12, insert "or" after the semicolon.

Page 3, after line 12, insert the following new paragraph:

"(4) seized a vessel of the United States on the basis of rights or claims in territorial waters or the high seas which are not recognized by the United States and a fine, license fee, registration fee or any other direct charge has been paid in order to secure the prompt release of the vessel and crew;

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment broadens the circumstances under which the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the U.S. Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank to vote against any loan of the funds of the Bank.

The committee bill directs the Executive Director to vote against a loan to a country which expropriates U.S. property.

My amendment extends these instructions to include the seizure of U.S. vessels which are fishing on the high seas.

On December 7, 1971—on the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1972 (H.R. 12067)—the House adopted an amendment by Mr. VAN DEERLIN which would prohibit any of the

funds in that act to be used to provide assistance to Ecuador. Ecuador, as you know, illegally seized over 50 U.S. tuna vessels in 1971 and, thus far in 1972, has seized six U.S. fishing vessels. The Senate has not yet acted on the appropriation bill.

Last year, the Inter-American Development Bank loaned \$30 million to Ecuador. This year, Ecuador has projects pending before the Bank which require loans totaling \$20 million.

Mr. Chairman, our policy on expropriation is clear. Hopefully, it will resolve the problem.

But, we must clarify our policy regarding the illegal seizure of U.S. fishing vessels. Because of inaction by the State Department, foreign governments continue to hijack our vessels which are fishing well beyond the recognized 12-mile limit.

Because of the success of Ecuador in collecting over \$2 million in fines last year, on January 22, the Foreign Minister of Costa Rica proclaimed his government's intention to claim exclusive fishing rights within 200 miles of Costa Rica.

Mr. Chairman, unless we act to clearly state our policy on fishing rights on the high seas, we will not only continue to subsidize piracy, but we will also be inviting other countries to take advantage of this "back door foreign aid."

The adoption of my amendment would make it clear that our Government will not tolerate piracy any more than we tolerate expropriation.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments offered by the Committee on Banking and Currency and to the amendments thereto offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON).

My point relates not only to S. 748, for the Inter-American Development Bank, now before this body, but also like amendments in the bill S. 749, for the Asian Development Bank, and the bill S. 2010, for the International Development Association.

Section 21 and its counterparts in the other bills are an attempt to restrain the use of funds for the Inter-American Development Bank and the banks which are being funded in the other two bills.

The new sections would require the U.S. Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan or funds for a country giving financial offense to a U.S. corporation.

Mr. Chairman, it is this kind of retaliation, with vindictive overtones about it, which is going to lose us the good will and friendship of the nations in the underdeveloped parts of the world. This is the kind of medicine that will turn them into the camp of the Communist or other radical doctrines.

We can have no doubt that these qualifications to American generosity appear to the people south of the equator and even some this side of it, to be restraints upon their sovereignty. I am sure that these restraints are all the more gall and wormwood to these peoples who are just now emerging from the colonial world and savoring the pride of nationalism for the first time.

Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that

these restraints are really class legislation? They are clearly aimed to help large American corporations to avoid the pinch that is put upon them by the measures for nationalization and expropriation that that some of the underdeveloped nations feel obliged, within the rights of their own sovereignty, to apply.

At the same time, I cannot fail to note that amendments offered on this floor in the past to help the poor people in these faraway nations do not succeed on this floor. I myself have offered amendments aimed at helping the black people in South Africa. This House has also voted down an amendment to restrain the purchase of chrome from Rhodesia or account of the racial policies followed there.

In voting down these efforts to aid the poor people in Africa, the opponents invariably make the point that it is interference in the sovereignty or affairs of South Africa or Rhodesia or whatever other nations are involved. If they are to be consistent then let them oppose these instant amendments of the Banking and Currency Committee, which are certainly subject to the same criticism. They exert leverage against the sovereignty and internal affairs of other nations.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the play of the marketplace will discourage the lending of funds to these nations that habitually ignore their obligations. They will suffer the consequences of their own failings. In a good many cases, it is quite apparent that the expropriations are carried out with some form of compensation. I submit that the amendments before us are really designed to influence the level of compensation and that total expropriation is the exception rather than the rule.

Members of the House and Mr. Chairman, we are entering into an era of the world when the underdeveloped people are pulling themselves up by their bootstraps. I submit that the amendment before us here is truly a knife to cut the bootstraps, and I urge that it not be adopted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, we should keep in mind that the thrust of the amendment which has been offered is to encourage just compensation and negotiations on a reasonable basis entered into at reasonable times. This amendment should not be looked upon as an infringement on the rights of a nation in eminent domain. In fact it would be impossible for us in our legislative halls to do so. What is accomplished in this amendment is to make clear our reluctance to support flows of funds from multinational banks of which we are a substantial supporter in funds to those countries which exercise a ruthless type of confiscation which does not allow for a reasonable process for setting and paying a just compensation predicated on a balanced consideration of all operative facts. We do not ask that our citizen be always pleased or ever favored but that the processes are available to them and fair in its weighing and dealing with the subject matter under dispute.

February 1, 1972

We have that right within our own country, and we exercise it, but we do so with the constitutional mandate that there be just compensation. What we are seeking is to extend that right to our people wherever they might go, especially where they have been induced to go by our own legal support, by the policies we pursue, and by the invitation of the countries into which they go. We are not by this amendment suggesting that there are not instances in which there will be difficult, prolonged, protracted argument that comes from the basis of reasonable misunderstanding, but this is not to say we should not have legislation that suggests and urges that there be this kind of reasonability and this kind of approach in trying to come to a finding of just compensation for what has been expropriated.

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

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

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California. I think further he would agree with me in this particular amendment that we will get into making the Treasury Department the policeman of the world. There are others of us in this and the other body who do not want this. My own personal opinion is this does not belong in the bill.

Mr. HANNA. That is correct. As the amendment seeks to extend this to fishing vessels, let me suggest we go into an entirely different field when we go into this. I certainly would not say we would not want to support our California fishermen in their problems. However, let me say this brings up a great many other considerations that are not in this bill at the present time, and which should not be in this bill.

There are a great many things involved in our dispute in trying to maximize the freedom of the seas and the whole thrust of the future of our Nation and other nations in conservation. Actually there has been and there are now being made approaches in trying to settle this problem on the basis of treaties. Those treaties have been very tortuous in their discussions and the meetings have not been always in good faith, but they are now in a posture where I think they can move forward.

I hope our Navy will take the kind of attitude on this that will allow us to come into agreement with the other people involved. As a Californian, I only wish we had had a greater conservation arrangement for the sardines which we used to have in great numbers between San Diego and San Francisco. Because we did not have conservation provisions, we and the Japanese and all who could get their boats into those waters have taken all those fish, and there is no such fishery now for any of us.

Certainly the people in South America have a concern. Whether they have gone about it legitimately in exercising that concern is a question which should be determined on the basis of a treaty if possible. I would hope we could take up this matter with hearings in depth and consideration in depth rather than act-

ing on it on the floor right now as an amendment to this bill. I urge support for the committee amendment and opposition to the amendment to the amendment at this time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I concur in the objections to the amendment expressed by the gentleman from California who has just spoken. I think the substance of the amendment may have merit, but the practical problems involved in the enforcement of the amendment make it impractical to include it in this legislation. If the sponsor of the amendment wants to pursue this question, I am sure that there will be ample opportunity for him to present his concern to the appropriate committee and appropriate legislation, in turn, can be adopted but there is a great deal of difference between what the gentleman is proposing in his amendment and what the committee has adopted in this bill with respect to expropriation of property. Because of the practical difficulties involved in the enforcement of the gentleman's amendment, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment deals with expropriation. My amendment would extend the act to the seizing of fishing vessels on the high seas. I am told if a fishing vessel is seized by a foreign nation for the third time, they then threaten expropriation and thus would then fall under the provisions of this bill. What my amendment actually does is take care of the situation before it gets that far, so if a foreign nation illegally seizes U.S. fishing vessels on the high seas, the first time, we would then instruct our representative to vote against any loan for that nation.

I do not believe my proposed amendment is too far away from the proposal made by the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I appreciate what the gentleman has to say. I believe he has analyzed the situation very well.

However, I believe we can have confidence in the way in which this country will exercise its prerogatives under the expropriation language, so that even if there is no legal requirement in the statute for the United States to follow, where there has been arbitrary and capricious action by another nation, it will be able to have the influence necessary to discourage such action.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Does the gentleman believe that—say, in the case of Ecuador, which last year seized 50 of our vessels, and this year thus far has seized six of our vessels, that we should allow or by indirection suggest to our Director of the Bank that he vote to extend to Ecuador a \$20 million loan as a reward?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I do not say that at all.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is the situation that my amendment tries to cure.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. All I am saying is that I am satisfied with the control that will be exercised by the United States through its voting power on approving loans under the fund for Special Operations, and I believe the action at which the gentleman's amendment is aimed, can be taken into consideration without specific legislative authority, because we do not have to give reasons for vetoing loans. We can still veto a loan.

I just do not believe we ought to bind our authorities into recognizing a statutory obligation every time a vessel is seized when the real merits of that seizure have not as yet been determined.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I also want to indicate my strong opposition to the intent of the entire section 21 of this measure. It is indeed unfortunate that the committee chose to amend this legislation to require the IDB's U.S. Governor to take negative action against the loan request of a nation which may have expropriated U.S. property or violated contracts with U.S. citizens and not made compensation arrangements. I believe very strongly that all nations must strictly adhere to the international principle of providing prompt, adequate and effective compensation for expropriated property. I am fearful, however, that this provision will be misunderstood by many of our Latin neighbors—who are already understandably resentful of such ill-conceived devices as the Hickenlooper and Pelly amendments—and that it will tend to add an unnecessary pressure to our already strained relations. Further, the committee amendment has the potential of hanging like a Sword of Damocles over international arbitration efforts or bilateral negotiations and that it will tend to intimidate Latin American nations. As undesirable as the committee amendment may be, however, it should not be permitted to impede the progress of this legislation. The continued support of the IDB and its Fund for Special Operations must be given overriding consideration.

I hope that all of us in the Congress and in this country will understand that what is occurring in Latin America today is of very great importance to the future of the United States. This administration and this Congress may be remembered not so much as the administration and the Congress that brought about an end to the war in Indochina but as the administration and the Congress that lost Latin America.

What is going on in Latin America today is an attempt by many countries in varying stages of development to move into the 20th century. Any economist of whatever persuasion will tell us that a country can only become developed if a certain proportion of its total investment is in capital goods.

At the present time these countries do not have a large enough industrial plant

to be able to enter the 20th century. If this development is not going to be accomplished through communism the only way industrial development can occur is through aid from outside sources, and specifically from the United States.

We have been fortunate in this country that the development of Cuba under Castro has been such a disaster, because more and more Latin American countries are beginning to realize that Russia is not really interested in helping to develop Latin American nations. For that reason, not because of anything we have done, the United States still has some good will left in Latin America.

But if we are going to try to move those countries toward developing economies we cannot at the same time impose political requirements upon them.

What section 21 seeks to do is, in effect, to mandate policies by the Congress upon the administration of those countries. It makes it difficult for them to accept aid.

What we have to do is to recognize that the issues we are talking about in the entire section 21 are complex. They should be left to the discretion of the leaders of the respective countries to decide. We will be making a tragic mistake if we believe that Latin American countries are going to accept help under any circumstances from the United States with such intimidating provisions.

They are still independent sovereign countries; they still believe that they can resolve their own battles; and they are going to do it with or without the help of the United States.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BADILLO. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. I have been listening to the gentleman and trying to follow your logic. Do I understand that you mean to say it is all right for countries in South America to expropriate or take over an American-owned company and not pay for it?

Mr. BADILLO. No; I did not say that at all. I say we should leave the negotiation of those issues with the appropriate officials in those countries. What I say is there are countries who would have no intention at all of taking over a foreign vessel or doing any of the acts mentioned under section 21. The mere fact of the existence of section 21, however, will make it difficult for representatives of those countries to work with the United States. To many countries of Latin America this appears as political interference with the affairs of those countries; not that it would happen but that it makes it difficult to maintain the kind of relations which I think all of us would want to see with Latin American countries. If we leave it to the discretion of the executive, then there is ample leeway to negotiate on these matters as particular problems may arise.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BADILLO. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. I simply want to point out that if a country in South America expropriates an Amer-

ican firm and pays for it, then we have no problem whatsoever.

Mr. BADILLO. I am not arguing against that. I am answering your question by saying that my point is that we are making a precondition which, in terms of the politics of Latin America, makes it difficult for those who are trying to move the country ahead to operate with the help of the United States and to work with us. It is that precondition which the sponsor of this amendment would try to have the Congress establish today. I do not think we should do it, and for that reason I oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, a prevailing sentiment in many sectors indicates that Washington does not understand or appreciate what is happening in Latin America. There is a strong feeling in the capitals of the Americas and elsewhere that this Nation is insensitive to the needs and aspirations of the Western Hemisphere. As the result of generally inept diplomacy and a lack of commitment, relations with our southern neighbors at the present time have deteriorated to their lowest level in many years.

Today, we have an opportunity to begin to correct this deplorable situation. We can take steps to return the United States to those principles and goals which underscored the Good Neighbor Policy and the Alliance for Progress. By supporting the legislation authorizing payments of \$900 million to the Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations we will not only be fulfilling an international commitment but will also demonstrate to our sister republics that we actively support efforts to assist in the economic and social development of Latin America. In authorizing these payments we will be partially implementing recommendations of our Inter-American Affairs subcommittee which, 2 years ago, called for an increased emphasis on long-term technical aid and support for those programs covered under the Fund for Special Operations and to aid in supporting Latin America's economic development efforts. Also, we will be clearly indicating that we listen to the suggestions of our Latin neighbors by effecting a suggestion contained in the 1969 Consensus of Vifia del Mar that multilateral financial cooperation should be strengthened.

In its 11 year history the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) has made many and important contributions to the economic, social and technical progress of Latin America. Although its achievements may not be as spectacular as some may desire, the IDB is this hemisphere's major development financing instrument. Through it has flowed, as of last June, over 200 individual loans alone, amounting to over \$1.5 billion, for productive or infrastructure projects in industry, agriculture, transportation and electric power.

The Fund for Special Operations (FSO) was established to provide financing for economic and social development when lending on conventional terms is not appropriate. These FSO loans are made on easy repayment terms and are extended entirely from resources provided by the IDB. Almost 300 FSO loans,

totaling \$2.2 billion, had been authorized as of June 30, 1971. I believe we should especially note the comment by the Banking and Currency Committee in its report that these loans are of "particular importance since they do not exert excessive debt-service and balance of payments pressures on the debtor country."

These FSO loans are utilized to finance basic investments in a wide variety of areas—in agriculture, transportation and communications. They also aid in a number of social development efforts, formerly administered by the Social Progress Trust Fund, such as sanitation, housing, education, land settlement and improved land use and water supply. These urgently needed and, in many cases, long overdue economic and social development programs are critical for growth and stability in Latin America. They cannot be permitted to fail for the lack of financial support.

Mr. Chairman, last summer our former Ambassador to the Organization of American States, Sol Linowitz, aptly observed that the 270 million Latin Americans are at a critical decision point and that they are anxious to fulfill the hopes and aspirations which this country has helped to raise in the hemisphere in this great area of rising expectations. Commenting that our Latin neighbors will accomplish the goals which have been established either through peaceful means or violent revolution, Ambassador Linowitz cautioned that:

We in the United States can play a decisive role in urging the peaceful path with the assurance of our cooperation, understanding and support. If we fail to do this . . . then we may well find future explosions on our own doorstep.

Mr. Chairman, we have both a moral and legal obligation to aid our sister republics of this hemisphere in achieving healthier, better educated, more productive lives for their citizens and in maintaining the momentum to secure real social and economic progress. We must not ignore this obligation and should give meaning to our commitments by actively supporting self-help efforts. I urge our colleagues to support S. 748 and hope this legislation will be enacted without further delay.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could vote on these amendments to the committee amendment now?

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to address just a few remarks on this subject.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on these amendments to the committee amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on these amendments to the committee amendment close in 10 minutes.

February 1, 1972

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

It seems to me that what Ecuador and other countries are doing is the taking of the law into their own hands. There is a good basis for reestablishing the rights of countries in and to territorial and international waters, but for any country to undertake to stop our fishing vessels and decide for themselves that their territorial limits extend to a distance of 200 miles is quite inconsistent with international law and a direct affront to this Nation.

And, it is a great affront to this Nation, and for us to continue to pour money into a country which at the same time acts in that way. It seems to me that boarding and commandeering our vessels amounts to the same thing as the expropriation of our properties.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of private money that would go into South America right now if the leaders would change their attitude toward the private American firms which want to invest there.

It seems to me this is a two-way street. While we want to see economic development in South America we must tell the Latin American leaders that they must act in a manner consistent with international law and consistent with the rights of our Nation and its citizens, as well. I am hopeful that we can support this amendment and have it embodied as a part of the law. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) for offering this important amendment to the law.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. REES).

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I would oppose this amendment because it confuses present international conferences where the nations of this world are trying to deal with the problem of where each nation draws its territorial boundaries in the ocean.

We have, for example, Brazil going out to a 100-mile limit. We have the case of the United States seizing the Soviet trawler which was out to a limit of 5 miles when, supposedly, we only recognize 2 miles.

I think that when the nations of the world are trying to negotiate a reasonable ocean territorial accord, it would not be proper to put this type of restriction in this bill.

You have to remember that countries such as Ecuador and Peru have as major industry fishing and they feel they have to protect this industry in their own national interest and for their own national survival. I think we should be very tolerant during this period of time and that

we should wait to see what happens in the international negotiations in order to see if the nations of this world cannot agree upon what should be the correct territory to assert in the oceans, these areas of great interest to them.

So I would urge a "No" vote on this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Anderson of California amendment because I think it imposes upon the Department of the Treasury unusual and new duties which it is ill equipped to carry out.

I believe that the determination as to whether a vessel has been fishing illegally on the high seas is simply beyond the current ability of this particular department.

On the other hand, I do want to support the committee's expropriation amendment which I feel certainly will not punish any country which wishes to expropriate, as long as it is willing to enter into negotiations for reasonable payments for its expropriations.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, when the Congress was meeting in Philadelphia in 1798, a Member of the House, I believe he was from South Carolina, and I believe his name was Harper, arose and said something to this effect:

Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute.

In this campaign that is being carried on by some Latin American countries, seizing American fishing vessels and their crews on the high seas, I say the time has come to ignore the strip-pants crowd in Foggy Bottom and turn to the Navy for a demonstration of gunboat diplomacy.

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

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

Mr. DENT. I support this amendment, because I just came back from a tramp cruise on the Atlantic. Eighteen miles off the New Jersey shore from Atlantic City we counted on our scope 258 Soviet, Yugoslav, and other vessels. On the North Banks we counted 192 of the same type ships, mother vessels, supply vessels and others. They are dragging everything out of that ocean that crawls, swims, or runs. But, they do not eat them. They turn them into meal or fertilizer. They process it all on the offshores of the United States. Two or three days later we had to escort into one of our ports two Russian fishing trawlers. And that is the worst kind of involvement in destroying the sealife and seafood for the larger fish that move up and down the coast of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

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

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON). I hope that the Members of this Committee recognize that we signed treaties with these Latin American countries as far back as 1909 providing that any differences would be adjusted through an impartial conference. They have refused to participate in any such conference. We have asked them to try and settle our fishing disputes by submitting the issue to the International Court of Justice. This they have refused to do. We have asked them to have the matter mediated and they have refused to do so. They will not discuss the subject.

I think the Members of this House should recognize that this issue is one that can go in one or two directions. Either we are going to have those who are affected adversely by this seizure, in other words our American fishermen, satisfied by deterring these seizures of their property by these Latin Americans, or we are going to have boycotts and the people are going to have to take matters into their own hands through picketing ships from those countries.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a fair amendment, just asking our U.S. representative on the Board of the Bank to vote against a loan to those countries who seize our boats. I do hope the Members of this Committee of the House will support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Anderson amendment relating to the limiting of these funds in the Inter-American Development Bank Act to any country that is presently making, or has made, a definitive practice of expropriating American property. I know full well that my colleague from California (Mr. ANDERSON) has continually worked for legislation to reduce this kind of piracy on the high seas that Ecuador and other nations have practiced against tuna boats and other forms of American property. My colleague (Mr. ANDERSON) has been diligent and persistent in his efforts to see that legislative action is taken to do something about this problem rather than just uttering words of complaint. This amendment is a vote to protect American property of all kinds and should be added to the legislation since we are asking the American taxpayers to put up their hard earned money under this act.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON). I think the issue is being

confused into thinking in terms of the opposition of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow), to the amendment we have already attached in committee, which I think covers the ground that has been needed and is long overdue, calling for congressional policy which we seek to do by that amendment. The Anderson amendment is really not germane to this in that it refers to fishing vessels whereas we are talking about investments through the Bank in an entirely different type of activity.

I would suggest to the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) that if he really wants to do something about the seizure of fishing boats that he should introduce a bill or go to the gentleman from Iowa in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and get some kind of amendment that would affix a tax to the imports into the United States from those countries who are violating American property rights. That would be meaningful and that would really say something. This amendment even if it were to be adopted into this particular bill would be meaningless. It would do nothing to stop or help or give any relief for the seizure of ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) to the committee amendments.

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments, as amended.

The committee amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. The Inter-American Development Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 22. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President has made a determination, and so notified the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances (as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such instruction shall continue in effect until the President determines, and so notifies the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to prevent such sale or entry of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances."

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, we are all aware that the amendment which was offered by the Committee on Banking and Currency to direct that our representatives on the Inter-American Development Bank cast a negative vote as to loans for those

countries that attempt to seize American investments in their country without paying prompt, adequate, and effective compensation is a way for America to demonstrate its deep concern about these acts of countries whose economies development we are attempting to assist.

To this extent, it seems fitting and proper that when we find out that those countries we are helping to build a better way of life for their citizens demonstrate a lack of concern about the international trafficking in drugs, allow the opium crops to grow, to be grown within their borders, allow the seeds and morphine to be processed, and allow heroin to be transported right through their countries—knowing that the target will be the people of the United States of America—certainly we should do the same thing when the President of the United States has made a determination that they are not cooperating with this Government. That is to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct our representatives to cast that negative vote.

On January 25, the House of Representatives took a historic step forward by authorizing the President of the United States to cut off all foreign aid to those nations not assisting us in our drug control efforts.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The Members on this side are willing to accept your amendment.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the chairman for his consideration of this amendment, and hope that, in view of the gentleman's statement, my colleagues will agree. I thank you very much.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEDZI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 748), to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contributions to the fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, pursuant to House Resolution 784, 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 third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be 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 that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. 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 285, nays 102, not voting 44, as follows:

	[Roll No. 14]	YEAS—285
Abourezk	Eshleman	McCulloch
Abzug	Evans, Colo.	McDade
Adams	Fascell	McDonald,
Addabbo	Findley	Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	McEwen
Anderson, Ill.	Fisher	McFall
Andrews	Flood	McKay
Annunzio	Flowers	McKevitt
Arends	Foley	McKinney
Ashley	Ford, Gerald R.	Macdonald,
Aspin	Ford,	Mass.
Aspinall	William D.	Madden
Badillo	Forsythe	Mahon
Barrett	Fraser	Mallard
Begich	Frelinghuysen	Mallary
Belcher	Frenzel	Mann
Bergland	Frey	Mathias, Calif.
Betts	Fulton	Matsunaga
Biaggi	Gallagher	Mayne
Blester	Gettys	Meeds
Bingham	Garmatz	Melcher
Blanton	Giaimo	Metcalfe
Blatnik	Gibbons	Michel
Boland	Goldwater	Milka
Bolling	Gonzalez	Miller, Calif.
Bow	Grasso	Minish
Brademas	Gray	Mink
Brasco	Green, Oreg.	Minshall
Brooks	Green, Pa.	Mitchell
Broomfield	Griffin	Mollohan
Brotzman	Griffiths	Monagan
Brown, Mich.	Grover	Morgan
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Morse
Broyhill, N.C.	Halpern	Mosher
Buchanan	Hamilton	Moss
Burke, Mass.	Hanley	Murphy, Ill.
Burleson, Tex.	Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton	Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi
Byrne, Pa.	Harrington	Nelsen
Byron	Harvey	NIX
Cabell	Hastings	O'Neil
Caffery	Hathaway	Patman
Carey, N.Y.	Hawkins	Patten
Carney	Hays	Pelly
Cederberg	Hebert	Pepper
Celler	Hechler, W. Va.	Perkins
Chamberlain	Heckler, Mass.	Peyser
Chappell	Heinz	Quie
Chisholm	Helstoski	Railsback
Clark	Henderson	Rangel
Clausen, Don H.	Hicks, Mass.	Rees
Cleveland	Hicks, Wash.	Reid
Collins, Ill.	Hillis	Price, Ill.
Collins, Tex.	Hogan	Pucinski
Colmer	Hollifield	Quie
Conable	Hosmer	Rangel
Cotter	Howard	Ried
Coughlin	Jacobs	Rodino
Curlin	Johnson, Calif.	Roncalio
Daniels, N.J.	Johnson, Pa.	Rooney, N.Y.
Danielson	Jones	Rooney, Pa.
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Rosenthal
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Tenn.	Rostenkowski
Davis, Wis.	Karth	Roush
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Roy
Delaney	Kazan	Royal
Dellenback	Keating	Ruppe
Dellums	Kee	Ryan
Diggs	Keith	St Germain
Dingell	King	Sarbanes
Donohue	Kluczynski	Saylor
Dow	Koch	Scheuer
Drinan	Kyl	Shewell
du Pont	Landrum	Schneebell
Eckhardt	Leggett	Shoup
Edwards, Ala.	Lent	Shriver
Edwards, Calif.	Link	
Eilberg	Lloyd	
Erlenborn	Long, Md.	
Esch	Lujan	
	McClory	
	McCullister	

February 1, 1972

Sisk	Teague, Calif.	Widnall
Skubitz	Thompson, N.J.	Wiggins
Smith, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.	Williams
Springer	Thone	Wilson, Bob
Stanton,	Tiernan	Wilson
J. William	Udall	Charles H.
Stanton,	Van Deerlin	Winn
James V.	Vander Jagt	Wright
Steiger, Wis.	Vanik	Wyatt
Stephens	Veysey	Wydler
Stokes	Vigorito	Wyman
Stratton	Waldie	Yates
Sullivan	Ware	Young, Fla.
Symington	Whalen	Zablocki
Talcott	Whalley	Zwach
Taylor	White	

NAYS—102

Abbitt	Haley	Rarick
Abernethy	Hall	Roberts
Archer	Hammer-	Robinson, Va.
Ashbrook	schmidt	Roe
Baker	Harsha	Rogers
Baring	Hull	Rousselot
Bennett	Hungate	Runnels
Bevill	Hunt	Ruth
Bray	Hutchinson	Sandman
Brinkley	Ichord	Satterfield
Broyhill, Va.	Jarman	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Jones, N.C.	Schmitz
Burlison, Mo.	Kemp	Scott
Camp	Kuykendall	Sebelius
Clancy	Landgrebe	Slack
Collier	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Crane	Long, La.	Snyder
Daniel, Va.	McClure	Spence
Denholm	McMillan	Steed
Dennis	Martin	Mathis, Ga.
Dent	Martins	Steiger, Ariz.
Devine	Mazzoll	Stubblefield
Dickinson	Miller, Ohio	Stuckey
Dorn	Mills, Md.	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Mizell	Terry
Downing	Montgomery	Thompson, Ga.
Dulski	Myers	Waggoner
Duncan	Natcher	Wampler
Flynt	Nichols	Whitehurst
Fountain	Pettis	Whitten
Fuqua	Pickle	Wylie
Gaydos	Pike	Yatron
Goodling	Price, Tex.	Zion
Gross	Quillen	
Hagan	Randall	

NOT VOTING—44

Alexander	Derwinski	O'Hara
Anderson,	Dwyer	O'Konski
Tenn.	Edmondson	Passman
Bell	Edwards, La.	Powell
Blackburn	Evins, Tenn.	Preyer, N.C.
Boggs	Galiianakis	Pryor, Ark.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gude	Purcell
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Seiberling
Casey, Tex.	Horton	Sikes
Clawson, Del	Kyros	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Lennon	Staggers
Conte	McCloskey	Steele
Conyers	McCormack	Ullman
Gorman	Mills, Ark.	Wolf
Culver	Moorhead	Young, Tex.

So the bill passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kyros for, with Mr. Passman against.
 Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Sikes against.
 Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Blackburn against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gude.
 Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Conte.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Casey of Texas with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Clay with Mr. McCormack.

Mr. Galiianakis with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Steele.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Seiberling.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Preyer of North Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PATMAN. 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 (S. 749) to authorize United States contributions to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank.

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 S. 749, with Mr. NEDZI 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 Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WINNALL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, in the 1970's Asia may hold the key to world peace. No other geographical area has such potential for conflicts. Economic growth is essential if Asia is to avoid further conflict in the 1970's. And one major method of achieving growth is to assist Asian nations in creating the conditions for economic progress. Roads and ports must be built, the agricultural sector must be improved, power and electricity must be furnished, industry must be supported, and schools must be built and equipped. With improvements in infrastructure, per capita income should rise, and many Asian nations can take steps to assuage the poverty so prevalent in their countries.

The Asian Development Bank is well equipped to help create a sound economic infrastructure in Asian countries. As a multilateral institution, it may make loans free from the domination of a single country. It brings to its lending operations technical skills and expertise in the problems of Asian development. It provides an institutional setting in which developed nations—both Asian and non-Asian—can contribute to Asian development. This permits an equitable sharing

of the burden of developmental financing. Most importantly, the Asian Development Bank, in its first 5 years of operation, has a sound record of achievement, and has prudently managed the resources made available to it.

Of the lending facilities of the Bank, the special funds may be of increasing and critical importance in this decade. From the special funds the Bank makes loans on concessional terms, charging 2 to 3 percent interest on loans as long as 40 years. These loans may be a key element in the economic development of the lesser developed Asian countries. We are all familiar with the enormous debt-servicing burdens of these countries—and these costs will rise dramatically—if these countries must borrow at commercial rates of interest. Loans on concessional terms are also designed to support projects to improve the economic infrastructure of the developing countries. These projects do not yield immediate short-term economic benefits, which would normally justify borrowing on commercial terms. Instead, the benefits are long range.

Loans from the special funds resources will do much to promote development in Asia. A loan already committed to Nepal, for example, will assist in financing the importation of tractors, which will be made available to more than 1,000 farmers. A loan to Singapore will aid the expansion of a technical college; this was the first of the Bank's loans for education. As of June 30, 1971, the Bank had extended 21 special funds loans to 11 countries, in the total amount of \$71 million. The Bank has also used specially pledged funds to provide technical assistance to some 15 countries.

I strongly endorse S. 749 because economic development in Asia will be so critical to its political stability in the 1970's. The bill provides for a U.S. contribution to the ADB's special funds of \$100 million, payable in two annual installments of \$60 and \$40 million.

The United States will not be alone in making contributions to the Asian Development Bank, for nine other countries have pledged or contributed more than \$174 million to the special funds. Six European countries are contributors, and Canada has made a commitment of \$25 million. Japan has contributed \$100 million. In making their pledges and contributions, other countries have relied on the proposed \$100 million contribution by the United States.

The bill now before the House also contains numerous safeguards to protect U.S. interests. The U.S. balance of payments will not be significantly affected because the U.S. contribution will initially be tied to U.S. procurement, and because the U.S. letter of credit will be drawn against only to meet specific procurement contracts, or to defray certain administrative expenses. Procurement in other countries is possible only pursuant to procedures described in the bill. A committee amendment, finally, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to implement a U.S. expropriation policy in accordance with the principles of international law. In certain conditions, thus,

he must direct the U.S. Executive Director to vote against a loan to a country which has nationalized property beneficially owned by U.S. citizens.

The manifest need for concessional funds for Asian development, and the wisdom of channeling development financing through the Asian Development Bank, led the House in 1970 to pass a bill which was substantially the same as the bill now before us. Events of the last year make it imperative that the House take similar action this year. Failure of the United States to play a key role in adding to the special funds will jeopardize the concessional lending activities of the Bank. It is imperative, thus, that the House vote again to authorize a U.S. contribution to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) such time as he may use.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, this bill would authorize the United States to contribute \$100 million to the Asian Development Bank Special Funds, which is the soft loan facility of the Asian Development Bank. Other countries have already contributed \$174 million, many on the expectation that the United States would contribute. The House has previously approved this authorization, but the other body did not agree. I am glad to report to you that the Senate last year approved this authorization, and has receded from its former position. Favorable action by the House today would enable us to conclude this matter.

The Asian Development Bank is a new institution, having begun in 1966, but its development to date has been most promising. Its leadership has been outstanding and its programs sound. The bank has attracted considerable support from Japan, which has made contributions to it equal to our own, and 12 European countries have likewise demonstrated their support. Indeed, to date the U.S. contribution amounts to only 20 percent of the Asian Development Bank resources—and we have contributed nothing to the special funds.

I believe that the Asian Development Bank has earned our support, and that we should contribute to the special funds facility, just as have other nations. They have proved willing to assume their share of the burden, and that merits our respect and indeed our support.

This authorization is tied to the procurement in the United States; no money from our authorization can be spent for procurement outside this country unless there is some special circumstance—and in no event, even then can the funds be spent elsewhere, save on the specific assent of our Government. This means that our contribution to the Asian Development Bank soft loan facility will have little or no adverse effect on our balance-of-payments situation. Indeed, the effect should be to help open Asian markets more fully to our companies, so it is not inconceivable that our balance of payments picture will actually be helped by this authorization.

As in the case of the Inter-American Development Bank, the funds authorized by this bill would be advanced through

the letter of credit procedure, whereby funds are only drawn against as project needs arise. It is not expected that any of the U.S. funds would be drawn against this year, and only a few millions next year. Budgetary impact will therefore be very small, and in any case will be spread over a period of years.

This bill provides an expropriation amendment, identical to the amendment attached to S. 748. As in the case of the Inter-American Development Bank, this amendment provides a clear U.S. policy on expropriation, one that is consistent with the position of the President, and which is easily workable. The amendment simply provides that in the case of a country that has expropriated U.S. property, the U.S. executive director will be instructed to vote against use of any ADB resources in the expropriating country until and unless there has been prompt, adequate, and effective compensation, or the matter has been submitted to arbitration, or there are good faith negotiations in progress aiming at a fair settlement.

Mr. Chairman, the House has approved this authorization before, so I need not belabor the issue further here. I feel certain that the Asian Development Bank has proved its potential, and that it has demonstrated its capacity to attract international support and contributions. It has earned our support, and I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 749. We are considering today a bill to provide for a U.S. contribution of \$100 million to the multipurpose special funds of the Asian Development Bank. I want to make clear my strong support for this bill, which has just been reported favorably out of committee. In my view, the Asian Development Bank in the 4½ years since its founding, has amply and visibly demonstrated that it is a fully viable and soundly managed institution, one which merits our trust and support.

Let me summarize very briefly the record of its accomplishments: it has made 84 loans totaling more than \$632 million—as of December 31, 1971—on both conventional and concessional terms, undertaken 60 technical assistance projects in 15 regional member countries. The bank has provided long range studies and surveys in the fields of transportation, agriculture and industry. In short, Mr. Chairman, this bank is making a significant contribution as a lending institution and as a catalyst for economic development for the free countries of Asia and the Far East.

At the same time, it has firmly established itself as a reputable borrower in the private capital markets of the world. Last year for the first time, the Bank entered the U.S. private capital market, following successful borrowing operations in Japan, Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. In addition, the Bank has borrowed from regional central banks in Asia. There is every indication that it will be welcome again to these markets and to others as yet untapped to replenish its ordinary capital lending resources.

Unfortunately, the private capital markets of the world cannot provide the bank with resources it needs for lending on concessional terms. By their nature, loans of this type to the least developed member countries—which finance roads, schools, hospitals, and other similar projects with indirect but highly valuable economic returns—must be provided from member government resources.

This is the purpose of the bill we are now considering, a bill to provide a U.S. contribution of \$100 million to the special funds for concessional lending of the Asian Development Bank. Other major donor countries—including Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom—have already made available more than \$174 million. The favorable decision of the House in 1970 on this legislation was a proper action then, and is now. I urge prompt and favorable action on this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) such time as he may consume.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, having had the opportunity to travel in Asia with Eugene Black, one of the great statesmen of this country, in helping to set up this institution and having watched it as a member of this great committee as the Bank has developed and has lived up to the great expectations which we held for it, I think this is an appropriate move for us to make.

I suggest that in this approach we do several things to overcome the criticisms that were being leveled against our foreign aid program.

Even though this is a so-called soft window, this is still a controlled loan situation in which the project first has to be justified. The money comes from many nations besides our own, and they must have local money in every one of these projects. So, many of the things we have sought for are in this Bank, and they are getting our policies carried out in the places where we need assistance.

In 1970 the House voted that a \$100 million contribution be made to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank. The Senate acted favorably on this legislation last year and now it is again before us. It should be passed, because of the manifest need to encourage economic development in Asia through an international institution familiar with Asian problems.

Concessional lending will probably be the key to Asian economic development in this decade. Concessional loans are at interest rates substantially lower than the ordinary commercial rates, and for terms that may run as long as 40 years. Only loans on concessional terms can support improvements in the infrastructure of developing nations. Although remarkable economic progress has been made by Taiwan, South Korea, and a few other Asian countries, the infrastructure of these and the poorer countries needs major development. The agricultural sector of most Asian countries requires

modernization. Better transportation will aid farmers and small industry in bringing their products to the city. Improved power transmission facilities will mean better irrigation, and will set the stage for industrial and educational development. Additions to port facilities will allow freer exchange of goods.

Ordinary commercial lending will usually not support improvements in the infrastructure of a developing country. Interest rates are often too high—in South Korea recently they reached 30 percent—and infrastructure improvements yield long-range and often non-quantifiable benefits for a country, rather than income which can be used to service commercial loans.

Even the relatively low interest rates of ADB ordinary capital lending may prevent countries from making essential investments in their infrastructure. ADB loans from ordinary capital are made from borrowings by the Bank, and thus must reflect—and even exceed—its cost of borrowing. Loans on softer terms are necessary. These loans will themselves encourage further improvement in the infrastructure of developing countries, and will limit the high debt servicing costs which these countries now bear.

It was precisely to enable the ADB to make soft loans that the special funds were established. In its first 4½ years of operation the ADB has committed more than \$71 million in 21 special funds loans to 11 countries. These loans have supported irrigation improvement, land development, rubber and oil palm development, fisheries improvement, agricultural development, a technical college expansion, beef cattle development, and air transport and highway projects. The major recipients of loans from the special funds have been Indonesia, Ceylon, Afghanistan, Nepal, and Laos. A loan of \$2.5 million has been made to Vietnam for fisheries development.

The special funds require additional capital. The present amount—approximately \$174 million pledged or contributed, including \$100 million from Japan—is far too low to support major economic development projects so urgently required in the 19 developing Asian nations which are Bank members. To supplement the special funds, the bill now before the House authorizes a U.S. special funds contribution of \$100 million, payable in annual installments of \$60 million and \$40 million.

If enacted, the present bill would not have a significantly adverse impact on U.S. balance of payments. Under the bill, the U.S. Governor will enter into an agreement with the Bank, which will provide that the U.S. contribution will be used for procurement of goods and services in the United States, and to defray certain administrative expenses. Procurement may be made in other countries only if the U.S. Governor, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, determines—*inter alia*—that such procurement is compatible with the international financial position of the United States. The U.S. contribution, it should be noted, will take the form of letters of credit, which will

be drawn against only when dollars are required for project disbursements. And dollar loans from the U.S. contribution will be repaid in dollars.

The present bill also insures that the United States will not bear the principal responsibility for financing development projects through the special funds. Burden sharing is its key note. At the time letters of credit are issued, the U.S. contribution must be less than 50 percent of the total resources of the special funds, and must be matched by one other country. This condition has now been fulfilled by Japan's commitment of \$100 million.

The bill does not merely focus on concessional lending. An amendment by the Banking and Currency Committee will work to enhance private investment in developing countries by discouraging expropriation of property beneficially owned by U.S. citizens, without payment of compensation in accordance with international law. In certain circumstances the Secretary of the Treasury is required to direct the U.S. Executive Director to vote against a loan to a country which has so expropriated U.S. property.

The numerous safeguards written into the present bill are one reason justifying its passage. A far more important reason is that, in its first 5 years of operation, the Bank has demonstrated its ability to prudently manage its resources. It has earned the confidence of the international financial community, which has backed its borrowings in five major capital markets, including the United States. The Bank staff has recognized expertise in the development problems of Asia, and has successfully employed this expertise in both advising about loan projects, and in deciding on particular loan applications.

Most importantly, the Bank has demonstrated that it has all the advantages associated with lending through multilateral institutions. The sharing of developmental burdens is clearly reflected in the Bank's membership and capital structure. Twelve European countries and Canada are Bank members. Of the regular authorized capital of the Bank of \$1.1 billion, regional members have subscribed to \$625 million, and nonregional members other than the United States, to an additional \$180 million. The U.S. contribution is less than 20 percent of the total subscribed capital and has been matched by Japan.

A corollary of this sharing of development burdens is that no one country bears responsibility for the financing of particular development projects. The politics of lending are largely removed from the Bank's operations.

For all these reasons it is imperative that the House vote in favor of passing S. 749, and thereby authorize a long-awaited and much needed U.S. contribution to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the bill, S. 749, entitled the Asian Bank Act amendments is a bill which we cannot afford not to pass. Needless to say conditions in the Far East are in a state of flux and uncertainty. The President's

announced visit to mainland China is the cause of much consternation in the Far East. At the same time, the Soviets are in the process of expanding their efforts to increase their influence in that part of the world—as witness the recent visit of Andre Gromyko to Japan, reportedly to discuss trade relations with that nation.

This bill, just as the preceding measure, S. 748, provides for assistance to developing nations through a multinational organization. In this regard it is important to note that the member nations are not all Asian. There are 14 non-regional countries made up of the United States, Canada, and 12 European countries; three developed nations in the Far East: Australia, New Zealand, and Japan, and 19 developing Asian nations.

The bill provides for our contribution to the special funds of the Bank, to assist in the financing of high priority development projects and programs in developing countries which are Bank members. A goodly number of contributions and pledges have already been made by other developed nations—many on the assumption that a U.S. contribution would be forthcoming. The Bank has been operating for 3 years and has proven to be a sound financial institution.

This bill, like S. 748, protects American interests in the case of expropriation.

I cannot too strongly urge that my colleagues support and vote for S. 749.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that any Member who wishes may get 5 minutes, under the 5-minute rule, and there is no demand for time on this side, and I understand none on the other side, I ask that general debate now close.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 749

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled That the Asian Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 285-285h) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 12. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the United States Governor of the Bank is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Bank providing for a United States contribution of \$100,000,000 to the Bank in two annual installments of \$60,000,000 and \$40,000,000, beginning in fiscal year 1972. This contribution is referred to herein-after in this Act as the 'United States Special Resources'.

"(b) The United States Special Resources shall be made available to the Bank pursuant to the provisions of this Act and article 19 of the Articles of Agreement of the Bank, and in a manner consistent with the Bank's Special Funds Rules and Regulations.

"Sec. 13. (a) The United States Special Resources shall be used to finance specific high priority development projects and programs in developing member countries of the Bank with emphasis on such projects and programs in the Southeast Asia region.

"(b) The United States Special Resources shall be used by the Bank only for—

"(1) making development loans on terms which may be more flexible and bear less heavily on the balance of payments than those established by the Bank for its ordinary operations; and

"(2) providing technical assistance credits on a reimbursable basis.

"(c) (1) The United States Special Resources may be expanded by the Bank only for procurement in the United States of goods produced in, or services supplied from, the United States, except that the United States Governor, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, may allow eligibility for procurement in other member countries from the United States Special Resources if he determines that such procurement eligibility would materially improve the ability of the Bank to carry out the objectives of its special funds resources and would be compatible with the international financial position of the United States.

"(2) The United States Special Resources may be used to pay for administrative expenses arising from the use of the United States Special Resources, but only to the extent such expenses are not covered from the Bank's service fee or income from use of United States Special Resources.

"(d) All financing of programs and projects by the Bank from the United States Special Resources shall be repayable to the Bank by the borrowers in United States dollars.

"Sec. 14. (a) The letters of credit provided for in section 15 shall be issued to the Bank only to the extent that at the time of issuance the cumulative amount of the United States Special Resources provided to the Bank (A) constitute a minority of all special funds contributions to the Bank, and (B) are no greater than the largest cumulative contribution of any other single country contributing to the special funds of the Bank.

"(b) The United States Governor of the Bank shall give due regard to the principles of (A) utilizing all special funds resources on an equitable basis, and (B) significantly shared participation by other contributors in each special fund to which the United States Special Resources are provided.

"Sec. 15. The United States Special Resources will be provided to the Bank in the form of a nonnegotiable, non-interest-bearing, letter of credit which shall be payable to the Bank at par value on demand to meet the cost of eligible goods and services, and administrative costs authorized pursuant to section 13(c) of this Act.

"Sec. 16. The United States shall have the right to withdraw all or part of the United States Special Resources and any accrued resources derived therefrom under the procedures provided for in section 8.03 of the Special Funds Rules and Regulations of the Bank.

"Sec. 17. For the purpose of providing United States Special Resources to the Bank there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 1972 and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, all of which shall remain available until expended."

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 22, strike out the quotation mark.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, following line 22, insert the following:

Sec. 18. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Asian Development Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country which has—

"(1) nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens;

"(2) taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens; or

"(3) imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned;

unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines that (A) arrangement for prompt, adequate, and effective compensation has been made, (B) the parties have submitted the dispute to arbitration under the rules of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress aimed at providing prompt, adequate and effective compensation under the applicable principles of international law."

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who brought this foreign handout bill to the House floor, why there are no departmental reports to accompany it?

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman. But this is an administration bill. But when we ask the agencies for a report and they do not send us a report but say, "We are ready to testify," and they prefer to come up, and we hear them, and the hearings are printed and made available, we have permitted that to suffice.

Really, I do not see where one could have too much complaint about that, when everything is available in the hearings, and even more than a report could contain.

Mr. GROSS. Am I to understand that this same Bureau of the Budget, which projects a \$38 billion or \$39 billion deficit at the end of the current fiscal year June 30, and another built-in deficit of \$25.5 billion for the next fiscal year, approves this legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, the Bureau of the Budget approved this bill, and the President of the United States supports it.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman from

Texas approves this legislation, of course?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me why this Government is putting up at least 35 percent of the funds for this Bank.

Mr. PATMAN. The bill is much smaller than any other international authorization bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but we still put up 35 percent, do we not?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we take a minority position in the Bank. We get recognized according to our payments into the fund. We paid in 35 percent, and that gives us a minority position. If we paid in 51 percent, of course, that would be different.

Mr. GROSS. We are in the minority in voting strength too, are we not?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct, and we have contributed in the minority.

Mr. GROSS. And we have contributed in the minority?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. We are getting exactly what we are paying for.

Mr. GROSS. If this is such a good deal, how much have we paid into this particular Bank so far, what are the contributions of any other large single country, and what has it accomplished?

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) to answer that.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I made the statement earlier that we have not yet participated in this special fund. This is our first authorization, if we do, to participate in this special fund. We have subscribed to the Bank, naturally. We were the initiators of it. But we are really a minority compared to our position in the other international banks.

Also you asked a question about how much have we participated to it. Well, we have subscribed in ordinary capital \$100 million and in callable guaranteed capital \$100 million, making a total of \$200 million.

But what we are debating here today is the authorization to participate for the first time in a special fund. The other nations have.

Mr. GROSS. What is the difference between the special fund and the capital fund of the Bank?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I think the gentleman knows the difference. It deals with the differences in lending and the variety of operations involved.

Mr. GROSS. What are they doing with the capital fund of the Bank to which we have subscribed 35 percent?

Mr. GONZALEZ. We are disappointed that the gentleman did not listen to the presentation I made earlier. I gave what I thought was a pretty succinct statement about what has been accomplished and why it has been accomplished.

Even though we exerted leadership, we have been a minority participant thus far in this particular Bank.

Mr. GROSS. We have accomplished getting rid at least of all of part of the \$200 million, have we not?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Not exactly, no, sir.

Mr. GROSS. We are really working on it, are we not?

Mr. GONZALEZ. We have subscribed

February 1, 1972

to it, but what has been drawn on from that has been considerably less.

What we ought to keep in mind here is we are talking about not foreign aid as the gentleman has attempted to describe this in the sense that we talk about foreign aid in our participations in a bilateral way. This is a multilateral enterprise. This is one of the areas in which we have been eminently successful in attracting cooperative achievements in Southeast Asia. I believe it is very important for us to realize, even though we exerted leadership, that our actual participation has been minimal. This fiscal year it is not much. Through a departmental report you cannot get much more from the Secretary of the Treasury, because there will be no outlay of American dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GROSS. Whether it is bilateral or multilateral aid, we are getting rid of money that we desperately need in this country. Is that not true?

Mr. GONZALEZ. No, sir. There is a difference. What you are talking about bilaterally is a different type of aid from your loan situation which these banking institutions represent. We are not giving, but we are lending money.

Mr. GROSS. We are lending money.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. For 30, 40, and up to 50 years; is that correct? Well, make it 40 years as an example.

Mr. GONZALEZ. In some cases.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not want to bet a lead nickel on the fact that we will collect those 40-year loans, would he?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes, I would bet on it.

Mr. GROSS. We are already being warned that we are going to see all kinds of defaults on the soft loans already made and they are just now—

Mr. GONZALEZ. Well, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. The first soft loans that were made to foreign countries are just beginning to reach the point of payments on principal and we are being warned now that there will be defaults on those payments.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. In which case? In the case of the Inter-American Development Bank or some other institution, or in the case of the bilateral loan programs? I am not clear.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, as long as this Government foolishly keeps pumping billions of dollars in other forms of foreign aid into these countries, they may not default on these loans, but there must come a day in this country—and if the gentleman does not recognize it he had better begin to recognize it—when we are going to be faced with financial collapse and then what is going to happen around the world to these 30-year, 40-year, and 50-year so-called loans with a 10-year grace period on which they pay not a dime of interest and do not begin to pay

a dime on the principal of the loan for 10 years?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: In what cases are you referring to about this notice of default? What kind of cases?

Mr. GROSS. In all cases of soft loans. We have them all over the world, and they are not limited to any single lending institution.

Mr. GONZALEZ. We must.

Mr. GROSS. There are only one or two that do not have soft loan windows.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I beg to disagree, because in the case of the Inter-American Development Bank not only is it operating extremely conservatively, but it shows a net profit of \$30 million.

Mr. GROSS. There are billions in 30-, 40-, and 50-year loans out with a 10-year grace period before any repayment starts and you are just now beginning to come down to the wire.

Mr. GONZALEZ. You could not possibly have a default if they have had a return of \$30 million.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman and I are not going to resolve anything. The gentleman cannot convince me that these are sound loans; that any part of them are sound loans, or that we will ever get anything back, even a pittance of what we put into them. You cannot convince me and I cannot convince you. I am well aware of that.

Let me ask you this question: Can this bank use any of its assets, special funds or capital funds of the Asian Bank—can they be used in any way to make good on Henry Kissinger's promise that we are going to put out \$2.5 billion to bribe the North Vietnamese?

Mr. GONZALEZ. No, sir; not at all. They are not members of this association. They could not possibly be.

Mr. GROSS. That is not the question. The question is, can any of the money in this Bank, under any circumstances, be used to carry out what has been reported as his proposal to do this humiliating thing, one of the most humiliating proposals I have ever heard of in my life, to pay the North Vietnamese \$2.5 billion if they will end the war?

Mr. GONZALEZ. No.

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

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Would the gentleman say to the Members of the House that you oppose subsidized REA cooperative loans in order to establish a telephone system in this country and that the Members should be opposed to these subsidized loans?

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any default by the REA on any loans?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is not the question. The question is if a Member did not oppose subsidized loans to the REA, we should oppose this?

Mr. GROSS. I would be perfectly willing to loan money to foreign governments, if available, if I could be sure they would repay it on schedule.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. At subsidized rates?

Mr. GROSS. No; the going rate of interest, and that is what the REA ought to be paying.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to listen to this conversation, especially after receiving the latest figures from the Treasury Department that I received about a month ago.

The United States owes to foreign countries at this moment \$63 billion. These \$63 billion stem from the adverse trade balances in spite of the deliberate lies and false figures fed to this House from the very first day that I came into this Congress by each succeeding administration. Aside from the \$63 billion we are owed from foreign countries, \$27 billion of which only \$3 billion are collectible on demand. The rest are soft loans, subsidized loans to the agencies of the various international development funds. These are subsidized exports that they are not paying for on demand, but are part of forgivable debts.

We have also just finished a meeting with Kosygin in Russia, and he has demanded as a preagreement contract with the United States for export-import trade that, first, the Soviet Union be given a favored nation status. Second, that the Soviet Union be eligible for all loans and all credits now given to any other trading nation, including the Export-Import Bank credits. He has also asked, in the face of what he says is a dire need in the Soviet Union, for certain types of industries. His proposition is that the United States go into Soviet Russia and build certain types of industries using our credit and not theirs. As a precontract agreement they demand that in 5 years we buy back from Soviet Russia the products of these new industries equal to the cost of the plants so that the plant and the industry is paid for.

Then a further stipulation is that we continue to buy in the same volume that we bought in the first 5 years from them the products of these industries for the next 20 years.

This agreement I think is already secretly agreed to—because we are in the kind of government today where all agreements have to be secretly worked out.

For this we are going to have the great privilege of selling agricultural products, particularly protein foods for their feed-lots, since they have a shortage of protein and need meats. We will sell these feed grains at 17 to 20 cents a bushel less than we sell to our own feedlot operators in the United States.

Then there is the further stipulation that these will have to be shipped in Soviet bottoms, setting aside the 50-percent allowance we have for the American merchant marine at this moment under the so-called subsidized exportation of foreign aid products.

I asked for a trade covering all of the years since 1960. The Commerce Department gave me a list showing the balance of trade on a census basis and the balance of trade on a balance-of-payment basis, and I find that from 1960

to 1971 every year, according to the Commerce Department, except 1971 there has been a surplus balance of payments in our favor. However, in a recent publication I discovered, backed up by dates and statistics, that in the years 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 the Commerce Department shows a balance-of-payments surplus in our favor.

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

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

Mr. DENT. The balance of payments in our favor according to the Department of Commerce figures of 19 billion plus dollars for this 4-year period. But in the statistics of a public document now available to every Member of the Congress, it shows in the same period of 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 a balance-of-payments deficit of \$10,600,000,000 in that 4-year period.

On the floor of this House in 1962, I put in the RECORD what I said was the deficit for 1960, 1961, 1962 of \$6,700,000,000. The House was told that I did not know what I was talking about. I am telling you at this moment that we are nearer to bankruptcy than any other nation in the world; that we owe more money today than all of the other nations combined; that we are losing on the basis of actual trade figures which are true, an amount equal to the budgets of a majority of the countries trading with us.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we have just heard from a gentleman who has shown more than adequate credentials in the field of international trade and poses a very important consideration on a question of specific trade.

Of course, this bill does not seek to deal with the problems he has discussed.

I would like to redirect your attention to the fact that this bill is talking about a process that we cannot help but take a part in. It is a process of regional development predicated on the proposition that if there is too wide a gap or too long a time of continued separation between those that have and those who have not, it jeopardizes not only the peace but jeopardizes the economic viability of the world itself.

As a large nation, one of the greatest nations in the world, it would seem to me imperative upon us that we take a reasonable and responsible position in terms of regional development.

We are never going to be able to change this world and put it together the way we want to put it as a whole. We may not even be able to do it by regional development, but the effort we are making I think is the most promising. We are asking for participation by those within the region and by those outside of the regions who have the resources which they can afford to put them to work so that we can all go forward.

We have yet to commit as much as 1 percent of our gross national product to the great effort in regional development in those areas where millions of people are so far below the standard of the developed part of the world.

Our effort has to be maintained and

it has to be continued and we are not going to be able to sit back and say that we do not want to take part in this world any more.

Whatever there is in the future for our trade and whatever there is in the future for a balanced peaceful world, and whatever there is in the future in terms of taking economic advantage of the great overcapacity that our country has created, lies in our backing these kinds of institutions.

Let me say this—our money does not go out of our country. For the most part, we have that money come back here for our goods—and it is our goods that are going out of the country, and they are goods that represent the overcapacity that we have built up in this great Nation. It represents a reflection of our great productivity.

So I would suggest that we support the bill with the sensible amendment by the gentleman from Texas, and I hope that this bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to be proposed? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Committee had risen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair failed to observe the gentleman from New York, who was on his feet.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. The Asian Development Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 19. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Asian Development Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President has made a determination, and so notified the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances (as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such instruction shall continue in effect until the President determines, and so notifies the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to prevent such sale or entry of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances."

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent

that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if the amendment is the same amendment that he offered to the bill that was previously considered by the House?

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Concerning narcotics. I think we would all be willing to accept it. We did before in connection with the preceding bill.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Nedzi, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 749) to authorize U.S. contributions to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank, pursuant to House Resolution 785, 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 third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be 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 that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. 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 256, nays 132, not voting 43, as follows:

	[Roll No. 15]	
YEAS—256		
Abourezk Arends Blester		
Abzug	Ashley	Bingham
Adams	Aspin	Blanton
Addabbo	Badillo	Blatnik
Anderson,	Barrett	Boland
Calif.	Begich	Bolling
Anderson, Ill.	Belcher	Bow
Andrews	Bergland	Brademas
Annunzio	Biaggi	Brasco

recognizes that these projects cannot be supported by hard-term loans. IDA therefore underwrites these projects with 50-year soft-term loans including a 10-year grace period.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join with me in placing the United States in the forefront of this vital multination endeavor to aid these nations in their struggle to take their place among the developed nations of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes the United States to contribute \$960 million to the International Development Association, which is the soft-loan window of the World Bank.

This contribution would be the U.S. share of the third replenishment of the IDA resources, and would be 39.3 percent of the total replenishment. Some 17 other industrialized nations would provide the rest. I would like to point out at the outset that our relative share of the burden in this replenishment would be 4 percent less than our initial contribution, so our relative burden is less. Other countries are carrying the majority of the load, and this proves that the concept of the burden sharing as envisioned by President Eisenhower, and as endorsed and nurtured by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has worked admirably well. The present administration fully recognizes the value and validity of this burden sharing, and has brought forward this request.

The International Development Association started its operations in 1960, after some years of consideration by this and other countries. The concept of a concessional loan facility for the World Bank was recognized by our country, and by both political parties. The record of achievement for IDA has been impressive, and fully vindicates the judgment of those who founded and supported it. From an original membership of 68, IDA has 107 member nations. Of those, 18 are so-called part I countries, which provide the actual resources that IDA uses for its lending. The recipient countries provided some \$263 million in IDA's initial resources, but have not been required to contribute to the replenishment resources. Again, I want to point out that the United States, even though it is the single largest donor, contributes less than half the resources that IDA has. Our 17 partners in the part I category of membership will contribute more than 60 percent of this, the third replenishment.

The United States is behind on its pledge, and IDA is currently being supported by the advance contributions of our partners. These advance contributions will run out this spring, so that if IDA is to remain as the strong and viable institution it is, favorable action on this bill is absolutely essential.

We are not being asked to contribute more than a fair share, but only an amount equal to our relative wealth in the world. Moreover, the World Bank is not asking for a free gift; it contributes about \$100 million annually to IDA through transfers from the earnings it has in its regular lending operations. If we seek fairness, surely this is it, for the

record shows that our partners in IDA faithfully increased their pledges and payments as their ability has increased. Moreover, our partners have also made advance contributions to IDA, to enable it to continue operations in this past year, even though they had no clear duty or responsibility to do so, since action had not been completed on the third replenishment. More eloquent, more convincing proof could not be asked for than this, that IDA has made itself a tool that our partners and allies consider essential for the development of the world. It is the largest of the multilateral concessional lending agencies, with 107 members, and it is the very embodiment of international cooperation and mutual self-help.

At the end of the last fiscal year, IDA had made 274 commitments, totaling \$3.34 billion, scattered through 58 countries. Of these commitments about \$2 billion had actually been disbursed. These commitments included \$177 million in credits to Latin American countries, thus providing additional assistance above and beyond that available through the Inter-American Development Bank. Most of the funds have gone to the areas of greatest need—some \$2.3 billion to countries in Asia and the Middle East. Some \$666 million in assistance has gone to countries in Africa, and \$177 million to Turkey.

Much IDA assistance has gone to India and Pakistan, but their share of IDA credits has dropped considerably in recent years—15 percent between 1967 and 1971, and IDA now reports that as a matter of policy this trend will continue, thus making IDA resources available to a larger number of developing countries.

IDA makes the basic development loans without which development cannot take place. These are the infrastructure loans—the roads, the dams, the electrical power projects, the agricultural projects that are at once costly and difficult to finance by ordinary means. IDA provides the funds that make the crucial difference between a country's ability to finance a project or having to abandon it—for although countries generally provide most of their own development capital, there is often a gap that absolutely cannot be covered except through a concessional loan of the type IDA can offer.

IDA loans go to the sectors where they are most needed—some 25 percent to agriculture, and another 25 percent to transportation projects. Electric power projects, education, and telecommunications projects receive about 6 to 8 percent of IDA credits.

These development projects are the kind of works that we in our own country support with soft loans, through such immensely successful operations as the rural electrification program. Concessional lending terms are familiar to us in our own domestic operations, so we have a sound basis for understanding the need of such programs in other countries. The difference is that we have been blessed with the capacity to finance the domestic programs from our own resources, whereas developing countries must turn to the industrial countries for at least some assistance. IDA provides essentially the

crucial difference between what a country can afford to do on its own and what it must do in order to progress and develop.

As in the cases of other international lending institutions, the contribution authorized in this bill would take the form of a letter of credit, to be drawn against only as need arises. During the first 2 years, drawings against our letter of credit probably would not exceed \$60 million, which is a very small fraction of our total contribution for those years. Most of the drawing down will take place in the midseventies or later. The great advantage of this procedure is that it not only protects us against excessive expenditures in any one year, but also protects our balance-of-payments position. In fact, the adverse balance-of-payments impact of IDA operations probably will not exceed \$30 million during the first 2 years of operations under this replenishment. If, as I believe might happen, the United States becomes more competitive in international markets, we should win a higher share of IDA procurements, and that, together with the fact that IDA operates out of a headquarters in Washington, should mean that our long run balance-of-payments impact will be positive. Overall, the World Bank actually makes a net return to this country—and it is a bargain investment.

I have written, and the committee approved, an amendment on expropriation which is included in this authorization bill. The amendment is identical to the one attached to S. 748 and S. 749. As in those cases, it provides a clear U.S. policy on expropriation.

With particular respect to IDA, however, I would like to emphasize that the expropriation amendment will provide much encouragement for the use of the International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, which is set up in the World Bank for the exact purpose of arbitrating differences involving international investments. IDA nations involved in expropriation problems are already familiar with the Center, and many have signed the Convention which created it. I believe that the amendment will go far toward making it plain that the United States expects only fair treatment in expropriation matters, and that we are more than willing to allow impartial international arbitration to settle disputes.

We have a duty to protect the rights of our citizens, and to assure their fair treatment by other countries. Expropriations may be necessary from time to time, and in the national interests of the countries involved. Yet unjustified actions must be discouraged, because private investment is essential to the development of many countries around the world. If unjustified, capricious expropriations take place we can expect to see a decline in private investment, which will adversely affect the prospects of developing countries. These nations need to effectively utilize all the capital they can save internally, to attract the international assistance that they can, and to encourage prudent private investments whenever this is possible. A fair, sensible international policy on foreign private investment may be a key to this, and that

is why I have offered this expropriation amendment. I believe it is as sensible as it is simple, and I hope that it will be adopted.

The World Bank has been in business for almost three decades. It has proved its worth and value. The Bank, in its ordinary lending operations, earns a good rate of return. About half its earnings are plowed into the soft-loan operations of IDA—and the contributions of the Bank to itself now total better than \$595 million, \$110 million last year alone. The World Bank believes in IDA, and supports it with a healthy investment every year.

Our 17 partners in IDA contributions contribute a healthy share—in fact, will contribute more than ourselves to this replenishment.

Our own country believes in IDA. We helped formulate the agency, and it has received two replenishments in resources from us. Four Presidents have supported it, including President Nixon. I believe that the House should approve this bill, and urge favorable action today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse this bill that is now pending before us. I think it is needed. It is thoroughly justified. It has been well explained by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize one thing in connection with it. On page 4 of the report you will find that prompt action by the United States is essential if the third replenishment is to achieve its goals. Under the terms of the pertinent agreement, the third replenishment cannot become effective until donors pledging not less than \$1.9 billion and including at least 12 of the 18 part I members have notified IDA that they will make the specified contributions. The third replenishment cannot become effective, thus, unless the United States commits its share.

Numerous countries have already committed funds to IDA in advance of the replenishment coming into effect on the expectation that the United States will make its agreed contribution. Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Japan, Kuwait, the United Kingdom and Yugoslavia have pledged or formally committed in advance more than \$314 million. These advance contributions and pledges have been made in the expectation of early action by the United States to make the third replenishment effective. In addition, the World Bank has made its normal annual transfer to IDA out of Bank net profits. This year's transfer amounted to \$110 million.

This, it seems to me, exemplifies what we have been asking that should be done by our representatives in connection with participation in multilateral agencies, an increased sharing in the burden by other nations and a decrease in the share that the United States has put into its participation. The U.S. participation is going down while at the same time major increases are being made by other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill. I think it would be wise to pass it as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes

to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to compliment the House on the action taken thus far for the very substantial margin by which the first two bills were approved this afternoon. The vote on the Inter-American Development Association was 285 to 102 and in the case of the Asian Development Bank the vote was 255 to 132.

The vote in each case was a strong affirmation of the backing of the United States and the Congress on behalf of these two organizations. At this point I would like to urge the members of the committee to equally strongly support the bill before the committee at the present time, the proposed amendments to the International Development Act.

In my hand, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the President which I would like to read, indicating the support of the President for all three of the measures that have been before the House this afternoon. As indicated earlier, the first two measures have already passed, and we now have the third before us at the present time. The action of the President in supporting this legislation follows the action originally taken by President Eisenhower, supported by President Kennedy, likewise supported by President Johnson and now by President Nixon. With your indulgence I will read this letter from the White House. It is dated February 1, 1972:

FEBRUARY 1, 1972.

DEAR JERRY: My January 19, 1972 policy statement on "Economic Assistance and Investment Security in Developing Nations" expressed the great importance I attach to meeting in full the pledges we make to the international financial institutions that play so vital a role in financial development abroad.

I wish to stress now, as I did then, that our contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank represent our most concrete form of support for regional development in Latin America. Together with our vital contributions to the International Development Association, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, they are essential elements in our development assistance policy.

The three bills that are now on the calendar of the House of Representatives, providing for contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank (S. 748), the Asian Development Bank (S. 749) and the International Development Association (S. 2010), are precisely the items of authorizing legislation to which my January 19 statement referred. I strongly urge Congressional passage of these bills—bills which are truly a cornerstone to our search for peaceful development in the world.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, we have done a good job this afternoon, thus far with an overwhelming approval of the first of the two bills on the agenda. I urge at this point a favorable consideration of the legislation now before the Committee.

I add in justifying a favorable vote an important point that has been made by two previous speakers. This is a case, as was the case in the other two, of an instance where if we put up one U.S. dollar, we get considerably more financial cooperation from other contribut-

ing nations. In this instance, for every 2 U.S. dollars utilized, there will be \$3 contributed by the other members of the organization. I think this is a good investment. It will pay off in the future as it has in the past. I urge favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have had some excellent speeches made on this bill from both sides of the committee, and I feel that under the 5-minute rule, the Members will have adequate protection on this particular bill, so I hope we can agree to dispense with further general debate at this time, and that the Members can rely upon the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to yield further time?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I said that I would yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and I would like to do so at this time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to this bill as it is now written. I cannot in conscience pass on to future generations in this country the burden of paying an additional \$480 million which will be put into IDA during the next 3 years—over and above what the annual commitment would be if it were continued at the present level.

I think it is important for this House to distinguish between this bill and the two bills which have just been passed. The loans under IDA do not provide for sound and realistic repayment. They are so-called soft loans—and the repayment experience will not be good.

We now hear about the decreasing percentage of American involvement. But this decrease is actually very small. What we are not told by the proponents is that this bill provides for a one hundred percent dollar increase in our annual commitment.

I do not call this a decrease—I call it adding fuel and fire to the flames of inflation, deficit spending, and our deficit balance of payments in the world.

When this bill last passed in 1969, I believe, there were over 150 votes against it. I think today it is even more critical in this country than it was at that time. Ten years have now expired since we commenced contributions to IDA. The beginning of repayments, if they are going to come, as we have been promised, should be occurring today; so it should cut down the amount of new commitments and additional contributions to be made to this fund.

There is ultimately no provision for any return of these dollars to the Treasury of the United States of America—even if they were repaid which I doubt that they will be.

Mr. Chairman, when the bill is being read and is open for amendment, I will offer an amendment to reduce our commitment—as our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, said previously last year—to its pristine purity, to the amount of money which we are currently contributing today on a per annum basis which is \$160 million rather than doubling it to \$320 million. I do not believe this country can afford to do so at this time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield

3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN).

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and as one who served on the International Finance Subcommittee, I have had considerable opportunity to evaluate the superb achievements of IDA.

Now as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I can view the activities of the Association with an even broader perspective and I am convinced that our participation in the Association is a vital and effective part of our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, the International Development Association is a cornerstone of our efforts in the area of peaceful cooperation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the present bill before us providing for replenishment of IDA's resources.

This bill reflects a reasonable and carefully negotiated international understanding among a larger number of sovereign nations—among which we are important but only one. It represents a plan for orderly financing over a 3-year period of an institution that most of us regard as the leading multilateral institution providing assistance to the poorest nations on concessionary terms appropriate for these countries. Other countries—whose combined contributions exceed the amount we are considering today—have already taken the steps to carry out this multiyear plan; the United States however, has been tardy in allowing the understanding to come into effect and forced IDA to reply upon advance contributions from other countries—contributions which have already been committed.

I think Congress should approve the bargain we struck in fair negotiations with other nations and allow this important replenishment of IDA resources to go forward. Our failure to so act would have important foreign policy implications—far out of line with the cost to us. The replenishment represents a package; other countries agreed to their proposed contribution because we agreed to make a certain contribution. If we refuse now, the replenishment, if it went forward at all, would have to be renegotiated at a greatly reduced level. The probabilities would be—in fact—that we would be denying the poorest countries resources amounting to \$5 for every \$2 we fail to provide, a most undesirable outcome.

Furthermore, the \$320 million per year for 3 years that is our share would affect our budget only over an extended period of years—10 or more. The budgetary impact of our contributions are delayed through the use of letters of credit instead of cash for making subscription payments. There is no budgetary impact until these letters of credit are encashed by IDA to meet its disbursements—which happens only over the next decade or more. The anticipated budget impact for fiscal year 1972 is \$10 million and \$55 million for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, this bill symbolizes the "burden-sharing" we are seeking from other countries a point so well made by the minority leaders. The benefits

from our participation far outweigh the costs. Let us not be so shortsighted as to refuse to bear our fair share in this major effort to help the developing world.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, we now have before us S. 2010, which will provide additional funds to the International Development Association. This organization, established in 1960 as an affiliate of the World Bank, has a proven track record of effective operation and accomplishments. It is the world's largest single multinational institution extending credit on concessionary terms to finance high priority development projects and programs of the least developed of its member nations. The initial membership of 68 has grown to 107 nations. This institution has been a major force in attacking the gap between the developed and developing nations.

I believe it is very important to note several facts. Each dollar contributed by the United States will generate the equivalent of a dollar and a half in contributions by other nations. In comparison with the initial U.S. contribution, the U.S. share authorized in this bill attests to a gradual increase in the development burdens assumed by other countries.

The U.S. contribution takes the form of letters of credit, providing for procurement in the United States. In that regard the executive is currently studying measures to enhance procurement in the United States in respect to projects financed by IDA and plans to increase the flow of information to potential U.S. suppliers. It is also expected that a realignment of international exchange rates should contribute significantly to the competitiveness of U.S. suppliers.

Here again, in this bill, we have the advantage of a multinational organization as a means of our assisting developing nations. And again, we have the committee amendment protecting American interests in the expropriation of American property.

Again I urge the Members of the House to continue their support of this successful international organization and to vote for passage of S. 2010.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further request for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Development Association Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 11. The United States Governor is hereby authorized to agree on behalf of the United States to contribute to the Association three annual installments of \$320,000,000 each as recommended in the 'Report of the Executive Director to the Board of Governors on Additions to IDA Resources: Third Replenishment,' dated July 21, 1970. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, the amounts necessary for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of three annual installments of \$320,000,000 each for the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Association."

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "sections".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARCHER: On page 1, line 8, strike out "\$320,000,000" and insert "\$160,000,000 each", and strike out lines 9 and 10 and through to period on line 11. On page 2, line 4 strike out "\$320,000,000" and insert "\$160,000,000".

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, at a time when the United States is suffering from a serious balance-of-payments deficit, it is, in my opinion, inappropriate for the Congress to authorize a 100-percent increase in our country's contribution to the International Development Association. Through the 10 years that it has existed, the IDA has caused a drain on the U.S. balance of payments. Mr. Chairman, I therefore offer this amendment which would keep our contribution to IDA at the present level of \$160 million per year instead of increasing it to \$320 million per year.

As we are well aware, the United States has not yet brought our balance of payments into equilibrium. In fact, we are now even experiencing a trade deficit. The administration has taken significant and encouraging steps to curb the balance-of-payments deficit and the trade deficit, but we are still going to face this problem in the years to come. A doubling of the U.S. contribution to IDA is hardly in keeping with those measures to improve our trade and balance of payments, and no one can predict with certainty, in spite of what you have heard today, the results of this legislation on our balance of payments, particularly since there is no provision in this act assuring that the funds will be spent in the United States, as was previously in the law.

In the 10 years that IDA has existed the United States has extended over \$1 billion in credit. Of this over \$1 billion, IDA has used \$611 million. Project procurement and administrative expenses in the United States have amounted to only \$328 million, however, or a deficit of \$283 million in our balance of payments.

This week once again Congress has been asked to increase the ceiling on the national debt limit from \$430 billion to \$480 billion. With Federal spending at unprecedented heights, it has been evident for some time that the United States is now overextended. In the face of this situation, we are now requested to increase this particular type of foreign aid by a whopping 100 percent per year. Make no mistake about it, contributions to IDA are another form of foreign aid.

IDA, which is the "soft-loan" affiliate of the World Bank, makes development

loans on a 50-year basis with no interest other than a three-quarter percent per year service charge and no repayment for the first 10 years.

As a recent editorial in the Washington Post indicates, there is every possibility that a majority of these loans will never be repaid.

The American public, in recent years, has expressed its opposition to increasing foreign aid outlays. Now is the time for the Congress of the United States to reverse the process of "spend now and pay later"—thus passing on an ever-increasing tax burden to generations yet unborn. I call upon the House to adopt this amendment to maintain our contributions to IDA at the present level.

Holding the program at the existing level, of course, would require negotiation among IDA member nations concerning the third replenishment agreement. But renegotiation has occurred before. This is not a precedent—and it can be done now.

Perhaps the most important facet of this legislation is that most of our contributions will never be repaid, and in this it differs greatly from the two bills already passed today. I include for the record the January 1972 editorial from the Washington Post which sounds the warning that most lenders and borrowers in this program alike have shut their eyes to the day of reckoning:

THE POOR NATIONS' DEBTS

The development decade, as optimists called the 1960s, is being followed by the debt decade, as realists might call the 1970s. It figured. Eager to lead their peoples into a new world, the governments of the poor nations earlier shopped the world for loans, looking for the cheapest, taking the best they could get. The rich loaned practically everywhere: public lenders did it to buy friends and influence, to create markets for their own exports, even to do good; private lenders did it to make money. Of \$43 billion owed by the developing countries to public lenders, \$20 billion comes due in 1970-75, the World Bank says, and of \$16 billion owed to private lenders, \$13 billion. Until the war crisis, India's debt repayments amounted annually to half of its new loans. The problem has been thoroughly studied and anticipated: Lester Pearson called it "explosive," Rudolph Peterson called it "urgent." Yet most lenders and borrowers alike have simply shut their eyes to the day of reckoning. Now, for an increasing number of countries, it's here.

The symptoms are easily visible. Politically, debt problems mean political tension; economically they mean economic tension. The coup the other day in Ghana, for instance, can be traced quite clearly to Prime Minister Busia's inability to meet his people's demands for a better life, and his creditors' demands for their money. The colonel who ousted him shows no promise of being able to do any better. If the experience of other coup-struck countries is a guide, he will merely use his power to try to repress the discontent that otherwise would have flowed out through democratic channels. He has his work cut out for him because the price of cocoa, the main source of Ghana's export earnings, is sharply down.

Chile's case is interesting, not to say calamitous. Its scheduled debt payments amount to a giant 35 per cent of its export earnings. Currently it's trying to "renegotiate" payments of debts totaling \$3 billion. But lender governments, the international agencies such as the World Bank which they dominate, and the private banks which they influence, are more likely to reschedule debt

payments for friendly governments than for a country like Chile whose relations with Washington are rather bleak. Pakistan last year declared a "moratorium" on its debt service—with no pretense at "renegotiation" and the United States took it in stride.

Anyway, governments, like Indonesia's, which do get their debts rescheduled usually must pay a price—in terms of austerity measures or privileges for foreign investors—which can become very onerous and politically unpalatable, if not at the moment, then later. Borrowers may not like it but the lenders tend to believe in the words of the World Bank, that the answer to the debt problem lies not in "inappropriate terms" but in "the borrowing country's management of its economy."

President Nasser, when asked if Egypt were not falling into thrall to Egypt's Kremlin creditors used to answer with a laugh that the debtor had the upper hand. This was of course, nonsense. A lender can perhaps be defined as someone who can afford to lose his money, but the borrower is not so fortunate. A country like China, apparently alone among nations in having no foreign debt, may dissent, but for others it is surely true that, as the World Bank says, "To be able to borrow abroad is an important advantage." To keep open that advantage for the underdeveloped countries, and to keep it open on terms compatible with their progress and their dignity, is the common challenge the rich and the poor now face.

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

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

Mr. ARCHER. No one, of course, can argue that the goals of this program are not noble, but now, as never before, our attention must be directed to our urgent domestic priorities. Doubling our contribution by an extra amount of \$480 million is an idea whose time should not come now.

I wonder if Will Rogers was not right when he said ironically: "We'll show the world we're prosperous even if we have to go broke to prove it."

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I think your amendment is a reasonable suggestion against a very unreasonable demand on the American taxpayers and properly reduces our American commitment by one-half. In discussing, as the gentleman has, "the soft-loan window" which this legislation really provides the gentleman from Texas has correctly called attention to some of the terms which are available under this program. No matter how worthy some of these projects may be, you have shown by your testimony what the real effect actually is on the basis of what we are voting money for here today. This program provides the kind of long-term loans that none of our constituents can get in their own banking or financial community here at home. So we are taking money from our taxpayers with one hand and giving it to an international institution that turns around and makes liberal and extremely favorable loans available for others, in many cases interest free. Yet our own constituents are unable to obtain this

February 1, 1972

kind of loan at home. In addition our constituents are required to pay 6 to 10 percent on their loans.

Mr. ARCHER. I could not justify it to my constituents.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. A vote for this would be a vote to take money from our constituents to give to another bank that provides extremely liberal terms, while our own constituents cannot get those terms.

I think the gentleman is to be complimented on the very responsible way he recommends that this be cut back to its present level and not be increased by 100 percent. I give my support, for whatever that may be worth, to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Under other normal circumstances I would not debate at this point, but the facts as evidenced by the record are so contradictory to what my colleague from Texas just attempted to present to the House I feel compelled not only to set the record straight but also to give a complete picture of our contributions, their net impact, their merit plus their demerit.

As a matter of fact, since this operation has been in existence, some 11 years, the payments have begun to come in. If my colleague from Texas had bothered to look at the annual report from the World Bank he would have seen this item had a net income last year of over \$7 million; a net positive, affirmative income, not a loss.

Anybody will tell us—and the gentleman from Texas has been in the banking industry or associated with it—that some banks sooner or later make some bad loans. If such has been the case here, I defy any Member to present it.

According to the best available estimates, during the 10 years or more of its operation, IDA has had a negative impact on the U.S. balance of payments of about \$275 million, or, if we want to average it out, \$25 million a year, though last year the adverse effect was about \$3.5 million.

But IDA has also given developing countries resources of \$2 billion, so our losses have been microscopic in relation to the total benefits generated by the IDA contributions. In other words, for the investments made through this particular mechanism the overall results have been multiplied quite a number of times, as we can see, as differentiated from our bilateral aid type agreements.

Moreover, the World Bank must be taken as a whole. We must remember that IDA is a soft window of the World Bank; it is not standing over on its own. When we take the World Bank as a whole, we have had a positive impact on our balance of payments. IDA, after all, is just a part of that Bank.

All during its lifetime, the combined operations of the World Bank and IDA have resulted in \$2.5 billion in positive flow to our balance of payments. I believe that ought to be on the record.

During the next 3 years the estimates are that the combined IDA-World Bank operation will adversely affect our balance of payments by about \$12 million a year, but at the same time the institutions will be generating \$860 million a

year in assistance. In short, if we look at the long run we will be making money, and even if we just consider the short run our balance-of-payments losses as a result of the World Bank-IDA operations are simply microscopic. The return on our investment is literally impressive. Any investor would be happy to have this kind of leverage under any circumstances.

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

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

Mr. ARCHER. The gentleman prefaced his comments with the fact that my facts were inaccurate. I wondered just what those facts were, because the gentleman has confirmed what I stated in my presentation as to the balance-of-payments deficit.

The Library of Congress furnished me with information that during the time of its existence we have had a balance-of-payments deficit of \$283 million from IDA alone. One cannot compare IDA to the World Bank, although it is a part of the World Bank. The other part of the World Bank is run on a realistic basis, but it can exist without the enormous increase of new funds committed to IDA.

I wonder just where in my presentation the gentleman feels I presented the facts inaccurately?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I believe the gentleman left out the very important question that we have to look at the total operation of the World Bank as it affects the IDA operations as well in its impact on our balance-of-payments deficit, if we want to give a complete picture.

Also, in all fairness, I believe the gentleman failed to point out or failed to note that the IDA today is operating at twice its capacity compared to what it was at the beginning. He is asking for the same contribution for half of the membership, whereas we have twice as many today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I will probably ask for some additional time before I get through.

Does the gentleman from Florida wish me to yield to him?

Mr. HALEY. Yes; I do.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, this Member is a little confused here about many things. I understand that this bill calls for approximately \$1 billion. I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It is my understanding—and correct me if I am wrong, Mr. PATMAN—that you today or yesterday appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means opposing the raising of the debt ceiling by \$40 billion. If you oppose that and you are successful in it, then where are you going to get this money?

We are now running at a terrific deficit. I cannot understand your thinking and the thinking of other people here who are going to oppose the raising of the debt ceiling, because you are voting for all of these things.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, for a lucid, quick answer.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. Of course, you do not give quick answers to questions like that, except that his information is incorrect. I have never voted against raising the debt limit when it was necessary to pay our bills. I only suggested that they go at it partially and not give them the whole thing for a whole year and then not see them again for a year but, instead, give them something for 3 months or 6 months and let them come back here. I did not oppose the raising of the debt limit.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, he wants to delay paying for it. That is all.

Mr. HALEY. What the gentleman says is just about the same as what the lady says about being a little bit pregnant. Is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. That is a farfetched illustration.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I will be surprised if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency does not come around soon asking Congress for money to buy some more of those high-speed British printing presses that we have used to produce our printing press money. I will be surprised, if he gets many more spendthrift bills like this through the Congress if he does not come in with a bill to spend some money for faster production of greenbacks.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) said that he rose in wholehearted support of this \$960 million bill, the third foreign handout bill of the afternoon, which will bring the outlay for foreign aid for this one afternoon—because I am sure it will be approved by the House—right close to \$2 billion. I am in wholehearted opposition to it.

And I notice with interest that it has the warm support of the minority leader (Mr. FORD).

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Nation is awash and afloat in red ink. How in the world this House can vote this afternoon to beef up the International Development Association to the tune of \$960 million is beyond me. If there is any concern whatsoever in this House for the desperate financial situation in this country, if there is any concern whatsoever for the generations to come who are going to have to bear the burden of the debt that you are helping pile on their backs here this afternoon, I cannot begin to understand how you can do this.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would be glad to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would say the only way you can believe these kinds of bills, especially the one for the Japanese, the so-called Asian Bank, you have got to be a believer in Alice in Wonderland. You have got to understand that soft loan does not mean "loan." It means "gift." Nobody is going to pay it back.

And then you have got to understand that a Budget Director who estimates there will be a \$6.5 billion deficit and turns out with a \$40 billion deficit is the greatest Budget Director in the history of this country. That is what the President says. And you know if you take the figures and take the President's

statement and if you believe both of them, you have got to be a fan of Lewis Carroll, you have got to believe in Alice in Wonderland. There is no other way you can do it and keep your sanity.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

A little while ago the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) talked about how this money comes back to the United States in one way or the other; how they buy our products in this country. Let me give you an example of what happens by reading from the United Press wire service today and the news item is from Caracas, Venezuela.

But first let me say that I made a hurried check a few moments ago on the telephone and found that the United States has given Venezuela somewhere in the neighborhood of \$400 million in foreign aid.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. We have given through this foreign handout program some \$400 million to Venezuela. What happens?

CARACAS.—First deliveries of FC5 fighter planes acquired by Venezuela from Canada will arrive in Caracas this week, Air Force Chief General Luis Arturo Ordóñez said.

Sixty-five Venezuelan technicians are presently in Canada and in Europe being trained in handling new equipment being acquired by the Air Force, the general said.

In addition to the FC-5s, Venezuela is also buying Mirage aircraft from France.

And, you stand here and tell me that the money has been spent in the United States that we are ladling out to these countries?

If we only knew the truth, if the public only knew the truth about all of the shenanigans that go on in the expenditure of this money, I am sure they would be down here, if they were farmers, with pitchforks trying to prick the conscience and other parts of the anatomy of the individual Members of Congress into some awareness of what they are doing to them and to this country.

How anyone can stand on the floor of the House this afternoon, I say again, and support this kind of business, is beyond belief.

If I read the tables right in this report, we have contributed from the beginning until today more than 40 percent of all the money that has been put into this program. And, if the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) or the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) can stand before the public of this country and justify putting more than 40 percent into any of these so-called lending institutions, I would like to see them do it.

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I think the gentleman makes a very good point, that there are nations that are using multilateral aid for purposes for which it was not intended.

Mr. GROSS. Let me interrupt the gentleman. I do not care whether it is multilateral or bilateral aid. We do not have the money in this country to do what is

proposed here today without further inviting bankruptcy and you know it if you have any sense of fiscal responsibility.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. There is no question but what we disagree with the way in which some of the funds are used, whether they are bilateral, multilateral, or whatever they may be. This Congress on occasion has either formally or informally with regard to the Export-Import Bank and with regard to the Inter-American Development Bank indicated its displeasure not only with the use of the multilateral funds that have been supplied in part by this Nation, not only with regard to credit that is extended by the Export-Import Bank but in all ways, using multilateral funds of this Nation for the purpose of arms when they should be using those funds for other purposes more consistent with the needs of that country.

In fact we have gone so far in many of these cases to indicate to those countries that we do not permit and we will not permit the use of a substitution process whereby although our funds are not used for arms, but our funds are used for their development purposes, they then use their own funds not for development purposes but for the purchase of military arms.

So I think we are not unaware of the problem to which the gentleman has directed himself and I think the Congress should keep a careful watch on this. But the Congress cannot have it both ways. The Congress cannot say, "You cannot use any part of this money for the purchase of arms," and at the same time say, "Buy your arms from us." It just does not fit.

Mr. GROSS. I found in my experience that what multilateral aid does best is to permit people to sweep under the rug the sad results on how the money is spent. It is a good way to keep us from obtaining information.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, is another report on another bill, the third bill considered this afternoon without a single departmental report to go along with it. Not a single word from any agency or department of government. Is the Bureau of Budget ashamed of this bill? Is the administration ashamed of this bill? Why is there nothing in this report to state the position of any official of this administration?

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

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

(On request of Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have asked my colleagues to permit the gentleman from Iowa to proceed for 1 additional minute because the gentleman has raised a good point and that is that the report in this case does not include some of the information which the gentleman thinks it should. I think he is correct on that. However, with re-

gard to the Inter-American Development Bank Bill which we considered this afternoon, the first bill we took up, the report filed in the fall of last year when the Congress acted on the same legislation and passed it, fully covered the information the gentlemen sought today.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I am practical, and I have voted for a lot of these bills for a number of years, but now I want to talk especially to my friends on my left. Last week in the most Republican town and in the most Republican county in my district, with a Republican mayor and all six Republican councilmen, they were turned down for \$250,000 that they asked to go along with a couple of million of their own, or a million and a half in order to upgrade their sewage plant so as to meet the standards of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Now if anybody thinks that I am going to stand here today and vote to give almost a billion dollars—\$960 million, or 4,000 times that much—or maybe it is 40,000—I am not very good with mathematics—as a soft-loan window, with no means for getting it back, and then go out and try to explain to those Republicans why they cannot get \$250,000 but these people can get almost \$1 billion—well, I am not quite that foolish. And I want to say to my friends that if any of you would like to go out to my district and tell them how it is done and why it is done, then I will set up a meeting for you with a good dinner and take you out there. But I am not going to be stupid enough to try to do that.

Now then, we passed a bill here a little bit ago. I voted for the first one. I went along with the so-called Latin American Bank through which we are supposed to try to keep prosperity in this hemisphere, I am told. But I did not go along with that Asian one, and I will tell you why.

I would have made this speech before, but I was upstairs in committee on an appointment. When I got down the Speaker had just resumed the Chair and I did not have a chance to do so.

I had a next door neighbor when I lived out at Lake Barcroft who quit a job with the World Bank to take a job then being formed in the newly developed Asian Development Bank.

He came to see me after 2 years and I said, "How are you getting along?" He was out at the headquarters out in the Far East and he said, "I quit. I am hunting a job." I said, "What is the matter?" He said, "That thing is run by the Japanese; with the Japanese; and for the Japanese." He said, "The head of it is a Japanese and they have not made a loan that has not been used to throw American businesses out of a contract and give it to the Japanese."

Those are his words. I know because I have looked into it—that is exactly what has happened. It might as well be an agency and a branch of the Japanese Government.

We talk about our balance-of-payments deficit. The President slapped a surcharge on everybody. I will just pick

one—France—which has an \$800 million balance of trade in our favor—we sell them that much more than they sell to us. He slapped it on that.

But our problem is with the Japanese. They are the ones who are causing our trouble. If you want to apply a specific remedy, you ought to be putting some kind of remedy on them. Then we can get used to that without spending a lot more money.

I suppose if the truth were known, they are going to make a lot of soft loans for industries which are Japanese controlled and Japanese owned and which are Japanese operated in a lot of these so-called underdeveloped countries. If a crash comes and we wonder what happened to us, well you can say that we were just a little bit too stupid to deal with our friends on the other side of the Pacific.

In addition to that, we have supplied all of their national defense in toto, and are doing so today.

If you want to figure out how much that costs, that is probably another \$15 billion or \$20 billion if they had to provide an air force, and army, and a navy of their own.

So if you think we are not being taken you are mistaken. I want to tell you, my friends, we are coming into a campaign and we well know it. The American people are not so stupid that they do not know what is going on. I supported the President on his Vietnam policy and I supported the President where I could on foreign policy, but I am not going down this road on this bill and the previous bill. I think I know enough to explain it to the American people.

Those of you from either side of the aisle who subsequently vote against appropriations for housing and sewerage and for clean water and for clean air and then vote for this one—well, somebody might just complete a list, and there will be some very tough questions to answer.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I might point out that only a comparatively short time ago, perhaps 2 weeks or 3 weeks ago, this International Development Association made a line of credit available to India in the amount of \$75 million. This was after the U.S. Government was supposed to have cut off all aid to India.

Mr. HAYS. India probably used that money to buy jet planes from the Soviet Union.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. Now, these Latin American countries—if they ever got into a war—they could not have a war without our weapons. What else would they use them for?

In the recent fracas out on the subcontinent between Pakistan and India, it was fought almost exclusively with American weapons—and I guess they can get some more from this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ARCHER) there were—ayes 36, noes 33.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. ARCHER, GONZALEZ, PATMAN, and ROUSSELOT.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 165, noes 191, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—165

Abbitt	Fuqua	Pike
Abernethy	Gaydos	Pirnie
Archer	Goodling	Poage
Ashbrook	Grasso	Poff
Aspinall	Griffin	Price, Tex.
Baker	Griffiths	Purcell
Birling	Gross	Randall
Bennett	Grover	Rarick
Betts	Haley	Roberts
Bevill	Hall	Robinson, Va.
Blanton	Hammer-	Roe
Bray	schmidt	Rogers
Brinkley	Harsha	Roncalio
Broomfield	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Brotzman	Henderson	Roush
Broyhill, N.C.	Hicks, Wash.	Rousselot
Broyhill, Va.	Hogan	Roy
Burke, Fla.	Hull	Runnels
Burleson, Tex.	Hungate	Ruth
Burlison, Mo.	Hunt	Sandman
Byron	Hutchinson	Satterfield
Cabell	Jacobs	Scherle
Caffery	Jarman	Schmitz
Camp	Jonas	Scott
Carney	Jones, N.C.	Sebelius
Casey, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Shipley
Chappell	Kazen	Shoup
Clancy	Keating	Skubitz
Clausen,	Kemp	Slack
Don H.	Kyl	Smith, Calif.
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Snyder
Cleveland	Landrum	Spence
Collier	Latta	Steed
Collins, Tex.	Link	Steiger, Ariz.
Colmer	Lujan	Stubblefield
Crane	McClure	Taylor
Daniel, Va.	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	McKevitt	Terry
Davis, S.C.	Mahon	Thompson, Ga.
de la Garza	Mann	Thompson, Wis.
Delaney	Martin	Thone
Denholm	Mathis, Ga.	Veysey
Dennis	Mayne	Vigorito
Dent	Mazzoli	Waggoner
Derwinski	Michel	White
Devine	Miller, Ohio	Whitehurst
Dickinson	Mills, Md.	Whitten
Dorn	Mizell	Wiggins
Downing	Mollohan	Wilson, Charles H.
Duncan	Montgomery	Winn
Edmondson	Murphy, Ill.	Wynner
Fisher	Myers	Wyder
Flowers	Natcher	Wylie
Flynt	Nichols	Yatron
Fountain	Nix	Young, Fla.
Frey	Pickle	Zion

NOES—191

Abourezk	Brasco	Drinan
Abzug	Brooks	Dulski
Adams	Brown, Mich.	du Pont
Addabbo	Brown, Ohio	Eckhardt
Albert	Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Calif.
Anderson,	Burton	Eilberg
Calif.	Carey, N.Y.	Erlenborn
Anderson, Ill.	Cederberg	Esch
Anderson,	Celler	Eshleman
Tenn.	Chamberlain	Evans, Colo.
Andrews	Collins, Ill.	Fascell
Annunzio	Conable	Findley
Arends	Conte	Fish
Aspin	Conyers	Flood
Badillo	Cotter	Foley
Begich	Coughlin	Ford, Gerald R.
Belcher	Curlin	Ford.
Bergland	Daniels, N.J.	William D.
Biaggi	Danielson	Forsythe
Blester	Davis, Wis.	Fraser
Bingham	Dellenback	Frelenghuysen
Boland	Dellums	Fulton
Bolling	Dingell	Gallagher
Bow	Donohue	Garmatz
Brademas	Dow	Gettys

Giaimo	Meeds	Rostenkowski
Gonzalez	Melcher	Royal
Green, Pa.	Metcalfe	Ruppe
Gubser	Mikva	Ryan
Halpern	Mink	St Germain
Hamilton	Minshall	Sarbanes
Hanley	Mitchell	Saylor
Harrington	Monagan	Schneebell
Harvey	Morgan	Schwendel
Hastings	Morse	Seiberling
Hathaway	Mosher	Shriver
Hechler, W. Va.	Moss	Sisk
Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, N.Y.	Stanton
Heinz	Nedzi	J. William
Hicks, Mass.	Nelsen	Stanton
Hillis	Obey	James V.
Hosmer	O'Hara	Steiger, Wis.
Howard	O'Neill	Stephens
Johnson, Calif.	Patman	Stratton
Johnson, Pa.	Patten	Sullivan
Karth	Pelly	Symington
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Talcott
Keith	Pettis	Tierman
Koch	Peyser	Udall
Lent	Podell	Ullman
Lloyd	Preyer, N.C.	Van Deerlin
McClory	Price, Ill.	Vander Jagt
McDade	Pucinski	Vanik
McDonald,	Quie	Walde
Mich.	Railsback	Ware
McEwen	Rangel	Whalen
McFall	Rees	Whalley
McKay	Reid	Williams
Macdonald,	Reuss	Wilson, Bob
Mass.	Rhodes	Wright
Maillard	Robison, N.Y.	Wyman
Mallary	Rodino	Yates
Mathias, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.	Zablocki
Matsunaga	Rosenthal	Zwach

NOT VOTING—75

Alexander	Gray	Madden
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Barrett	Gude	Mills, Ark.
Bell	Hagan	Minish
Blackburn	Hansen, Idaho	Moorehead
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski
Boggs	Hawkins	Passman
Buchanan	Hebert	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Heilstoki	Pryor, Ark.
Byrnes, Wis.	Holfield	Quillen
Carter	Horton	Scheuer
Chisholm	Ichord	Sikes
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Iowa
Clay	King	Smith, N.Y.
Corman	Kluczynski	Springer
Culver	Kuykendall	Staggers
Diggs	Kyros	Steele
Dowdy	Leggett	Stokes
Dwyer	Lennon	Stuckey
Edwards, Ala.	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, La.	Long, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Evens, Tenn.	McCloskey	Wampler
Frenzel	McCormack	Wolff
Gallifianakis	McCulloch	Young, Tex.
Gibbons	McKinney	
Goldwater	McMillan	

So the amendment was rejected.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, strike out the quotation mark and insert the following:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank and the Association for the benefit of any country which has—

"(1) nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens;

"(2) taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens; or

"(3) imposed or enforced discriminatory

taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned;

unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines that (A) an arrangement for prompt, adequate, and effective compensation has been made, (B) the parties have submitted the dispute to arbitration under the rules of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress aimed at providing prompt, adequate, and effective compensation under the applicable principles of international law."

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. The International Development Association Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 13. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of the Bank and the Association for the benefit of any country with respect to which the President has made a determination, and so notified the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances (as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such instruction shall continue in effect until the President determines, as so notifies the Secretary of the Treasury, that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to prevent such sale or entry of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances."

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was passed in the two preceding bills. It deals with narcotics. I do not think there is any objection to it.

I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and be open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. Nedzi), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2010) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, pursuant to House Resolution 786, 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 third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 165, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—208

Abourezk	Ellberg	McKay
Abzug	Erlenborn	McKevitt
Adams	Esch	Madden
Addabbo	Eshleman	Maillard
Anderson, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Mallary
Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Mathias, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.	Fish	Mayne
Andrews	Foley	Melcher
Annumzio	Ford, Gerald R.	Metcalfe
Arends	Ford,	Mikva
Ashley	William D.	Mink
Aspin	Forsythe	Mitchell
Aspinall	Fraser	Mollohan
Badillo	Frelinghuysen	Monagan
Begich	Frenzel	Morgan
Bergland	Gallagher	Morse
Biaggi	Garmatz	Mosher
Biester	Gettys	Moss
Bingham	Giaimo	Murphy, N.Y.
Blanton	Gonzalez	Nedzi
Boland	Grasso	Neisen
Boiling	Gray	Obey
Bow	Green, Pa.	O'Hara
Brademas	Griffiths	O'Neill
Brasco	Gubser	Patman
Brooks	Halpern	Patten
Broomfield	Hamilton	Pelly
Brotzman	Hanley	Pepper
Brown, Mich.	Hanna	Perkins
Brown, Ohio	Harrington	Peyer
Burke, Mass.	Harvey	Pickle
Burton	Hastings	Pirnie
Carey, N.Y.	Hathaway	Podell
Cederberg	Hechler, W. Va.	Poff
Celler	Heckler, Mass.	Preyer, N.C.
Chamberlain	Heinz	Price, Ill.
Clark	Hicks, Mass.	Pucinski
Collins, Ill.	Hillis	Quie
Conable	Hogan	Railsback
Conte	Holifield	Rangel
Conyers	Hosmer	Rees
Cotter	Howard	Reid
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Curlin	Johnson, Pa.	Riegler
Danielson	Karth	Robison, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Davis, Wis.	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Dellenback	Keith	Rooney, Pa.
Dellums	Koch	Rosenthal
Diggs	Lent	Rostenkowski
Dingell	Lloyd	Royer
Donohue	Lujan	Ruppe
Dow	McClory	Ryan
Drinan	McDade	St Germain
du Pont	McDonald, Mich.	Sarbanes
Eckhardt	McFall	Saylor
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	Scheuer

Schneebeli	Sullivan	Whalley
Schwengel	Symington	White
Seiberling	Talcott	Widnall
Sisk	Tiernan	Williams
Smith, N.Y.	Udall	Wilson, Bob
Stanton	Ullman	Wilson, Charles H.
J. William	Van Deerlin	Wright
Stanton, James V.	Vander Jagt	Wyatt
Steiger, Wis.	Vigorito	Yates
Stephens	Waldie	Zablocki
Stokes	Ware	Zwach
Stratton	Whalen	

NAYS—165

Abbitt	Fuqua	Pike
Abernethy	Gaydos	Poage
Archer	Goldwater	Price, Tex.
Ashbrook	Goodling	Purcell
Baker	Griffin	Randall
Baring	Gross	Rarick
Belcher	Grover	Rhodes
Bennett	Hagan	Roberts
Betts	Haley	Robinson, Va.
Bevill	Hall	Roe
Bray	Hammer-schmidt	Rogers
Brinkley	Harsha	Roncalio
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Roush
Broyhill, Va.	Henderson	Rousselot
Buchanan	Hicks, Wash.	Roy
Burke, Fla.	Hull	Runnels
Burleson, Tex.	Hungate	Ruth
Burlison, Mo.	Hutchinson	Sandman
Byron	Jacobs	Satterfield
Cabell	Jarman	Scherle
Caffery	Jonas	Schmitz
Camp	Kaeding	Scott
Carney	Keating	Sebelius
Casey, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Chappell	Jones, Tenn.	Shoup
Clancy	Kazen	Shriver
Clausen, Don H.	Keating	Skubitz
Clawson, Del	Kemp	Slack
Cleveland	Kuykendall	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Kyi	Snyder
Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Spence
Colmer	Landrum	Springer
Crane	Latta	Steed
Daniel, Va.	Link	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniels, N.J.	McClure	Stubblefield
Davis, S.C.	McCollister	Stuckey
de la Garza	McEwen	Taylor
Delaney	Macdonald	Teague, Calif.
Denholm	Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Dennis	Mahan	Terry
Dent	Mann	Thompson, Ga.
Derwinski	Martin	Thompson, Wis.
Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Thone
Dickinson	Mazzoli	Veysey
Dorn	Miller, Ohio	Waggoner
Downing	Mills, Md.	Wampler
Dulski	Minshall	Whitten
Duncan	Mizell	Wiggins
Fisher	Montgomery	Winn
Flowers	Murphy, Ill.	Wydler
Flynt	Myers	Wylie
Fountain	Natcher	Wyman
Frey	Nichols	Yatron
Fulton	Nix	Young, Fla.
	Pettis	Zion

NOT VOTING—58

Alexander	Green, Oreg.	McKinney
Barrett	Gude	McMillan
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Miller, Calif.
Blackburn	Hansen, Wash.	Mills, Ark.
Blatnik	Hawkins	Minish
Boogs	Hebert	Moorhead
Byrne, Pa.	Helstoski	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Horton	Passman
Carter	Ichord	Powell
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Pryor, Ark.
Clay	King	Quillen
Corman	Kluczynski	Sikes
Culver	Kyros	Smith, Iowa
Dowdy	Leggett	Staggers
Dwyer	Lennon	Steele
Edwards, Ala.	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, La.	Long, Md.	Wolff
Evins, Tenn.	McCloskey	Young, Tex.
Galifianakis	McCormack	
Gibbons	McCulloch	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kyros for, with Mr. Passman against. Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Sikes against. Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Hébert against. Mr. Wolff for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Minish for, with Mr. Galifianakis against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Lennon against. Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Blackburn against. Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Quillen against. Mr. Gude for, with Mr. King against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hansen of Idaho. Mr. Culver with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. O' Konski. Mr. McCormack with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Corman with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Steele.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Ichord with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Messrs. McCOLLISTER and BUCHANAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the fifth annual report on the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. That act authorized implementation by the United States of an automotive agreement with Canada which was designed to create a broader U.S.-Canadian market for automotive products. Included in this annual report is information on automotive trade, production, prices, employment and other information relating to activities under the act during 1970.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 1972.

REPORT ON EARTHQUAKE INSURANCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 5 of the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965, I am hereby transmitting the "Report on Earthquake Insurance" prepared by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the direction of Federal Insurance Administrator George K. Bernstein.

As indicated in the introduction, submission of this report has been delayed to allow coordination with a special study of natural disaster insurance and to incorporate the experience following the February 1971 earthquake in San Fernando, Calif.

I am also enclosing for your attention copies of the transmittal letters of Secretary Romney and Administrator Bernstein.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 1972.

STAGEHANDS AT KENNEDY CENTER SAID TO EARN UP TO \$1,500 A WEEK

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of this morning there is a story from which I read the first paragraph:

Stagehands at the Kennedy Center are making as much as \$1,500 a week under a union contract—apparently the richest in the American theater—that has become the management's biggest embarrassment and headache.

Mr. Speaker, this is not only an embarrassment and a headache; it is an outrage. I hope that the Members of the House, when the pending bill to provide \$1.5 million from the pockets of all the taxpayers of this country to take care of the operating expenses of the Kennedy Cultural Center comes before the House, will defeat it out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire article which I have previously referred to: [From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1972]

STAGEHANDS AT KENNEDY CENTER SAID TO EARN UP TO \$1,500 A WEEK

(By Christopher Lydon)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 31.—Stagehands at the Kennedy Center are making as much as \$1,500 a week under a union contract—apparently the richest in the American theater—that has become the management's biggest embarrassment and headache.

For 125 members of the International Association of Theatrical and Stage Employees, there are at least four factors that make for a bonanza:

1. Hourly rates that are the highest, on average, in the country: \$7.70 for the head electrician, carpenter and property man in each of three theaters, down to a minimum \$6.60 for their subordinates. The comparable hourly wages in Los Angeles are \$6.25

and \$4.35. On Broadway department heads get \$8.65 an hour, but their more numerous assistants get \$5.85, or 75 cents less than their counterparts here.

2. A rule requiring four hours of pay for each assignment or "call." At the Kennedy Center—particularly in the frantically busy, multipurpose Concert Hall—there may easily be four or five calls a day. Stagehands get a full four hours of pay for each of the first two calls and time and a half, or six hours of pay, for each one thereafter.

3. A minimum complement of three department heads during each use of each theater and a "fly man" to handle scenery in the Opera House and Eisenhower Theater.

4. An apparent shortage of stagehands to work Washington's booming schedule of performing arts, so that by midweek the available help has clocked 40 hours and continues at time and a half or double time.

UNION AGENTS SILENT

William Bennett, the stagehand's business agent here for more than 30 years, does not discuss his contracts with outsiders.

As a reporter introduced himself last week, Mr. Bennett proffered his calling card and altered the German shepherd that guards his office on New York Avenue.

"I hope I can do you a favor some day," said Mr. Barrett, smiling cordially. "I know why you're here, but I have nothing to tell you."

Kennedy Center officials, who say paychecks in the neighborhood of \$1,000 a week are commonplace, offer this example of how paychecks get fattened up:

The day's first assignment in the Concert Hall, a four-hour call to set up the platforms and chairs on stage for the National Symphony Orchestra, might start at 9 A.M. and be completed by 10:30 A.M. Another four-hour call for heads of the three stagehands departments might be for a one-hour children's concert at midmorning. At noon there could be a third call for a two-hour National Symphony rehearsal, and at 2:30 P.M. there could be a fourth to rehearse the next day's jazz show for an hour and a half. In the evening, of course, there is a separate call for the National Symphony's concert, which lasts perhaps two hours.

At the end of a day that had spanned 13 hours and included eight hours work, each department head would have had five calls—three at overtime—and would have been paid over \$200, and more if he had already worked 40 hours that week before the day began.

All Sunday work is paid at time and a half unless, as is usually the case, stagehands are already on overtime by Sunday. The Sunday rate then goes to double time.

SHIFTS ARE OVERLAPPING

The fact that three theaters are clustered together in the single Kennedy Center works to the stagehands advantage in the overlapping calculation of overtime.

A man who puts in 40 hours during the week in the Concert Hall starts any weekend work in the Opera House at time and a half, even though he is working in a different theater for a different producer on a different show.

Thus the local sponsors of the Ballet Folklorico of Mexico last weekend had to pay 16 stagehands time and a half and double time for moving the show in and out of the center for two performances.

The stagehands negotiated their contract only weeks before the Kennedy Center's September opening, when tickets to performances had already been sold. They were in a strong bargaining position at the start and appear to have pressed their advantage.

One afternoon during the American Ballet Theater's first visit in September, for example, as stagehands worked on the lighting, dancers came onstage for a workout. The union insisted on being paid for a rehearsal, charging the Kennedy Center for eight hours

lighting and a four-hour rehearsal call, at overtime.

In New York, the American Ballet theater dancers are allowed to use the City Center stage while stagehands are out to lunch. But at the Kennedy Center, stagehands returning from lunch found dancers on stage and billed the center for another four-hour call.

There have been other fights about what constitutes a rehearsal, but the union always seems to win. Last October, when Gary Graffman, the piano soloist, walked onstage before a concert with the National Symphony, ran his fingers up and down the piano, the union promptly billed for the services of three department heads at a full four-hour rehearsal call. The Kennedy Center protested but paid.

Patrick Hayes, managing director of the Washington Performing Arts Society, speaks hopefully of a new contract in which rehearsals would be redefined to exclude warmups and the calculation of overtime hours could not overlap from one show to another.

But Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the center, says he is probably stuck with the contract, though he wishes he never signed it. The stagehands contract has clearly cut the occasional profits and increase the typical losses on Kennedy Center shows, but there is no evidence that it has driven attractions away.

BUDGETARY RESERVES AND IMPOUNDMENT

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have received an up-to-date 20-page report from the Office of Management and Budget, dated January 25, 1972, entitled "Budgetary Reserves and Impoundment."

In this report, OMB has attempted to differentiate between what it considers placing funds in "reserve" and funds that are "impounded." The report continues and lists 14 items OMB considers impounded which total \$1,748,000,000. It also lists 99 items considered as placed in reserve which total \$10,558,778,000.

The report further states that under the Department of Agriculture \$58 million is impounded from the Farmers Home Administration under its sewer and water grant program "to be used for continuation of the water and sewer grant program in fiscal years 1973 and 1974." Also, under the Department of Agriculture, \$107 million is being impounded for loans within the Rural Electrification Administration and OMB states that "apportionment of this entire amount is planned on July 1, 1972."

I have stated on several occasions that my office has discovered the intent of the Nixon administration to impound \$500 million in the vital water and sewer program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The OMB report I have referred to clearly shows that \$500 million indeed is being impounded for use in the next 2 fiscal years. In checking further with sources downtown, my office has learned that in fiscal year 1973 OMB plans to obligate only \$200 million, therefore continuing to impound \$300 million of water and sewer funds at the end of fiscal 1973. Because of the decentralization of this program

in 77 field offices within 10 HUD regions throughout the Nation, it has been nearly an impossibility to check the number of current applications for water and sewer grants. However, one HUD official informed my office that we could safely assume that the present need for these funds exceeds \$1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, what is the sense of priority within this administration? Mr. Nixon asks for no appropriations for water and sewer in his latest budget—only intends to obligate \$200 million next year—intends to impound \$300 million to be brought into fiscal year 1974—and the present need for these funds exceeds \$1 billion.

This is not pork barrel legislation. We are dealing with the lives of thousands, hundreds of thousands, indeed millions of people, their health and sanitary conditions. We are dealing with vital environmental questions.

The administration, through the OMB report submitted to my office, states four reasons which give the executive branch the right to impound. They are:

First, to help keep total Government spending within a congressionally imposed ceiling;

Second, to help meet a statutory limitation on the outstanding public debt;

Third, to develop a Government-wide financial plan for the current year that synchronizes program-by-program with the budget being recommended by the President for the following year; or

Fourth, to otherwise carry out broad economic and program policy objectives.

It is hard for me to notice any meaningful economic and program policy objectives of this administration. It persists in treating domestic programs and the many people affected by them as second order while it continues its efforts toward more spectacular measures such as an unproven ABM system.

It is true that we in Congress set the ceiling on the Nation's public debt and it is true that we establish "upper limits" for expenditures in various programs, but it is equally true that the administration fails consistently to come near these limits and makes public debt ceilings increase because of waste, cost overruns, and a warped sense of priorities.

It is abundantly clear that Mr. Nixon intends his budget to look good by impounding funds from previous fiscal years and not to request funds in an election year—funds for programs where great needs exist.

In addition, my office has found out that there are currently pending 627 applications with REA for electric and telephone loans totaling nearly \$1 billion. Under the FHA's water and waste disposal program there are approximately 1,800 applications for financial assistance totaling over \$148 million. In my home State of Tennessee alone there are over \$13 million in applications now pending before the Department of Agriculture for these two programs.

To stress—these are pending applications and obviously do not include the hundreds of future applications between now and July 1973.

It will be hard put for us, as representatives of the American people, to explain to constituent localities both urban

and rural why these applications for financial assistance for these vital programs are being held up.

I am against waste in Government and for keeping expenditures down in the hope of balancing a seemingly runaway budget. But, Mr. Speaker, we must insist that the practice of withholding by the OMB, especially in the realm of essential domestic programs, cease.

Again, as I have stated on a number of occasions, a grave constitutional question exists here. The House and Senate under our Constitution have the responsibility of investigating through our legislative process the urgent needs of our fellow countrymen. We make appropriations to meet these needs and it is the duty to the executive to move with dispatch to implement programs to solve the problems.

Many basic questions should be asked: Do we really need a \$6 billion increase in the Department of Defense? Do we really need an unproven ABM system? Do we really need an increase of 64 percent in the budget of the Subversive Activities Control Board as Mr. Nixon has requested? The answers to these questions and others are debatable.

But, do we really need full funding for water and sewer programs in rural and urban America? Do we really need full funding to feed the poor and do we really need an accelerated urban mass transportation program and programs for low-rent housing? The answers to these questions are not debatable. The answers are yes.

Let us put our financial resources where it will do the most good and where the needs are the greatest.

The issue of impoundment by the Executive has prompted me to introduce last Wednesday a bill which would require the President to notify Congress if he impounds or authorizes the impoundment of appropriated funds. Congress would then have 60 days in which to approve of the President's action. If Congress does not approve, then the President would be required to release the funds.

Response to this proposed legislation has been overwhelming with at least 40 colleagues already requesting to be listed as cosponsors.

This bill had previously been introduced in the Senate by the Honorable SAM ERVIN of North Carolina whom I consider the finest legislative authority on the separation of powers.

Passage of this legislation, I believe, would restore congressional prerogatives over our Nation's revenue. It will make the executive responsive to the will of Congress and to the people we represent.

As things stand now, the OMB, by virtue of its uncontrolled powers, has surpassed the Congress in fiscal importance. It is apparent indeed that it has become the second most powerful office in the land and by its actions has become the fourth branch of Government.

Many of the items that the aforementioned OMB report list as being placed in "reserve," I believe are legitimate and knowing the time it takes for plans and specifications to be drawn up—it is necessary to reserve such funds, but the "reserve" section of the report also shows a

real lack of administrative imagination and initiative.

OMB claims that funds are being "reserved" for many programs because the amount of funds in reserve are "in excess of current estimates of 1972 needs." Such programs listed under this category are farm labor housing grants and mutual and self-help housing grants under FHA. Also, for consumer protective, marketing and regulatory programs of the Department of Agriculture and the food stamp program.

I would hope that those responsible for administering such programs would seek out every possible means, even to the extent of spending the appropriated limits, to solve the obvious problems in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am in total agreement with the assertion by OMB that the practice of impoundment or withholding is one that has occurred under both Republican and Democratic administrations. It has reached a high point, however, under the present administration to the degree where the lives of many citizens both in rural and urban communities are being unduly affected. And just as important—it is contrary to the separation of powers doctrine under which we are governed.

It makes no difference to me if the President is a Republican or Democrat. The practice of impoundment is just not right and is not in accord with the provisions of our Constitution.

VICE ADM. PAUL FREDERICK FOSTER

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a great American who served his country with love and dedication for over half a century died yesterday. The distinguished career of Navy Vice Adm. Paul Frederick Foster ended on Sunday with his death in Virginia Beach, Va. Services will be held on Wednesday at Arlington Cemetery.

I have known Admiral Foster for over 20 years and I have worked closely with him due to our mutual interest in nuclear energy and national defense. He never lost interest in either of these fields. Up to the time of his death he was actively working in areas that kept him in close contact with defense programs.

As a naval officer and as a civilian Paul Foster served his country in peace and war in important positions.

Admiral Foster was the first naval officer to receive the Medal of Honor, Navy Cross, and Distinguished Service Medal—the Nation's three highest military awards for heroism.

His service as a civilian was recognized by his appointment by President Eisenhower as the U.S. Representative on the governing body of the International Atomic Energy Agency—a position carrying with it the rank of ambassador. Previously he had served as deputy general manager of the Atomic Energy Agency, coordinating its international

programs. He was closely identified with the atoms for peace program.

As a young naval ensign he participated in the Mexican campaign of 1914. He won the Medal of Honor in that campaign for rescuing wounded sailors under enemy fire at Vera Cruz.

He received the Distinguished Service Medal during World War I when he commanded the submarine AL-2 which forced a German submarine to the bottom after an underwater encounter. He won the Navy Cross in 1924 when, on the cruiser *Trenton* he entered a burning gun turret and put out the fire.

Mrs. Price and I extend our most sincere sympathy to his wife, the former Isabelle Lowe, and to his son, Navy Capt. Paul L. Foster.

MESSAGE OF MAYOR WALTER E. WASHINGTON TO NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in conformance with what has become a tradition, those of us who attended the National Prayer Breakfast this morning were rewarded with a truly magnificent program. As the observance progressed I thought to myself that if only every American could have been personally present in the Washington Hilton ballroom, their confidence in the morality of America, its Government, and those who serve in it would be greatly strengthened.

The remarks of those who shared the podium transmitted a very positive message, the philosophy of which, I believe, was shared by everyone in the audience, if their reaction was an indicator. The remarks of our President were eloquent and substantive, as was Billy Graham's message; in fact, each participant contributed measurably.

It is not my intention to single any one of them out, but I do believe that the thoughts offered by Mayor Walter Washington will be of interest to so many, and with that thought in mind I offer his text:

UNITY AND RECONCILIATION

(Message of Mayor Walter E. Washington)

I come this morning to this convocation of great leaders to speak in the name of all who seek unity and reconciliation.

I bring a message of hope from those to whom "time and chance" have given little reason for hope—from those who have seen violence, from those who have known hatred, and from those who have struggled against disillusion, despair and alienation.

The message I bring is not new. It has come before. It came from One who said, "By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another." It came in the words of Abraham Lincoln when he said that we must, "... finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds." And it came to us again a few days ago when President Nixon said: "Never has it mattered more that we go forward together."

The same message has come to us from the hearts of humble Americans whose voices are not often heard. They are not heard because they speak in different tongues, or in strange cadences, or in barely audible sounds.

But I say to you: We must hear them, too. We must listen to the voices of calm; not just to those who speak loudly, but also to those who speak softly. We must listen to the poor as well as the rich; to the sick as well as the sound; to the young as well as the old.

We must listen to the hope that cries out from the hearts and souls of a people with a great heritage. It is the heritage set forth in the Declaration that, "All men are created equal, . . . they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, . . . among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

There have been times when some Americans believed that these promises would come true only after death. But that time is past. We are in a different world today. We are in a world where the poor, the hungry, the helpless, are no longer content to wait until the end of life to claim what we have said is rightfully theirs.

Today those words are read as a promise of the liberation of the human spirit on this earth in the here and now. The great strides of science have cast doubt on the value of a dream deferred. These achievements have also convinced us that we can, if we will, make good today that great American commitment to everyone.

Those words inspire. But words require action. The Scripture tell us that, at the day of Judgment, it will be asked not what did you believe, but were you doers or talkers only.

Science, technology, art and ideas are changing man. And man is changing the world. In our lifetime, change itself has caused some men to fear the unknown future. Others, endowed with courage, see in change great opportunity for mankind.

Fear is father to suspicion, to hate, to racism, and to emotions that drive men apart, one from the other.

Courage is itself a force for reconciliation. Courage is a Divine force urging us toward unity. Courage breaks the shackles that bind us to those emotions that would destroy us.

And the shackles must be broken. We must be honest with each other. We must give up suspicion for trust; prejudice, for respect; meanness, for love. We must do this for those who cry out in pain and hunger, and for those who search for decent homes, for jobs, for opportunity. But most of all, we must do this for ourselves to hasten the day when we shall truly be free.

On that great day, we shall raise our voices together, crying out in spiritual liberation: "Free at last! Free at last! Great God Almighty! Free at last!"

Now, I close with a call for Divine help—a prayer for unity and reconciliation for the peoples of our nation and the world.

Heavenly Father: We give thanks for the simplicity of the Gospel. And yet we realize that these great simplicities, transferred into the light of our time, have the power to remake the world.

If we have lost our sense of unity, one with the other; if we have fled from ourselves and hence from Thee, help us to find the way. In that way, we may do our part in changing the world.

Today, we bow in humility when we remember the Love that went to the Cross and acknowledged our unworthiness at so great a sacrifice. Help us all to be worthy.

Help us in our times to keep our faith in God and in each other.

Amen.

CONSTITUENTS WHO HAVE LOST PENSION BENEFITS

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is a Representative in this Chamber who does not have numerous constituents who, through no fault of their own, have lost pension benefits for which they have saved many years. These people need protection, so they can plan for their retirement years, secure in the knowledge their planning will mean something.

I am submitting for the RECORD a newsstory which appeared in the Indianapolis Times of January 24 regarding this matter of pensions and documenting several cases where pensions have been lost in Indiana for lack of adequate protection. The news item, part of a series on problems facing the elderly, was written by Robert Peirce of the Star staff.

One good point the article makes is that fewer and fewer people today are worrying about planning for their retirement—it seems to be an old fashioned idea, either because people assume Uncle Sam will take care of them in their old age, or because they assume it is a hopeless task. I do not think this Nation can afford, either fiscally or morally, to let either of these assumptions take hold or become a reality.

Private pensions are an excellent means of planning for an adequate retirement income—if a worker is assured he will eventually receive the benefits to which he is entitled. To strengthen this system, I plan to introduce a piece of comprehensive pension protection legislation in the near future. I hope several of my colleagues will join me in that effort and that we can eventually eliminate the pension uncertainties outlined in the following article:

RETIREE'S DREAMS GO GLIMMERING AS PENSION FAILS TO MATERIALIZE

(By Robert L. Peirce)

Henry Rohlfing thought a lot about the "golden years" as he neared 65.

After 34 years as a blacksmith for Indianapolis Drop Forging Company, he figured he had earned those trips to Florida, or maybe a leisurely drive out West.

He still thinks that the pension of \$119 a month he would have received, plus Social Security, could have paid for those little dreams.

But on March 15, 1969, the plant at 1300 Madison Avenue closed, catching Rohlfing four months and four days short of 65, the age at which he would have been entitled to a full pension.

When the final settlement came, Rohlfing discovered that instead of \$119 a month for the rest of his life he was to receive one lump-sum payment of \$1,400.

The money is about gone, but Rohlfing, a German immigrant, is a practical man of few words:

"Sure, it's just about the dirtiest deal you can think of. But I don't give it much thought. What can you do about it? My wife (53 and unable to work because of arthritis) had some family in Florida we had wanted to visit. And I've always wanted to go out West."

"I don't suppose we can afford that now. But we get along. I get \$200 a month from Social Security and the house is paid for. You just have to stretch it a little and leave those expensive items alone on the grocery shelf."

"Oh, I've got a few shrubs I take care of in front of my home (4505 West Ohio Street). But it does get kind of boring."

"I can't tell you how often these kinds of things happen in Indiana," said Joseph M. Hannah, supervisor of the pension and profit division of the Internal Revenue Service here, "but it happens a lot."

Unlike the pension plan at Drop Forging, many company benefits now make workers eligible for full retirement income before age 65, Hannah said.

But he said there is even a catch to these plans. If a business goes under without first having a long period to invest money into the plans, there may not be enough funds to pay all those who are eligible for benefits.

IRS regulations, under which companies are granted tax deductions for pensions, require only that enough money is paid into the plan to cover years of service to the firm after the plan went into effect, Hannah said.

No money has to be paid to cover years of service before the plan's adoption, he observed, although workers receive retirement credit for those preplan years.

As long as money is paid into the plan for 20 or 30 years, there will be enough funds to cover all employees, he said.

But if a company dies before that time, there can be a huge shortage in pension money, he said. The older workers get what money there is, the younger ones are left with table scraps.

The United Steel Workers is wrestling with two defunct Indianapolis companies which left "vast shortages" in pension benefits because the retirement plan was young, according to a union representative, William Springer.

The pension plan at Drop Forging Company, owned by Federal Drop Forging Company of Lansing, Mich., was adopted in 1961, and the company did pay more money into it than required by the IRS, Springer said.

The reason companies don't pay the money for "past service liability" is that it would be tremendously expensive, explained Eldon H. Nyhard, pension consultant at Howard E. Nyhard Inc.

Pension negotiators assume that a plan will remain in effect for 20 or 30 years, he said. Even if some amount is paid for past service liability each year, unions will allow companies to pay less in this category to free more money for increased overall retirement benefits, he added.

Enough companies with young pension plans go out of business each year to prompt union leaders to push for Federal insurance to cover retirement benefits.

They also are asking for legislation to allow employees to have "portability" in transferring accrued retirement benefits from one company to another.

"Now companies can use retirement benefits as a hammer over the heads of employees to force them to stay on an unsatisfactory job," said Max Wright, executive secretary of the state AFL-CIO.

Springer also suggested a national pool of retirement money funded by all companies with pension benefits. Enough money would be on hand to pay retirement claims even of those companies who go out of business too soon, he contended.

Many union pensions in Indiana, governed under provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law, already are funded by several companies paying into one pool, said Len Teeuws, executive vice-president of Russell M. Tolley and Associates, consulting actuaries.

But even if pension funds are adequate today, most plans do not call for increased benefits if inflation sends prices skyward.

One way pension plans in the past have fought inflation was to purchase variable annuities, investment plans whose returns vary with profits made on the stock market, Nyhard said.

It had been assumed that as inflation rises, stock market returns would also, he ex-

plained. But, recent events have shown that the stock market can nose-dive while inflation continues upward, so that "annuities aren't nearly so popular anymore."

Beyond problems with funding pensions, Nyhard estimated that little more than half of the Hoosier work force is covered by them.

Recent figures from a Senate labor subcommittee study showed that the average monthly benefit from pensions is \$99. Average Social Security payments are \$129 a month, the study showed.

It observed that a retired couple getting the average pension and Social Security check would receive \$228 a month. However, the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures that \$241 monthly is needed to maintain even a low minimum budget for a retired couple.

At least "eight or nine bills" are pending before Congress for pension reform, Teeuws said.

Included is legislation, indorsed by President Richard M. Nixon, to give tax deductions for employees paying into plans. An objection to present employee contributions is that those dollars already have been taxed once as income.

Questions of pensions and income are the "number one priority" of the Indiana Commission for Aging and the Aged, said the agency's director, Dr. George Davis.

He feels, too, that schools are failing short in teaching the young to save for the future.

"I recently sat beside an honors student at a Purdue University dinner. I asked him when he planned to retire. He looked first like he didn't know what I was talking about. Finally, he said, 'well, I guess at 65, like everyone else.'

"He wasn't even aware that people are retiring a lot earlier these days. And he will have to save now if he is going to live comfortably later."

CHANGE IN FOGGY BOTTOM

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, rarely does a reorganization of a Government department make news. This has proven to be the case with the recent major changes in the State Department. I feel, however, that these particular changes are of genuine interest. For that reason I should like to insert the remarks of the Honorable William B. Macomber into the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

CHANGE IN FOGGY BOTTOM: AN ANNIVERSARY REPORT

My colleagues in the Department of State: Two years ago this month this Department launched an unprecedented program of management reform and modernization; and in this same period we have seen it move in a number of very important ways towards a more equitable and effective system of human relations.

On this second anniversary it is appropriate to take stock, to examine what working together we have accomplished in this period of ferment and change, and to focus on what remains to be done.

First let's look at the program of management reform and modernization.

This has been a unique and far-reaching effort. It has been unique in the sense that Secretary Rogers did not, as is traditional in an effort of this kind, turn the job over to a team of experts from outside. Instead, in an unprecedented step, he chose the career professionals themselves to draw the plans. He was convinced that you could do the job better than anyone else.

You responded to his challenge and pro-

duced the most comprehensive and searching critique ever written about this Department.¹ If one wants to really understand our problems (and our strengths), no other document can match it. More importantly, after months of consultation with colleagues in the Department and abroad, with other Government agencies, and with many institutions and experts outside of the Government, you produced an extraordinary blueprint for reform. This blueprint consists of over 500 recommendations, about 400 of which have been, or are now being, implemented.

This effort has not received the attention it deserves, which is perhaps understandable. Major changes in management techniques and philosophy are not the stuff of exciting newspaper copy.

It is a significant story, nonetheless.

For in the past two years, through this unique effort in self-analysis and creativity, important new foundations of a modern American foreign office have been laid.

i

It has been argued that developments over the last twenty-five years—the new involvement of most departments of government in foreign affairs and the development of national security council staffs or their equivalents—have lessened the importance of foreign offices everywhere. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The diplomat's job is more important and more complicated than it ever was. He carries his old responsibilities and needs all his old skills; but because of the vastly increased complexity and diversity of our foreign affairs, we need a broader range of skills and expertise; and because of the participation of so many other elements of our government in foreign affairs, our diplomats must now be managers, coordinators and leaders, to a degree undreamed of by their predecessors of a simpler age.

The collective wisdom, experience, and judgment in the foreign affairs field of the people in the United States Department of State is unmatched elsewhere in our Government or in any other government. The job therefore has been to find ways to unfetter those abilities and to bring them more effectively to bear on the Department's evolving responsibilities.

The significance of what has been happening within the State Department during the past two years is this: The career professionals (aware that all foreign offices tend to have a better understanding of what their job used to be than what it is today) have made a major effort to explore and define the new and expanded dimensions of their role. Further, they have determined that the management of the State Department and of the Foreign Service is not just the concern of the administrators. They also have concluded that to meet their new responsibilities, something more is required than the traditional adherence to a low profile and traditional reliance on native ability, experience, old fashioned intuitive judgment and "trying harder."

As a result, here is how far we have come:

We have for the first time a Policy Analysis and Resource Allocation system (PARA) in operation throughout the Department—a systematic process for the identification of issues, interests and priorities, the allocation of our resources in accordance with those priorities, and the periodic review of our policies.²

We have a new concept of team operation among the Seventh Floor principal officers which affords increased control of the Department's planning, decision-making, and allocation of resources. The team concept has permitted a more flexible utilization of the principals' time by breaking the relatively

Footnotes at end of article.

narrow field of specialization that each principal has been assigned. The Seventh Floor team is served by common staffs, operates under the aegis of the Secretary, and is directed by the Under Secretary.³

We have a new management evaluation capability in the expanded Inspector General's staff, which will now evaluate our policies as well as our performance.⁴

We have a new balance between competition and job tenure in our Foreign Service officer promotion system which preserves its competitive nature but provides increased stability and security in the middle years of an officer's career.⁵

We have made major changes in our recruiting activities which are already bringing a much wider range of skills into the Foreign Service Officer Corps than ever before.⁶

We have adopted the concept of a new Foreign Affairs Specialist Corps which has been very popular with our career specialists. Over 870 of these have applied for entrance into this new Corps. Legal objections have been raised against this Corps. I am very hopeful these will be overcome shortly so that this important innovation will play a key role in our modernization effort.⁷

We have established a "Mustang" program to identify clerical and staff support employees with unused talent or undeveloped potential and provide opportunities to them for advancement to officer-level positions through special training and assignments.⁸

We have encouraged the flow of information, new ideas, divergent opinion, and creative dissent within the Department and at our posts abroad through the mechanisms of special message channels, new staff functions, and the continued use of the Secretary's Open Forum Panel.⁹

In a quite different area, and in order to improve our service to the ever-increasing numbers of Americans traveling abroad, we have initiated a program in conjunction with the Postal Service to take passport applications in several hundred first-class post offices throughout the country. This will enable us to expand and improve our service dramatically without incurring the costs involved in establishing more federal facilities.

So on the managerial side these have been two very productive years. Much remains to be done, but much has been accomplished.

II

But modernization and reform, if it is to be really effective, requires more than improved management in these areas I have been discussing.

Of critical importance, as well, is the development of an increasingly effective, fair, and enlightened system of human relations within the Department. Here, too, we have had a remarkable two years, with much progress being made—and with much still left to be done.

To begin with, we have been operating on the simple, unassailable assumption that women possess approximately half the brain power in this country. We have therefore sat down with women employees and designed and implemented a program for encouraging rather than deterring career prospects for women officers. They are now assured equal consideration for assignments, training opportunities, and perquisites, without regard to sex or marital status. Indeed one of the more interesting aspects of programs to enhance career possibilities for women is the development of working family teams in which both the wife and husband are career Foreign Service employees. Over 30 such teams are now in the Department's Foreign Service, and more may be expected soon.¹⁰

The changes we have made in this area have been well publicized. They were made not only in justice to women but in the De-

partment's own self interest, for we can ill afford to ignore this major brainpower pool. I am pleased to report that this fall nearly three times as many women applied to take the Foreign Service exams as applied in 1969—the year before this program began.

Efforts are also underway to accord increased recognition of the professional status and rights of secretaries—still one of the largest and most important groups of women in the Department's Civil and Foreign Services.

We have also addressed the problem of a bill of rights for the spouses and dependents of Foreign Service employees. The voluntary unpaid support that wives have traditionally given to our embassy efforts overseas has constituted one of the great strengths of our Service and also, from a family point of view, one of its most rewarding aspects. But there have been occasions when this tradition was abused and when its voluntary basis was not properly understood. Working first with wives and later with the Secretary's Open Forum Panel we have now spelled out the rights of Foreign Service spouses and dependents—and I am confident that rather than weakening the traditional teamwork of Foreign Service families, this bill of rights will strengthen it.¹¹

In the past two years we have continued to emphasize our minority recruitment program despite our personnel cuts and the resultant reductions in our over-all recruitment.

In addition we recognize that there are many persons, some from minority backgrounds, some not, who have the ability to rise to positions of considerable responsibility but who have been denied their opportunity because of inadequacies in their education. With this in mind we have, as I mentioned earlier, created the "Mustang" program which each year will provide opportunities for specially selected employees to advance to officer rank.

Within this critical area of the Department's human relations, however, I believe the creation of a formal employee-management relations system for the Foreign Service is of overriding importance.

Following changes in Civil Service procedure, this new system has just been promulgated by the President.¹² It is a pioneering effort specially designed for the Foreign Service and is the result of extensive debate and consultation between the management of the Department and representatives of the Foreign Service. For the first time members of the Foreign Service will have an important and formal voice in the development of all personnel policies—policies which play such an important part in their lives and careers.

Under this system members of the Foreign Service can elect an organization to be their exclusive representative, and administrative officials in the Department are required to consult with that organization on personnel policies which either the Department or the employees wish to change. If these consultations do not result in agreement, the employee's representative can appeal over the heads of the Department's administrative officials to the Board of the Foreign Service.

The Board of the Foreign Service will have two subgroups to help it carry out its responsibilities. Both of these groups are independent of the administrative side of the Department. First is the three-member Employee-Management Relations Commission made up of representatives of the Department of Labor, Civil Service Commission, and Office of Management and Budget. This Commission will have the final say with respect to the supervision of elections and the adjudication of unfair labor practice complaints.

The second group, working directly under the Board of the Foreign Service, is known as the Disputes Panel. It is made up of one

member from the Department of Labor, one from the Federal Services Impasses Panel, one from the public, and two from the Foreign Service. Thus the majority of this Disputes Panel comes from "outside" the Department of State. In addition, the two Foreign Service representatives cannot be part of the management of the Department. When the administrative authorities of the Department are unable to reach agreement in their consultations with the representatives of the Foreign Service employees, it is the function of this disputes group, acting on behalf of the Board of the Foreign Service, to establish the facts and seek a solution through mediation. If this fails, the Panel must then recommend an appropriate solution to the Board of the Foreign Service.

With the development of this employee-management relations system we have passed an historic milestone in the continuing development of the Foreign Service. But this milestone was not reached easily. There were strong differences of views, and much hard bargaining and public controversy.

But what has emerged in the judgment of both the management of the Department and the leadership of the American Foreign Service Association is "a system well adapted to the Foreign Service, and a system under which the men and women of the Foreign Service can have a real voice in the policies and regulations affecting their careers."

Here again, the past two years have seen an important breakthrough. But the job is just beginning, not ending. If this new system is to fulfill its promise, it is incumbent upon all members of the Foreign Service to pay close attention to the positions taken by the employee organization chosen as their exclusive representative. It is incumbent on that organization and the administrative officials of the Department with whom it will be dealing to make every effort to see that this new system works in a fair, constructive and responsible manner.

However, it is not enough simply to build a system where members of the Foreign Service, in the collective sense, will have a stronger and more effective voice in the development of personnel policies. In addition, there is the need for each individual member to have access to a meaningful grievance procedure independent of the Department's personnel authorities, and in which the individual's rights are clearly defined and understood. Until recently such a system did not exist. There was in its stead a formal system of limited scope and an informal system in which every effort was made to be fair, but which was neither independent of the personnel authorities nor characterized by any specific definition of the rights of an aggrieved employee.

We have now instituted an interim grievance procedure which is a major step forward.¹³ The Interim Grievance Board is chaired by William Simkin, who from 1961 to 1969 was Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and is made up of distinguished public members as well as career officials with considerable experience in the Foreign Service. Unlike the earlier arrangements, it is set up and operates independently of the personnel and administrative officials of State, AID and USIA.

It is an "interim" grievance procedure because we believe that the definitive grievance procedure should be bargained out in the employee-management relations system—which is just what such a system is for. Once the definitive grievance procedure has been hammered out, the Department will support legislation which incorporates the basic principles of that procedure as an amendment to the Foreign Service Act.

Another crucial area of the Department's human relations is that of involuntary retirement or "selection-out." I believe that such a system, presently required by law, is an essential ingredient of a strong Foreign

Footnotes at end of article.

Service, and I believe that this view is shared by the great majority of Foreign Service Officers.

But this system has recently come under increasing attack. We now have in the employee-management relations system a particularly appropriate means for the representatives of Foreign Service employees to sit down with the Department's management for a careful and thorough reexamination of the selection-out system. I am confident that out of the re-examination will come reaffirmation of the need for a continued involuntary retirement system; and I am equally confident that in this re-examination we are going to find ways to make it a fairer and stronger system. Fewer than 10 officers are presently scheduled for involuntary retirement between now and June 30th. In view of this upcoming re-examination, the Department has suspended all final selection-out actions between now and that date.

In summary then, the most critical ingredients in the human relations field are the development of a strong employee-management relations system to deal with the development of personnel policies, and the establishment through the employee-management relations system, and ultimately by an amendment to the Foreign Service Act, of a definitive grievance procedure. Under the employee-management relations system we will also be re-examining involuntary retirement procedures and here, as elsewhere, looking for areas where we can strengthen the role of due process.

Some have said that in taking these actions we are undermining the basic discipline of the Foreign Service. Of course, the exact opposite is true. The way to guarantee the continuation of a disciplined Service is to make certain that its basic safeguards and fairness are apparent to all.

But as we move into this new era of the Department's human relations, let me make it clear that I do not believe the old system was as unfair as has sometimes been alleged. In a highly competitive system such as ours, there are bound to be disappointed persons. And while our involuntary retirement system has been run by human beings and is therefore fallible, it is my personal belief that those who manned the system earlier made every effort to make it as fair as possible.

But there is no denying that the system has been a paternalistic one. And even if it was far fairer than its critics give it credit for, it is not—because of its paternalism and its inadequate recognition of both the collective and individual rights of Foreign Service employees—a credible or acceptable system for today.

III

The past two years have been a time of tumult. There has been criticism, disagreement, and public controversy. This is understandable. When a major reform and modernization program is launched, it is predicated on the assumption that things are wrong and need correcting. One should not be surprised, therefore, when there is considerable public focus on what is wrong—and vigorous debate over proposed solutions. This controversy may appear unseemly by earlier standards of State Department decorum. It is, however—except when disfigured by unjust and personal attacks on a dedicated career Foreign Service Officer—a very healthy and useful process.

It would be a mistake to allow the tumult which has been a part of these last two years or the controversy and clash of views which will accompany the forthcoming employee elections, to obscure what is really going on in this Department. Controversy is an integral part of the progress we are all working for. There have been years in this Department when there has been very little tumult and very little progress. We are in a much better era now.

And now my final point: No effort of this

kind starts without antecedents. Much of the credit must go to those career officers among you who in increasing numbers in the years immediately preceding January 1970 pressed for reform and set the stage for what has followed. To you and to the many who joined you in the past two years, we owe a considerable debt.

The question I put to you now is this: Will your commitment to this effort be sustained? Important decisions lie ahead, and modernization is a task which, by definition, is never done. Even in the specific areas I have been reporting on today, the record is one of useful and important beginnings—not final accomplishments.

Modernization as a process will continue in the Department. That is inevitable. The question is whether you, the career professionals will continue to lead it. If you do, and for as long as you do, this critically important work will be in the best of hands.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Diplomacy for the 70's, A Program of Management Reform for the Department of State*, Department of State Publication 8551, December 1970. Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

² "Policy Analysis and Resource Allocation in the Department of State", Management Reform Bulletin #26, July 2, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

³ "The Seventh Floor", Management Reform Bulletin #24, July 2, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

⁴ "The Evaluation Process: Office of the Inspector General", Management Reform Bulletin #25, July 6, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

⁵ "Promotion Reform: Threshold Review and Mid-Career Tenure", Management Reform Bulletin #27, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

⁶ "Broadening the Foreign Service's Recruitment Base", Management Reform Bulletin #2, January 6, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

⁷ "Toward a Unified Personnel System: The Foreign Affairs Specialist Corps," Management Reform Bulletin No. 8, February 16, 1971; and, "Toward a Unified Personnel System: The Foreign Affairs Specialist Corps" (Supplement to MRB No. 8), Management Reform Bulletin No. 18, May 19, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

⁸ "The 'Mustang' Program: Identifying and Developing Talent Within", Management Reform Bulletin No. 28, July 2, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

⁹ "Policy on Security Practices and Expression of Views," Management Reform Bulletin No. 7, February 11, 1971; "Openness at Missions and Creative Dissent," Management Reform Bulletin No. 9, February 23, 1971; "Domestic Public Opinion: Informing the Policy Makers," Management Reform Bulletin No. 12, March 30, 1971; "Public Affairs in the Decisionmaking Process," Management Reform Bulletin No. 13, April 13, 1971; "Stimulation of Creativity," Management Reform Bulletin No. 32, November 17, 1971; Department of State, Wash., D.C.

¹⁰ "Implementing Policy on Equal Opportunities for Women and Employment Abroad of Dependents of Employees," Department Notice, August 12, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

¹¹ "Policy on Wives of Foreign Service Employees," Department Notice, January 21, 1972, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

¹² "Employee-Management Relations in the Foreign Service of the United States," Text and Analysis of Executive Order 11636, Department of State Newsletter Special Supplement, January 1972, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

¹³ "Foreign Service Grievance Procedures for State/USIA/AID," Department Notice, August 12, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

IF THE PAST IS PROLOG, CONGRESS WILL INCREASE THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT ONCE AGAIN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the yearly minidebate on the subject of raising the national debt limit is upon us once again. I am resigned to the fact that, whatever I say here and publicly, the Congress is going to look for the "easy way out" of the current fiscal mess by passing the deflated buck back to the public.

In spite of this dismal prognostication, I am heartened that a minirevolt has started among some of those Members who, heretofore, were first in line to help saddle the country with more debt. Incredible as it may seem, this minirevolt comes at the outset of an election year. I wonder if these same solons are going to introduce legislation to raise taxes this year? I will believe that when I see it.

To buttress my contention that the outcome of the current debate is foregone, I have compiled a brief chart which shows the votes in the House of Representatives concerning debt limitation legislation. You will note that in some years, we voted more than once to raise the limit. The chart follows:

To raise the "temporary" and "permanent" debt limitation: votes in the House, 1960-71

Year of vote:	Yea	Nays
1960	223	134
1961	231	148
1962	251	144
1962	211	192
1963	213	204
1963	221	175
1963	187	179
1964	203	182
1965	229	165
1966	199	165
1967	215	199
1967	197	211
1967	217	196
1969	313	93
1970	236	127
1971	227	162

The first overall debt ceiling was established in 1917, when the limit was fixed at \$11.5 billion. By 1945, the act had been amended 16 times, and the ceiling had been pushed up to \$300 billion. In June 1946, the World War II debt limit was reduced to a "permanent" \$275 billion. In 1954, 1955, and 1956, Congress voted "temporary" increases to bring the ceiling down to \$278 billion. A "temporary" increase to \$280 billion was approved in February 1958 and in that same year, the "permanent" limit was raised to \$283 billion. From 1960 through 1966, Congress had approved 13 "temporary" increases on the "permanent" ceiling, carrying the ceiling for fiscal year 1967 to \$330 billion. In 1968, the "permanent" limit was raised to \$358 billion and the "temporary" limit jumped up to \$367 billion by congressional action.

In this morning's mail, each Member of the House received a copy of the latest U.S. News & World Report and therein is an impressive and interesting chart/article entitled "Red-Ink Budgets over the Years." The pressure on the debt ceiling is ably reflected in the chart; the important point is that congressional action is

necessary to implement the progressive deficits requested of the administration. The article is summed up with the following:

What's ahead? As the business recovery picks up, Government tax revenues will rise. But new spending programs are being added and old ones expanded. From all sides come demands for still other ways to spend Government money. The upshot: No end to the floods of red ink is in sight.

That is, of course, unless Congress decides to put a stop to deficit financing.

Concurrent with the debate on the debt ceiling, I wish to bring two more articles to our colleagues' attention which appeared yesterday in respected national publications.

The first, an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* entitled, "A Use for the Debt Ceiling," calls a spade a spade when stating:

Even then, of course, the lawmakers chose to overlook the fact that it was they, not the President, who held true control over federal spending. No matter what the President wants to spend, it's pretty hard for him to do anything unless Congress chooses to vote the money. Congress certainly has chosen to vote a lot of money, on occasion a good deal more than Presidents have requested.

The full text of the editorial follows:

A USE FOR THE DEBT CEILING

In 1941 Congress attempted to control federal spending by imposing a limit on federal debt. The exercise has always had its weird aspects but this year it just possibly might serve a useful purpose.

The 1941 ceiling was aimed at President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who by the standards of those times was considered a free-spending President. The biggest outlay for any pre-war year totaled only \$14 billion, which even after adjustment for subsequent inflation now seems like small potatoes.

Even then, of course, the lawmakers chose to overlook the fact that it was they, not the President, who held true control over federal spending. No matter what the President wants to spend, it's pretty hard for him to do anything unless Congress chooses to vote the money.

Congress certainly has chosen to vote a lot of money, on occasion a good deal more than Presidents have requested. Time and again various administrations have had to go to Congress to ask new increases in the debt ceiling so that the government could go on operating, and time and again the legislators have done what was asked.

To be sure, the ceiling-boosting operation always provides lawmakers with fresh opportunities to lecture the administration on the virtues of economy. The hope is to score a few political points at home with voters who aren't exactly comfortable with the idea of all-out federal profligacy.

At the moment the debt ceiling stands (or quivers, if you prefer) at \$430 billion, and the actual debt is already within \$5 billion of the limit. The way things are going it seems sure that the debt will push through the present ceiling before very long.

The federal budget is expected to show \$38.8 billion of red ink in the year ending June 30, and the administration puts the deficit for fiscal 1973 at \$25.5 billion, even if Congress comes up with no new spending initiatives. So the administration has gone to Capitol Hill for a new boost in the ceiling and Congress has no choice but to approve an increase.

In passing it's surely worth noting that even if the budget is balanced next fiscal year on the so-called full-employment basis, as administration officials expect it to be, that result will be of no help whatsoever in

this area. The debt will grow even if the economists assure us the budget would be balanced if unemployment were only equal to 4% of the work force.

This is an election year, and President Nixon's Democratic critics in Congress are anxious for any ammunition they can find. It has already occurred to some of the lawmakers that it would be fun to lecture the President, who professes to believe in federal economy, for having so much trouble making income and outgo meet.

If the administration is wise it will decide that this is the sort of debate that it should encourage. Although the administration hasn't been exactly bashful about coming up with new spending proposals, the chief Democratic reaction often has been that the proposals aren't big enough. The administration's health-care plan, for instance, is expensive—but not nearly as costly as some of the Democratic alternatives.

If the administration could get the Democrats to prate loud and long enough of the need for federal economy, some of the voters might take them seriously and try to get them to match actions to words. If the lawmakers didn't, November could provide a time for retribution.

In a still uncertain economy, a little federal economizing is surely in order. The huge and continuing budget deficits are putting enormous federal pressure on the money markets, which are trying to finance a business recovery.

At the least this is likely to produce upward pressure on interest rates. The Federal Reserve System still worries about rising rates and, in any case, it has to see to it that the banks have enough money that the heavy outflow of new Treasury offerings will not fail. It's hard to imagine a situation more conducive to a resurgence of inflation.

The debt ceiling is still a pretty silly way to control federal spending. But if argument over another increase centers on the true issues, it could just serve a useful purpose.

The second article, entitled "Taxes Bite Deeper; No Relief Foreseen," is from yesterday's *New York Times*. In that article, the consequences of the fiscal leadership at the national level is recounted with a survey of the State and local tax increases throughout the country during 1971. The article quotes the Commerce Clearing House as calling 1971 the "year of the dog because so many citizen taxpayers were so painfully bitten." The full text of the article follows:

TAXES BITE DEEPER; NO RELIEF FORESEEN

(By Seth S. King)

CHICAGO, January 30.—Phase One of President Nixon's economic stabilization program has passed and Phase Two is struggling at the inflation barricades. But neither has included any restraints on state or local taxes, and these burdens are rising at record rates in almost every part of the nation.

Homeowners, apartment renters, mobile-home dwellers, welfare clients and beachcombers are being hit by more taxes in almost every imaginable form.

The Commerce Clearing House, a private organization in Chicago that surveys the nation's tax changes, called 1971 the "Year of the Dog" because so many citizen taxpayers were so painfully bitten.

Observers see no end to the spiraling tax burdens.

The roll-call of tax increases has been awesome. Last fall, 30 states raised their tax rates in some form, as did most of the nation's larger municipalities.

TOBACCO TAXES RAISED

Fifteen of these states raised personal and corporate income taxes and five others—Delaware, Florida, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and

Rhode Island—adopted new forms of these taxes.

Five states increased their sales tax rates. Eighteen increased tobacco taxes. Eight decided that, if a resident taxpayer could not refrain from drinking alcohol he should pay a higher levy to do it. And 16 others tapped motorists, either by raising gasoline taxes or vehicle-use taxes or both.

New York State was again the national taxing champion increasing every one of these taxes except those on motor-vehicle use.

So rapid was the rise in tax collections in the fiscal year ended last June that the total take from state levies reached \$51.5-billion, a 7.3 per cent increase over the previous fiscal year.

By the beginning of 1971, state and local tax levels were so high that the average per capita payment rose to \$427 a year, which was \$47 more per taxpayer than the year before.

New York again was the nation's leader, with an average of \$652, marking the first time that the \$600 level had been passed. Arkansas, with \$252, was the low state. Hawaii, California, the District of Columbia, Nevada, and Wisconsin broke the \$500 barrier.

Three years ago, only New York and California had the distinction of being above the \$500 mark.

These Commerce Clearing House statistics on per capita payments, it should be noted, were compiled before many of the tax-raising states had enacted new levies. The per capita bite is almost certain to rise even higher.

Only six Southern states—Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee—have such generally lower expenditures for education and welfare that they remain below the \$300-per-year level.

QUALITY QUESTIONED

Taxpayers and homeowners complain constantly that they are paying more for services that are at best no better than what they were five years ago. In fact, the costs of every service they depend on has skyrocketed in that time.

The general cost of living rose 21 per cent from mid-1965 through mid-1970. In the same period, in the more populated areas, public welfare costs rose 184 per cent; health and hospital expenses, 96 per cent; police protection, 77 per cent, and sanitation costs, 39 per cent.

The Tax Foundation, a private organization, reports that virtually every community over 10,000 population now has more teachers, policemen, garbage men, and dog catchers on its payrolls than five years ago. In many communities, the increases in these numbers have reached 70 per cent or more. From 1960 to 1970, the number of jobs opened and filled in Federal, state and city governments grew at a rate almost twice that of private industry, the watchdog foundation says.

SCHOOLS A KEY FACTOR

The costs of schools represent one of the most notable of these upward pressures. The Tax Foundation has found that economy-inspired efforts at consolidation have reduced the number of school districts in the nation by 50 per cent and the school-age population has increased by only a fifth in the last decade. But the spending for primary and secondary instruction is now 150 per cent greater than in 1961.

In its continuing observations of state and local taxing, the Commerce Clearing House has found that the biggest tax bites are made in the odd-numbered (nonelection) years. This premise should offer the hope of at least a holding of the line in 1972, an even-numbered (election) year.

But warnings are in order. The Bureau of the Census has estimated that state revenues

from all sources, including Federal grants, for the fiscal year ending next July should reach \$96-billion. The bureau expects more than \$102-billion to be spent by the states.

The omens from this are clear: it will only be a matter of time, unless inflation ends tomorrow and the economy booms the day after, until another round of tax increases will be needed.

NEW MEXICO SURPLUS

Some states may prove the exception. In New Mexico, where stricter enforcement of tax laws has produced higher collections, the state entered 1972 with a \$19-million surplus. But the Legislature is already talking of imposing a new statewide property tax for use in getting a more even balance in expenditures for schools.

Public resentment of seemingly endless tax increases is growing and lawmakers at all levels are becoming more fearful of provoking outright rebellion against new levies. By last February, the Tax Foundation determined that tax increases totaling \$6.5-billion had been proposed. There was a reversal to lower rates that were expected to raise about \$5-billion more this summer. Even this would be a record.

Most payers of local and state taxes, if they have children, are apparently more willing to pay higher school levies than most other taxes. If they do not have children, a recent survey of taxpayers in St. Cloud, Minn., showed, they rank willingness to pay higher taxes for police protection first, then for streets and traffic improvement, and finally for parks and recreation.

In all parts of the country, the taxes on property, both personal and corporate, are the most disliked.

"I'd hate to cut down on any services," Loyd Long of Monticello, Ind., said. "But I'd much rather pay more sales taxes than property taxes if there has to be a replacement of revenue. At least with the sales tax, if you don't want to pay it, you don't have to buy anything."

Ken Ross, owner of a Denver neighborhood business, bitterly objects to home and corporate property tax rates.

"This tax thing is killing us small guys," he said. "The property taxes go on whether you're making a profit or not. You'd have to pay it even if you locked your doors."

BOND ISSUES VETOED

Indeed, payers of local property taxes have become the most aroused group in the nation. In the last two years, property owners have voted down bond issues of all stripes, even those for schools.

The newest fashion in taxes is relief from new property levies. From President Nixon on down, officials are indignantly declaring that the limit has been reached and something must be done to provide new funds and spare the property owners.

But old taxes rarely die; they don't even fade away. Any time there is more revenue promised from one source, somebody will have to pay more taxes to provide it.

In Minnesota, Gov. Wendell R. Anderson persuaded the Legislature to increase state income and sales taxes to raise \$580-million in state aid by 1973. In return, a lid was placed on local property taxes for education and a promise was made that property taxes would be reduced.

The Minnesota Department of Taxation estimated that the average Minnesota homeowner, with a wife and two children and a salary of \$13,000 a year and a house worth \$16,770, would pay the following: His property taxes would drop \$68.06. However, his state income tax would rise by \$142.07. His sales tax would rise by \$27. So this would leave him paying \$101.01 more in total taxes, a 9.9 per cent increase over last year.

In the smaller communities, where property tax burdens are the heaviest, the relief will be greater. In the cities, where there is

no ceiling on costs for pensions and welfare and where owners of older homes are facing reassessment, the outlook is grim.

One Minneapolis homeowner counted his new blessings recently and found that he would pay \$16.80 less in property taxes but would pay \$200 more in state income taxes. He said he was afraid to calculate how much more he might pay in sales taxes.

EXAMPLE IN ILLINOIS

Illinois imposed its first state income tax three years ago. In selling it to a reluctant Legislature, Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie, a Republican, promised more aid to municipalities and an end to the small but annoying personal (nonresidential) property tax.

In 1970, Illinois state aid to education rose from 27 per cent of local costs to 35 per cent, and last year this rose another 3 per cent.

But in many localities, such as in suburban DuPage County, home property taxes have gone up about \$100 each year since 1969, even though a number of school bond issues have been defeated by weary taxpayers.

The voters outlawed the personal property tax in 1970. But this fall, the Illinois Supreme Court ruled that the referendum was unconstitutional on the ground that, if corporations were taxed on corporate belongings, the people should be, too. The Governor is appealing this judgment.

Further, the city of Evanston, Ill., as just one instance, has warned that, unless the threatened loss of income from personal property taxes are made up by something else, it will have to increase municipal property taxes by 26.3 per cent.

Chicago granted increases in teachers' salaries last year on the assumption that more state aid for education would be forthcoming.

Now, even though property taxes have been increased and assessed valuations in the city and Cook County have been raised by more than \$500-million, the Chicago Board of Education is facing a deficit of at least \$83-million and expects to have to curtail the length of the current school year.

A new element has appeared in the local and state tax pictures. Courts in at least four states have declared that support of education primarily from property taxes is unfair to the less affluent communities.

The forecasters expect these rulings, if they are upheld, to cause massive changes in taxing methods, and taxpayers through some different manner of collection.

The difficulty is that most state and local governments have already tested their ingenuity in devising new taxes. Virtually every source, from a taxpayer's necessities to his pleasures, seems to have been tapped.

The only new source being discussed at state as well as the Federal levels is a value-added tax, which President Nixon has indicated he favors. This is nothing but an elaborate sales tax. But it would be levied at the manufacturing and wholesaling stages, as well as at the retail stage. The added cost would be passed on to the citizen buyers in a new form of tax bite.

Observers concede that speculation about new taxes and old taxes—could be thrown out of focus by the effects of Phase Two's wage and price controls.

PER CAPITA TAX BURDEN 1960-70

State	1970	1960	Increase	
			Percent	Amount
Alaska	\$417	\$161	\$256	\$159
Virginia	340	134	206	154
Kentucky	299	119	180	151
Maryland	482	199	290	142
Hawaii	572	237	335	141
District of Columbia	517	217	300	138
Illinois	487	206	281	136
Wisconsin	509	216	293	136
Pennsylvania	401	173	228	132
Connecticut	485	213	272	128

State	1970	1960	Increase	
			Percent	Amount
Nebraska	\$397	\$174	223	\$128
Mississippi	296	130	166	128
North Carolina	311	137	174	127
New York	652	288	364	126
Delaware	450	199	251	126
Missouri	343	152	191	126
Georgia	312	142	170	120
Alabama	259	118	141	119
New Jersey	447	207	340	116
Iowa	436	205	231	113
South Carolina	274	129	145	112
Massachusetts	497	234	263	112
Vermont	471	223	238	111
Michigan	456	217	239	110
West Virginia	301	145	156	108
Tennessee	279	135	144	107
Rhode Island	408	198	210	106
New Mexico	359	175	184	105
Minnesota	442	217	225	104
Arizona	425	208	217	104
California	559	278	281	101
South Dakota	398	198	200	101
Arkansas	252	126	126	100
Indiana	357	180	177	98
Maine	380	193	187	97
Texas	316	162	154	95
Washington	443	228	215	94
North Dakota	376	198	178	90
Utah	375	197	178	90
Nevada	517	273	244	89
Florida	347	184	163	89
New Hampshire	333	177	156	88
Ohio	343	185	158	85
Wyoming	434	236	198	84
Idaho	347	189	158	84
Montana	398	219	179	82
Kansas	395	218	177	81
Colorado	419	234	185	81
Oregon	400	225	175	78
Louisiana	331	188	143	76
Oklahoma	306	177	129	73
U.S. average	427	201	226	112

Source: Tax Foundation Inc.

The point of this Mr. Speaker is only to call attention to the fact that "someone, someplace, sometime," must begin to call a halt to runaway public spending. President Truman used to say, "the buck stops here." Unfortunately, that is not the case with the national debt and the spiraling debt ceiling—the buck never stops. Perhaps if the Congress applied the brakes to Federal expenditures, the effect would be emulated throughout the country.

On a few occasions recently I have informed my colleagues about the growing size of the public debt. These comments would not be complete without bringing the matter up-to-date. As of January 25, the gross public debt stood at \$425,608,928,541.83.

HOW WE LOST SUPERIORITY AND ACCEPTED INFERIORITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, our national security is not a subject of partisan politics. Our survival as a nation is above politics. All Americans want to survive in this turbulent world. Many Americans differ as to the intentions of the Soviet Union and whether or not our basic self-interest demands military superiority or not. These are proper areas of debate. I believe most Americans want superiority and believe that we are only secure when we are the strongest nation in the world.

Those who reject superiority as a national goal have, unfortunately, been in the ascendancy in government for the

past 11 years. This bridges three national administrations. Those of us who have advocated superiority and reject unilateral disarmament, parity, sufficiency, and all of the theories which have been used to cover up our decline as a military power are more alarmed today than at any time in our postwar history. What we are confronted with in 1972 is no longer a theoretical debate. We are hard against an actual condition which even now is not understood by many Americans because our leaders choose not to present the facts to them. I take this time today to detail this 25-year decline in our military capabilities and to present the realities as they face us in the seventies.

The facts are there, the challenge is there. Many Americans have spoken out on the dangers of our current deterioration in defense posture. A few weeks ago, Dr. Edward Teller, the famed nuclear scientist, charged that he is "convinced that within a few years" we will not have the basic strategic forces to deter a Soviet nuclear attack. He made this solemn pronouncement on the ABC television program "Issues and Answers" and added the warning that—

The Russians are building very rapidly. We are in slow motion. Sometimes in no motion. They are getting ahead of us. They are ahead of us, even today, in every field, except possibly we may yet have an edge in sea power, and we are losing rapidly.

This is not idle talk. The facts which I present in this address clearly support this contention.

Statements by the score could be cited here to buttress my charge that our Government leaders are presiding over a deliberate deterioration of our defenses. Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover has bluntly warned that the United States faces "national extinction" unless major steps are taken to rebuild our defenses. The Dallas Times Herald of January 13, 1972, quotes Senator JOHN TOWER as saying:

We still have an edge but I could not begin to tell you how tenuous that edge is.

Whether or not we have an edge, it is clear that defense-minded experts like Senator TOWER are vitally concerned at the trend. He went on to say that decisive Russian superiority in armaments could "force the United States into an isolationist position whether we wanted it or not." Many of us have made these same warnings over the years, yet our situation has become more precarious each year.

Why have all of our warnings gone unheeded? Because Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon during their terms of office chose to follow the advice of those who counseled against superiority and accepted what I believe to be an incorrect assessment of the role of the Soviet Union in the future and whether or not the Communists are a threat to our future security.

Let me bring the issue into perspective in another way. For the past 10 years, Americans such as myself have debated other Americans on the question of whether or not the Soviet Union could develop the military capabilities to catch us and pass us. Unfortunately, we won that argument. While those who rejected

superiority presided over deliberate policies of disarmament in the past three administrations, the U.S.S.R. coldly and surely developed the capabilities to threaten our survival. To use Dr. Teller's term, while we were in "no motion," they aggressively moved with determination to become the No. 1 military power in the world. Now what happens? The debate shifts and the liberal now says, in effect, "So what, they have developed the capabilities—we lost that debate—but you can be sure that their intentions are honorable and they will not use this clearly developed military superiority to threaten us." Will we be required to debate 10 years on their intentions? What if the liberal is wrong on this issue, too? What will it take to convince them or this administration that they are wrong? A nuclear blackmail in some future confrontation with the U.S.S.R. in which the tables are reversed and we, not they, must back down? Or an attack by the Soviet Union? How ridiculous can we be in so foolishly playing Russian roulette with the survival of this Nation? But let me detail the strange story of how we lost superiority and accepted inferiority.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT DECEPTION

A nine-page statement written December 29 on the letterhead of the Secretary of Defense proves that 205,000,000 Americans are being left naked to Communist strategic attack or nuclear blackmail, and confirms that the disastrous policies of Secretary Robert McNamara have been continued under the Nixon administration. This statement, which apparently represents the best rebuttal the Defense Department can make to its critics, is a combination of revealing admissions, omissions, and false statements.

The key concept to keep in mind in discussion of U.S. defense policies and the Soviet missile threat is strategic superiority. By strategic superiority, we mean that America should be superior to every other nation in weapons which are capable of hitting the enemy in his homeland—so superior that any prospective enemy knows in advance that it is total folly to commit acts of aggression against us. Because we live in the nuclear-space age, strategic superiority means, more precisely, superiority in nuclear weapons.

Why do we need superiority? Because, unfortunately, we live in a world where there are international criminals who take advantage of weakness. The evidence of all recorded history provides emphatic proof that weakness invites attack and that the best way to live in peace and freedom is through superior military strength.

When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace.¹

So long as there are criminals in our streets, we will need the protection of our local police. So long as there are international criminals in possession of giant nuclear weapons, we will need U.S. nuclear superiority. History, logic, and commonsense all tell us that the safest road to peace is through military superiority.

Footnotes at end of article.

Hitler started World War II when he thought he could win quick easy victories because the West was disarmed under the influence of the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the London and Washington naval disarmament treaties. The umbrella-carrying officials of 1939 naively thought that we had moved from an age of confrontation to a new age of negotiation. The negotiations at Munich, however, only convinced Hitler that England and France were too weak to resist and whetted his appetite to devour other countries.

We have been told by some spokesmen that "parity," or nuclear equality, is enough to protect America because this would provide a "balance of terror" which neither side would dare to upset. For some nations in some circumstances, where both sides act according to the Golden Rule or the Marquis of Queensberry Rules for a fair fight, parity might be adequate.

SURPRISE ATTACKS

But everyone knows that the United States will never strike first, whereas the Soviets have a long history of always striking first—and without warning. The Soviets committed surprise, sneak attacks on Poland and then Finland in 1939, on Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in 1940, on Hungary in 1956, and on Czechoslovakia in 1968.

The test of U.S. nuclear strength is not our before-attack inventory, but how much nuclear power we would have left after a surprise Soviet attack. Under conditions of parity, the side which has a policy of surprise attack, has at least a 2-to-1 advantage over the side which does not practice surprise attacks. Therefore the only rational policy is for the United States to have decisive superiority which is known in advance by all prospective aggressors. As the Father of our country, George Washington, said:

If we desire to secure peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.²

Under the Eisenhower administration, military superiority was our established and recognized national defense policy. This policy worked. It was a proven success. President Eisenhower was not afraid of pacifist catcalls about "escalating the arms race." He preached and practiced the policy of overwhelming superiority.

The Eisenhower years were the years when we ordered all our Minuteman missiles, our Atlas and Titan missiles, our Polaris submarines, and our B-52 bombers. Virtually, every strategic nuclear weapon which protects the United States today was built or ordered under the Eisenhower administration.

The results of this policy were plain to see. No American boy was sent to die in any foreign war. No fifth-rate dictatorship such as North Korea captured any U.S. ships, such as the *Pueblo*, on the high seas. No Soviet missiles or submarines threatened us from Cuba. No Cuban pirates hijacked ships off the coast of Florida and imprisoned American citizens. In short, the United States was safe.

THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

When the Kennedy-Johnson administration took office in January 1961, it

inherited the vast strategic superiority built up under the Eisenhower administration. This is why we were successful at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in October 1962. Let no one think that the Soviets took their missiles off their launching pads in Cuba merely because President Kennedy looked eyeball-to-eyeball to Khrushchev. The only reason why the Soviets backed down in that nuclear confrontation was that, after our U-2 flight discovered the Soviet missiles, our great Strategic Air Command went on airborne or 15-minute alert with 50,000 megatons of nuclear striking power. We had a 5-to-1 superiority in nuclear striking power—and the Soviets knew it.

As we look back on the years of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, we can see that the policy of strategic superiority was deliberately—although covertly—abandoned after the Cuban missile crisis. The years following the Cuban missile crisis saw a steady dismantling of U.S. nuclear power—even in the face of a large-scale buildup of nuclear weapons by the Soviet Union.

PAUL NITZE'S PLAN

The rationale for this policy of scrapping U.S. nuclear striking power was laid out on April 29, 1960, by a New York investment banker named Paul Nitze. Speaking at the important Asilomar National Strategy Seminar in California before a distinguished audience of more than 500 scholars and strategists, Nitze made these far-reaching proposals: First, that we abandon "a true class A nuclear capability"; and, second, that "we scrap the fixed base vulnerable systems that have their principal utility as components of a class A capability."

As soon as Kennedy became President, Paul Nitze was brought into the Defense Department as Assistant Secretary of International Security Affairs. Subsequently, he was promoted to Secretary of the Navy, and finally to Deputy Secretary of Defense, the No. 2 job in the Defense Department, second only to McNamara.

Nitze's 1960 Asilomar speech seemed incredible when he made it, and even for several years thereafter. As we look back with the benefit of hindsight, we can see that it was a perfect preview of the McNamara policies which were to be carried out during the 8 years of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Here are the elements of the class A strategic nuclear power which McNamara and Nitze scrapped: three-fourths of our multi-megaton missiles—149 Atlas and Titan I missiles—all our intermediate- and medium-range missiles—based in Europe and Turkey—three-fourths of our strategic bombers—30 B-52's, 1,400 B-47's, and 600 carrier heavy-attack bombers which were stripped of their nuclear weapons—the 24-megaton bomb—our largest weapon—our airborne alert, 23 antibomber missile batteries—called Nike-Hercules—and our missile and bomber bases close to Soviet borders—in Turkey, Italy, North Africa, and England.

Here are the class A nuclear weapon systems which McNamara and Nitze

abandoned or refused to build: the second thousand Minuteman missiles which had originally been scheduled by the Eisenhower administration, an advanced supersonic strategic bomber which was actually built and successfully flown as early as 1965, an advanced bomber interceptor, the Skybolt air-to-surface long-range missile, the antimissile system, space weapons—such as the Soviet FOBS—Pluto, Dynasoar, Orion, and all plans to make our missiles mobile by putting them on surface ships and freight trains.

By 1967, our once overwhelming nuclear superiority was gone. The proof was provided by a report called "The Changing Strategic Military Balance"³ written by a distinguished committee headed by Gen. Bernard Schriever who had been in charge of the development and deployment of all our Minuteman missiles. Published by the House Armed Services Committee, the heart of this report was a chart which showed a comparison between the nuclear striking power of the United States and the Soviet Union. The chart formed a large "X." It showed that in 1962 the United States had a 5 to 1 superiority over the Soviets. Since that date, U.S. strength has gone steadily downhill, while Soviet strength has gone steadily uphill.

The chart showed that 1967 was the crossover year when the United States and the Soviet Union were roughly equal in megatonnage delivery capability, or nuclear striking power. The chart then projected into the future and predicted that by 1971 the positions of the United States and the Soviets would be completely reversed, with the Soviets having a 5 to 1 superiority over the United States.

RICHARD NIXON'S PROMISES

In the presidential campaign of 1968, candidate Richard Nixon addressed himself forthrightly to this issue. He warned in a radio network broadcast on October 19 that the Johnson administration by "shortsighted defense policies" had dissipated the strategic advantage left by the Eisenhower administration. He said:

As a result even where the thinly stretched forces of the United States can be deployed, they no longer are backed by the decisive nuclear superiority which in past crises made our power fully credible.

Continuing, Mr. Nixon warned that the Soviet Union has "very nearly achieved its goal of superiority in strategic nuclear power."

On October 24, 1968, candidate Nixon charged in a nationwide radio speech that under the Democratic administrations since 1961, when McNamara took over the Defense Department, "a gravely serious security gap" had developed that could grow to a "survival gap" by 1970 or 1971. Citing decreases in percentages of American superiority over the Russians in modern weaponry, Mr. Nixon charged that—

In recent years our country has followed policies which now threaten to make Amer-

ica second best both in numbers and quality of major weapons.

Mr. Nixon said that if elected President he would undo the sweeping Pentagon reorganization of former Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Richard Nixon then blasted what he called the Democratic administration's "peculiar, unprecedented doctrine called 'parity'." He said he intended to "restore our objective of clearcut military superiority," and "do away with wishful thinking either as to the capability or the intent of potential enemies."

These emphatic promises were a major reason why large numbers of voters believed "Nixon's the one" and voted for him in November 1968.

The Democratic platform at recent conventions has not stressed superiority. The American people had reason to believe, however, that Republicans would return to a policy of superiority. It is important to note that the Republican Party position on defense has always been for "superiority." The Republican Party never settled for any vague phrases such as "keeping America strong," or "strategic sufficiency," or "assured destruction capability," all of which are subject to a hundred different definitions. The last five Republican platforms clearly called for U.S. military power to be the greatest in the world—and everyone understands the meaning of being in first place.

For example, the 1968 Republican platform said:

We pledge . . . a comprehensive program to restore the *pre-eminence* of U.S. military strength.

The 1964 Republican platform said:

We will maintain a *superior, not merely equal*, military capability as long as the Communist drive for world domination continues.

The 1960 Republican platform said:

The Republican Party is pledged to making certain that our arms, and our will to use them, remain *superior to all threats*.

The 1956 Republican platform said:

We have the *strongest striking force in the world*.

The 1952 Republican platform said:

We should develop . . . such power as to deter sudden attack or promptly and decisively defeat it.

Richard Nixon ran on four of these five platforms, twice as a vice presidential candidate, and twice as a presidential candidate. Thus he pledged that he supported this consistent Republican policy of military superiority, especially when combined with his radio speeches of October 1968.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION RECORD

When the Nixon administration went into office, we expected it to move quickly to restore our superiority. We waited—and we waited—and we waited. In December 1970, the White House mailed out a brochure entitled "The Nixon Administration's First 2 Years." One page in this booklet was entitled "Keeping America Strong."

The first section brags about how President Nixon has "reordered priorities"

Footnotes at end of article.

from defense to social welfare. The second section tells how President Nixon's "reoriented defense" emphasizes the Safeguard ABM which he "substituted" for Lyndon Johnson's ABM. The fact is that the Nixon ABM calls for defending only two sites; the Johnson ABM called for defending 12 sites. The third part of "Keeping America Strong" concerns the draft lottery system which has nothing whatsoever to do with our overall military strength or superiority. Then, there is a blank space—the administration was unable to list even one action it has taken to restore U.S. superiority, as solemnly promised.

President Nixon issued his state of the world message on February 25, 1971, a very lengthy document called "U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's." This document was admittedly written by Henry Kissinger, who has been called the second most powerful man in our Government.

The state of the world message is written in very sophisticated language, but the meaning is clear to anyone who studies it. It admits the decision by the Nixon administration "to pursue a policy of strategic sufficiency rather than strategic superiority." The message includes a chart which clearly shows that the Soviets have many more missiles than we have, and it contains no program to build any more U.S. missiles.

Who made this decision to repudiate President Nixon's solemn promises and platform of 1968? When was it made? Did President Nixon make the decision? Or is Mr. Kissinger powerful enough to call the shots and reverse Republican policy?

The word "sufficiency" was carefully chosen by Mr. Kissinger in the hope that the American people will infer that it is "sufficient" to protect us. When we examine the content of this tricky term "sufficiency," we find it can cover a weakness worse even than parity. It can even mean decisive inferiority. In the face of the Soviet missile buildup, the only posture which is sufficient for American survival is effective superiority. The Kissinger doctrine is "sufficient" only as a sop for Americans and appeasement for the Soviets.

ADMINISTRATION REJECTS SUPERIORITY

On August 26, 1971, a letter written by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Lawrence S. Eagleburger, stated the policy of the Nixon administration even more bluntly. This letter clearly states that the Nixon administration policy "is a defensive one" and that "it rejects the aim of strategic superiority." The letter goes on to admit that "the Soviet Union presently does maintain a larger navy than the United States," but indicates no U.S. plans for restoring our former lead.

Of course, there was hardly anything else the Defense Department could do except admit Soviet naval superiority after the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy published its 278-page report on May 14, 1971, setting forth the official figures. The U.S. Navy has 563 surface units compared with the Soviet navy of 2,009 surface units. The United States has 142 submarines compared with

the Soviet submarine strength of 355. This prestigious committee concluded that unless prompt measures are taken to build up a nuclear navy, America will have "to give in on all issues." It said:

There may be no future. . . . We will soon find ourselves unable to defend our national interests.

Meanwhile, the Republican Congressional Committee newsletter inadvertently revealed other aspects of the Nixon administration policy. The March 22, 1971, issue asked the question "What truth is there to the reports that the Russians are once again building up their military capabilities in Cuba?" The answer says that President Nixon is relying on an "understanding" which President Kennedy had with the Soviets in 1962 that they will not install any nuclear missiles or submarine bases in Cuba. President Nixon is then quoted as saying:

We're watching the situation closely . . . and we will, of course, bring the matter to their attention if we find that the understanding is violated.

This makes the changed strategic military balance very clear, indeed. In 1962, President Kennedy could tell Khrushchev, "Take the missiles out," and Khrushchev took them out. In 1972, all President Nixon can do is to "bring the matter to their attention"—as if they did not already know it. The plain fact is that we no longer have the power to protect our country from nuclear missiles which can kill scores of millions of Americans. All President Nixon can do is call up on the hot line and say, "Please Mr. Brezhnev, don't fire."

The Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter of July 26, 1971, contains a chart which brags that, whereas President Eisenhower spent 49.7 percent of the Federal budget on defense, and President Kennedy spent 45.1 percent on defense, and President Johnson spent 45 percent on defense, President Nixon is spending only 33.8 percent of the Federal budget on defense. Obviously, there are no plans to restore our military superiority when the administration is boasting about so drastically reducing funds for defense and diverting them to welfare programs. President Nixon's budget message presented on January 24, 1972, shows that defense will receive only 29.2 percent of the budget for fiscal year 1972-73.

BLUE RIBBON REPORT

Shortly after his election, President Nixon appointed a blue ribbon defense panel to study the workings of the Defense Department. Seven members of that panel became so alarmed about the loss of U.S. superiority that they wrote a supplemental statement called "The Shifting Balance of Military Power." This report was signed by seven of the most distinguished business and professional men in the country, including the new Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell, Jr., who is reported to have been the principal author.

This blue ribbon statement deplored "the abandonment by the United States of its former policy of maintaining strategic superiority," and concluded that "in the seventies neither the vital interests of the United States nor the

lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure." The statement warned that—

The world order of the future will bear a Soviet trademark, with all peoples upon whom it is imprinted suffering Communist repression.

The blue ribbon statement concluded that, if we want to avoid this fate—

The only viable national strategy is to regain and retain a clearly superior strategic capability. . . . The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely to the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive.

The other six men who signed the blue ribbon supplemental statement were George Champion, president of the Economic Development Council in New York and former president of the Chase Manhattan Bank; William P. Clements, Jr., president of the Southeastern Drilling Co. in Dallas; John M. Fulke, president of the John M. Fulke Manufacturing Co. in Seattle; Hobart D. Lewis, president of the Reader's Digest Association in Pleasantville, N.Y.; and Wilfred J. McNeil, director of Fairchild Hiller Corp.

This blue ribbon supplemental statement was submitted to the President on September 30, 1970, whereupon it was suppressed by the Nixon administration for nearly 6 months. It was finally quietly released on March 12, 1971, without any explanation, comment, or refutation.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT REBUTTAL

A nine-page statement written December 29 on the letterhead of the Secretary of Defense is the first attempt by the Nixon administration to answer the blue ribbon supplemental statement or other criticisms of the Nixon defense policies. This Defense Department statement proves that the blue ribbon defense panel members were wholly justified in their alarm about the state of U.S. defenses and our inability to defend ourselves against Soviet nuclear power.

It seems to be human nature, when charged with responsibility for a disaster, to rely on one of two excuses: First, it is not true; or second, it is someone else's fault. The Defense Department statement falls into a hopeless trap by making the mistake of trying to use both excuses. It says, in effect; first, it is not true that our strategic defenses are in bad shape; and second, the reason why our defenses are in such bad shape is that Congress cut so much from Nixon's budget requests.

The obvious conclusion is: why blame Congress for cutting budget requests when the Nixon administration says, in effect, do not worry, our defenses are OK? The Defense Department statement is shot through with attempts to place all the blame on Congress for cutting the budget; yet the letter paints a rosy picture of our defenses which would entice almost any Congressman to slash spending.

Let us take the Defense Department statement and point out some of its revealing statements, omissions, and falsehoods. The numbered headings below are the subheads used in the December 29 Defense Department statement.

First. "The changing balance of strategic forces." This section of the Defense Department statement confirms "the recent rapid growth of Soviet nuclear forces" and admits that the figures cited in the blue ribbon statement and other criticisms of our present policy "are not significantly different from those provided by Secretary of Defense Laird" and in other public statements by the President and officials of his administration.

The Defense Department statement reminds us that the blue ribbon statement said that—

The President and the Secretary of Defense are fully aware of the trends.

That is right, they are fully aware of the trends. The trouble is that they are not doing anything about it. Nobody claims the President does not know about the Soviet nuclear threat; he proved in his 1968 campaign speeches that he does know about it. Nobody claims that Secretary Laird does not know about the need for U.S. nuclear superiority; he proved in his book "A House Divided" that he fully understands the Soviet nuclear threat. The problem is that they are not doing anything to protect the United States by rebuilding our superiority.

The Defense Department statement denies that the Nixon administration "is willing to settle for second place," and again denies that the Nixon administration "is willing to settle for a status quo posture in developing U.S. strategic forces." The proof that these statements are wrong is that the Defense Department is unable to cite one single new strategic weapon that the Nixon administration has built in 3 years. Just yesterday, my friend Senator BARRY GOLDWATER blasted the Defense Department for this very shortcoming. It has not built a single new ICBM, a single new Polaris or nuclear-missile-firing submarine, a single new strategic bomber, a single space weapon. When you do not order a single missile launcher in three long years, that is certainly settling for the status quo. In the face of the Soviet buildup, it is settling for second place.

Second. "Alleged superiority of Soviet Union." This section contains the kernel of the deception practiced by the Defense Department. The Defense Department statement denies that the Soviet Union is now the world's first military power, and makes the misleading claim that—

The U.S. today has more strategic nuclear weapons than does the Soviet Union.

The Defense Department statement offers absolutely no proof, no figures that can be checked. Let us look at the facts:⁷

	United States	U.S.S.R.
ICBM's.....	1,054	1,600
IRBM's and MRBM's.....	0	700
Space weapons.....	0	¹ FOBS
Sub-launched ballistic missiles.....	656	387
Sub-launched cruise missiles.....	0	350
Heavy bombers.....	450	200
Medium bombers (which can be refueled in air so as to hit the enemy).....	0	700
Antibalistic missiles.....	2	64

¹ Number unknown.

The Defense Department statement says that the numbers of strategic weapons "is only one of several elements that must be considered." That is correct. Numbers alone are wholly inadequate to give an accurate picture of the strategic balance. But the Defense Department statement implies that the other factors support the proposition that the United States is stronger. That implication is false: these other factors add overwhelming proof that the Soviet Union now has nuclear superiority, and that the United States has been reduced to decisive inferiority. Here are four vital factors which the Defense Department statement conveniently ignores:

Rate of construction. Because of the enormous leadtime required for nuclear weapons, we know now what the relative strengths of the two nations will be 2 or 3 years hence. The United States has not built a single additional strategic weapon since 1967. The Soviets, on the other hand, are building at a crash wartime rate. They have 100 big holes already dug for new and larger missiles.⁸ They have greatly increased the capacity of their shipyards and are turning out Polaris-type submarines at a rate that next year will equal our frozen total of 41.

Megatonnage. The amount of explosive firepower that nuclear weapons can rain on the enemy is the most important factor of all. When we compute the deliverable megatonnage totals of the weapons listed above, the Soviets have decisive superiority. Each giant Soviet SS-9, of which the Soviets have more than 300, has 25 times the explosive power of each of our Minuteman missiles.

In January 1971, Lt. Gen. Glen Martin, deputy commander of our Strategic Air Command, said:

The Russians today have three times the nuclear megatonnage of the U.S.⁹

Since then, the Soviet building program has continued at such a rapid rate that most authorities now estimate that the Soviets have a superiority of 5-to-1 over the United States in deliverable nuclear megatonnage. Stewart Alsop writing in *Newsweek* on November 1, 1971, stated that "in terms of missile megatonnage, they have between five and 10 times the thermonuclear capacity we have."

Refire capability. Many Soviet missile launchers have it, but U.S. missile launchers do not. Refire capability greatly increases the total number of deliverable Soviet missiles.

Reliability of delivery. Since the Soviets have an extensive antimissile system already deployed with 64 ABM launchers, and thousands of SAM's which can be upgraded swiftly to ABM use, we have no reliability that any significant number of our surviving missiles can get through and hit their targets.

Our bombers have even less reliability of delivery. Before launch, they are vulnerable to Soviet SLBM's, especially their low trajectory missiles, and to FOBS and OBS missiles. Because McNamara canceled the Skybolt, our bombers cannot deliver any payloads unless they actually

reach the area of the Soviet Union. There they are up against some 10,000 SAM's, the world's most extensive and complex radar systems, and more than 2,000 Soviet interceptor and fighter aircraft.

One of the most incredible sentences in the Defense Department statement is this:

The specific claim that the Soviet Union is now the world's first military power is not supported by the Supplemental Statement of some Blue Ribbon Defense Panel Members nor is it supported by the Defense Department's analyses of the current threat.

There has always been something drastically wrong with "Defense Department analyses" and estimates. President Nixon specifically stated that our intelligence estimates were 60 percent under actual Soviet missile deployment.

In regard to the blue ribbon supplemental statement, however, it appears that the Defense Department "experts" have not even read it. Here are some relevant quotations from the blue ribbon statement:

In a dramatic shift in the balance of power, largely unnoticed by the public, the quarter century of clear U.S. strategic superiority has ended. The Soviet Union has moved significantly ahead of the United States in ICBM's, the principal weapon system of the nuclear age. . . . No informed person now denies that the period of clear U.S. superiority has ended. . . . The Soviet SS-9 ICBM force alone is capable of delivering a megatonnage of nuclear warheads several times greater than that of the entire U.S. force of ICBM's and SLBM's. . . . The Soviet Union has attained for the first time a superior strategic capability—where it counts the most—in ICBM's. . . . More serious than the numerical superiority is the substantial megatonnage advantage enjoyed by the Soviet Union. The enormous payloads of the SS-9's have a destructive capacity incomparably greater than any U.S. missile.¹⁰

Third: "Military strengths." Buried in a mass of vague and meaningless words is a most revealing admission. The Defense Department statement quotes Secretary of Defense Laird as saying in April 1969 that—

The Soviet Union has the capacity of achieving by the mid-1970's, a superiority over the presently authorized and programmed forces of the United States in all areas—offensive strategic forces, defensive strategic forces, and conventional forces.

That statement made in April 1969 is tantamount to admitting that the Soviet Union now has that superiority because of the very rapid rate of Soviet buildup during the last 3 years—a rate which was far in excess of 1969 Pentagon estimates—plus the fact that "the presently authorized and programmed forces of the United States" have not changed. Even as late as the President's state of the Union message on January 20, 1972, the Nixon administration has no plans for actually producing any additional strategic weapons.

On August 27, 1971, Gen. B. K. Holloway, commander in chief of our Strategic Air Command, told the Commonwealth Club of California—

The U.S.S.R. exceeds us in every major offensive and defensive strategic weapon system, except missile submarines.¹¹

On October 8, 1971, the Pentagon's Research Chief, Dr. John S. Foster,

Footnotes at end of article.

stated that even that slim edge in missile submarines is gone because, counting what the Soviets have at sea and what they have under construction, the Soviet fleet of Polaris-type missile-firing submarines is now "roughly equal" to the U.S. force.¹²

Fourth. "National security policy." In this section, the Defense Department statement attempts to diffuse responsibility for maintaining U.S. superiority by shifting the argument to pretend that somehow we are safeguarded by "overall free world strength." Secretary Laird is quoted as saying that "America will no longer try to play policeman to the world, but will expect other nations to provide more cops on the beat in their own neighborhood."

Let us examine the facts. The Soviet Union has 700 intermediate and medium-range nuclear missiles targeted on Western Europe. There is absolutely no way that Western Europeans can provide "cops on the beat" to protect themselves against this nuclear threat. Western Europe does not have any antimissile defense system whatsoever, nor any missiles to serve as a deterrent to the 700 Soviet nuclear missiles. Most of our free world allies cannot build nuclear weapons to protect themselves because we prohibited them from doing that when President Nixon promoted and signed the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

If we compare conventional military forces, the NATO powers are hopelessly outnumbered and outgunned by the Warsaw Pact powers. There is no way Western Europe can be protected without the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

The unpleasant truth is that, since President Nixon took office, overall free world strength has receded badly in the Mediterranean, Libya—where President Nixon meekly surrendered our giant Wheelus Air Base—Berlin, Taiwan, the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia, and South Asia.

Five. "Military spending." This section of the Defense Department statement blames all cuts in defense spending on the winding down of the Vietnam war or congressional cuts. This evades the issue. The important part is what we are spending on strategic weapons—weapons to protect 205,000,000 Americans against the Soviet missile threat. A chart in the report called "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance," prepared by a distinguished committee including Nobel prize winners Dr. Willard F. Libby and Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, Dr. Edward Teller, developer of the H-bomb, and Dr. William J. Thaler, developer of over-the-horizon radar, shows the great superiority over the United States of Soviet spending for strategic weapons.¹³

This section brags that the winding down of the Vietnam war is "probably the most efficient and orderly withdrawal of both military forces and resources in our history." This boast is simply not true. In the 3 years since President Nixon took office, 20,000 American servicemen have been killed in Vietnam. President Eisenhower took office in 1953 under practically identical circum-

stances. Because he took affirmative action and warned the Reds that there would be no more privileged sanctuaries, he ended the Korean war in 6 months with few additional American casualties.

The Defense Department statement is unable to point out any significant spending it has done on strategic weapons. It has not added a single additional land-based or sea-based missile launcher, built a single strategic bomber, or developed a single space weapon. Its rate of spending on the two lone ABM sites is so slow that it will still be several more years before they are operational, although they were approved in 1969. If the Defense Department were on the job, it ought to be able to point to some new strategic weapons to show for the \$75 billion it has been spending each year.

The real clue to the deception practiced by the Nixon administration was provided in October 1971 when Senator JAMES BUCKLEY proposed three crucial amendments to authorize a mere \$42 million in research and development so the United States would have the option in the early 1970's to expand the range of our Minuteman missiles, and improve Poseidon missiles. The Defense Department lobbied strenuously against these amendments and brought about their defeat. It was not the Senate liberals who defeated these crucial amendments; it was the Nixon administration and the Defense Department.

Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research, stated that the Soviets are spending 40 percent more than the United States on military research, and that this "will lead almost certainly to some very serious military surprises." Dr. Foster said that U.S. military research has leveled off since 1968—that is, since President Nixon took office—while the Soviet effort has not only continued to increase but has shifted from space to military technology.¹⁴

The Defense Department statement ends this section boasting about the Nixon administration's "increased emphasis on our security assistance programs." Military aid in conventional weapons provided to other countries is irrelevant in the absence of the U.S. nuclear umbrella, which is the only way any of the free world can protect itself from the Soviet Union.

Six. "Alleged first-strike capability of Soviet Forces." In this section, the Defense Department statement plays on the general confusion of the American people in regard to what "first-strike capability" means. It means a counterforce capability, or the capability of effectively knocking out the enemy's strategic weapons.

The first thing to note about this section is that the Defense Department does not claim that the United States has a first-strike, or counterforce, capability against the Soviet Union. A U.S. first-strike capability was specifically rejected by the Paul Nitze proposal in 1960, and scrapped by the McNamara-Nitze team during its nearly 8 years of U.S. unilateral strategic disarmament. The United States has no effective capability to knock out Soviet strategic weapons in significant numbers.

Remembering that a first-strike ca-

pability means the ability to knockout enough of the enemy's strategic weapons to prevent devastating retaliation, we should heed the statement by Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Pentagon Research Chief, that when the Soviets have "a little over 400 SS-9's," they can knock out all but a small fraction of our Minutemen.¹⁵ We know they already have at least 300, and they have 100 large new missile holes already dug.

The Defense Department statement relies on the old McNamara "numbers game" to throw us off the track of the real meaning of the Soviet first-strike capability; namely, that "in numbers of deliverable warheads, the United States still has a substantial numerical advantage." The blue ribbon defense panel supplemental statement in commenting on this "numbers game" about warheads said:

It would be difficult to conceive of a better way to mislead the public than to present—without precise definition and analysis—comparative figures of this kind. Those who present such distortions contribute to the confusion rather than enlightenment of our people.¹⁶

To which I say, Amen.

The writer of the Defense Department statement added:

We are confident that the Soviet Union does not have an effective first-strike nuclear attack capability....

The writer simply is not able to pass that "confidence" along to the rest of us because he offers no proof of his comment, nor does he even attempt to refute the hard evidence of the horrendous fact that the Soviets do have a first-strike capability.

Seventh. "Strategic arms limitations talks—SALT." This section makes the admission that the United States has "exercised restraints" during the period of the SALT talks in the hope of obtaining an agreement. Indeed we have exercised restraints. We have not added a single new missile or submarine or strategic bomber since the SALT talks were proposed in 1968. Meanwhile, the Soviets have raced ahead. They have added 1,000 ICBM's including at least 200 SS-9's. The longer we talk, the more missiles the Soviets build.¹⁷

The Defense Department statement tries to confuse the fact of our failure to increase our strategic forces by a paragraph which might sound impressive to those who are not well informed. Let us examine what it really says.

The Defense Department statement claims that we are replacing 550 Minuteman I missiles with "the much more versatile MIRVed Minuteman III." The fact is that the MIRV is not a Nixon project but a McNamara project. It does not add a single missile launcher to our strategic forces. The MIRV project cuts our deliverable megatonnage drastically because the MIRVed missiles can carry only a fraction of the megatonnage that our earlier Minuteman missiles could carry. We made the choice to MIRV our missiles in extremis in order to secure some hope of penetration of the already existing and rapidly expanding Soviet ABM. The Soviets can out-MIRV us 5 to 1 if they want to, but they have no need of

the "versatility" of the MIRV because we have no ABM defense at all now.

The Defense Department statement claims that we are deploying the Safeguard ABM to protect a portion of the Minuteman force. The facts are that we are beginning to prepare to deploy an ABM at only two Minuteman sites, that we will not have them operational for several years, and that no ABM defense for 205,000,000 American people against Soviet missiles is even planned. Mr. Nixon has said that it would be "provocative" to the Soviets for us to give protection to the American people against nuclear incineration.

The Defense Department statement says that we are converting 31 of our Polaris submarines to the MIRV'ed Poseidon. Poseidon is not a new weapon or an additional weapon. It is merely a modernization of the Polaris. The "conversion" project is not a Nixon project, but a McNamara project, and will take years to complete.

The Defense Department statement claims that we are dispersing alert bombers to more bases to enhance their survivability. The fact is that we are not adding a single bomber to our bomber fleet, but keep reducing the number of our strategic bombers every year. The fact is that McNamara stripped our country of all its antibomber defenses, and the Nixon administration has done nothing to restore them. Most important, McNamara terminated the airborne alert of our strategic bombers and this has not been restored by the Nixon administration.

The Defense Department tries to give the impression that our bombers are superior to the Soviets in ability to penetrate enemy defenses. The DOD statement claims that we are "equipping our bombers with improved air-to-surface missiles to enhance their ability to penetrate enemy defenses." The fact is that the Soviets do not need any improved penetrability because we have not any defenses for them to penetrate. A January 11, 1972, report of the House Armed Services Committee told about a Cuban airliner which flew to within 25 miles of New Orleans without being detected until its pilot radioed the airport for landing instructions. Chairman F. EDWARD HÉBERT commented:

Since our potential enemies know of the gaping holes in our air defenses, I think it is high time that the American people were let in on this open secret.

The "improved air-to-surface missiles" which the Defense Department statement mentions are not a Nixon project, but a McNamara project that was no good. The great weapon which we should have built, but which McNamara canceled after the Eisenhower administration spent millions on its development, and which Nixon is not building, is the Skybolt. McNamara canceled this great weapon and replaced it with the SRAM, which can go only 100 miles instead of 1,000. Its very name brands it with this weakness, since SRAM is an acronym for "short range attack missile." It is such a poor substitute for Skybolt that SRAM is sometimes referred to as SHAM.

The Defense Department statement says that we are "developing" the under-

sea long-range missile system—ULMS. Note that the statement does not say anything at all about producing the ULMS. This is the same typical kind of stall that McNamara used for 7 years. He always talked about "developing" and "keeping the option," but the years went on and nothing was ever produced.

The Defense Department statement says that we are "developing" the B-1 strategic bomber. Note again that we are only "developing" and not producing. We have needed to go into production on an advanced strategic bomber for 10 years, but the Nixon administration is continuing the McNamara stall under which we get only words and wooden mockups, but never any strategic aircraft. The Nixon administration should have ordered the production of the B-1 in 1969, but the Defense Department statement confirms not only that we have not started production, but that the Nixon administration has not yet even made the decision ever to order the B-1 into production. Meanwhile, the Soviets have test flown their own "B-1," called the "Backfire." According to the New York Times, this puts them at least 5 years ahead of us in this field.¹⁵

The Defense Department statement claims—

We are developing them (the B-1) at the optimum rate consistent with effective management.

This is absolutely untrue. At the rate the Nixon administration is proceeding, it will be at least 5 or 6 years before we have what the Soviets have now. It is a pitiful confession of failure to admit that the U.S. "optimum rate" of development is 5 years behind the Soviets.

NIKON'S AFL-CIO SPEECH

I wish we could assume that this Defense Department statement were the handiwork of some lameduck bureaucrat who is a hangover from the McNamara regime, and whose words do not reflect the views of the President. Unfortunately, the evidence is rather clear that the Defense Department statement has taken its cue directly from the President in misrepresenting the defense of the United States.

For example, on November 19, 1971, President Nixon spoke to the AFL-CIO Convention in Miami Beach. According to the UPI news account of what Nixon actually said in that speech:

He said that the Soviet Union's land-based missiles are presently equal to the United States "and possibly even a bit ahead."

Now let us reexamine the facts about land-based missiles. The United States has 1,054 land-based ICBM's, a number frozen since 1967. According to Pentagon sources quoted by the Associated Press on October 9, 1971, the Soviets have 1,600 land-based ICBM's, a number which is constantly increasing. This means that in numbers of land-based missiles, the Soviets already have 50 percent more than we do.

The megatonnage, or explosive fire-power of these U.S. missiles is 1,270. Each of our 1,000 Minutemen has 1 megaton, and each of our 54 Titans have 5 mega-

tons. The megatonnage of the Soviet missiles, however, is about 9,400. This is based on 25 megatons for each SS-9, 1 megaton each for the SS-11's and SS-13's and approximately 5 megatons each for the SS-6's, SS-7's and SS-8's.

This means that in explosive power of land-based missiles, the Soviets have at least 640 percent more than we do.

Not by any stretch of the English language can a numerical superiority of 50 percent and a megatonnage superiority of 640 percent be described as "possibly even a bit ahead." There is no way to read this statement except as a falsehood calculated to deceive the AFL-CIO whose votes President Nixon wants, as well as the American people.

Actually, his falsehood is even greater than this because the term he used, "land-based missiles," also includes intermediate and medium-range ballistic missiles as well as ICBM's. In this additional category the Soviets have 700 missiles, but the United States has none at all.

UNPREPAREDNESS FOR WAR

On the keel of nuclear aircraft carrier that bears the name of President Dwight Eisenhower are his great words:

Until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well nigh as criminal as war itself.

I charge that this administration is leaving us unprepared in the face of the greatest threat ever to confront America: The Soviet missile threat. We are truly caught in the "survival gap" which Candidate Richard Nixon predicted in his campaign in 1968.

President Nixon's state of the Union speech on January 20, 1972, made clear that he is continuing the disastrous McNamara policies of spending more billions on nonstrategic items, but stalling in building the strategic weapons we need for the protection of 205,000,000 Americans. His failure to call for the restoration of our military superiority proves again that he has repudiated his solemn campaign promise of October 24, 1968, to restore our "clearcut military superiority." A slight increase in defense spending for research and development does not begin to come to grips with the Soviet ICBM force which is today 50 percent larger than ours in numbers, and 640 percent greater in explosive power.

Words and blueprints cannot defend America against this threat. Only weapons can do this. Yet, Mr. Nixon has kept us in a self-imposed missile freeze ever since he became President. His failure to call for the immediate production of additional strategic weapons is a shocking abandonment of the constitutional duty of our Federal Government; namely, to "provide for the common defense."

Instead of rebuilding U.S. power to protect us from the Soviet missile threat, the Nixon administration is relying chiefly on the fruitless SALT talks in Helsinki and Vienna to persuade the Soviets to stop increasing their offensive and defensive weapons. To represent the United States in these talks, President Nixon appointed the two men who were most responsible for carrying out the disastrous McNamara disarmament policies

Footnotes at end of article.

from 1963 through 1968 which threw away our great U.S. missile, bomber, and naval superiority. These two men are Paul Nitze, who was L. B. J.'s Secretary of the Navy for 4 years, and then Deputy Secretary of Defense—second only to McNamara—and Harold Brown, L. B. J.'s Director of Defense Research and Engineering, and then Secretary of the Air Force.

LEADERSHIP GAP?

The blame can not be shifted. Those of us who consistently opposed the McNamara policies must in equal vigor oppose this administration's policies which are even more disastrous. I say more disastrous because, as pointed out before, we are not now dealing with theories or a debate over whether the Communists can develop the capabilities to threaten us. They have, in fact, developed these capabilities while we have been asleep. Three points indicate how far we have gone in moving away from policies of superiority.

First, this administration admits it has adopted self-imposed restraints to induce SALT talk concessions from the Soviet Union. In his July 13, 1971, testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, former Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard succinctly stated:

This Administration made a deliberate decision not to improve the accuracy of our MIRV, thereby improving hardened target destructive capability to what was and is technically possible.

He admitted this was done out of diplomatic rather than military considerations. Has this policy been successful? Listen to his terse observation in the same testimony:

In all candor, I must unfortunately report to this Committee that a similar restraint has not been evidenced on the other side.

Need I say more? How much does it take to convince this administration and the public that our dangerous course charted by the diplomats has failed? Will we come to realize too late that military considerations of survival rather than diplomatic estimates of the intentions of our enemy must guide American military decisions starting right now?

Second, probably the best indication of the lack of urgency in this administration to the military threat to our Nation is seen in the recent top level appointment of a successor to Mr. Packard. Many of us had hoped that someone knowledgeable in the field of defense would take Mr. Packard's place as the No. 2 man in the Defense Department. Instead, it went to a man from the diplomatic service, Kenneth Rush, who negotiated the Berlin Treaty. This clearly indicates that those who stress disarmament and negotiations with the Russians will be firmly in the saddle at the very time our crisis dictates that more realistic, national security-minded leaders should be appointed to key policy positions.

A third postscript is the almost tragically pathetic report which Senator HUGH SCOTT had published on December 13, 1971. Billed as "The Republican Report," its title is as follows:

The Republican Goal: Peace—With a Chance to Survive.

Note that he is not saying that a Republican analysis of the current world situation indicates that we have at best a chance to survive. Many might agree with that. He indicates, quite improperly, that the Republican goal is to have a mere chance to survive. This further indicates the debilitating nature of our leadership at the very time when the American people must be summoned to a commitment to restore military superiority.

President Nixon must repudiate the Defense Department statement of December 29 which paints a very inaccurate picture of U.S. security—a picture so rosy that it would persuade any Congressman to slash away at the defense budget and transfer those funds into domestic giveaways. If President Nixon does not repudiate this deceptive Defense Department statement, then he must take full responsibility for all the cuts Congress may make in strategic forces appropriations, and full responsibility for lulling the Nation into an apathy which will lead to national disaster.

Every American is threatened. Every American has a stake in our survival. Every American should demand a national policy of clear-cut military superiority, the time is now. We have passed from superiority to sufficiency to insufficiency. Irretrievability is just a short time away. Our Nation must be summoned to this challenge and this is one challenge that must be met if America is to enter its third century as a free and powerful nation.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Luke, 11:21.
- ² Dec. 3, 1793.
- ³ Published by U.S. House Armed Services Committee, July 1967. See pp. 27-31.
- ⁴ Part IV. Page 169 of the official bound edition.
- ⁵ Hearing on Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, dated Mar. 10, 1971, pp. xx, xxi, 91, 100, 101.
- ⁶ Pp. 2, ix, 8, 33, 35.
- ⁷ Figures compiled from statement by Dr. John Foster, Jr., Defense Department Research Chief, Oct. 8, 1971; *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, Aug. 1971, pp. 61-79; and *Jane's Weapon Systems*, 1971-1972, London.
- ⁸ AP Dispatch, Oct. 8, 1971.
- ⁹ *U.S. News & World Report*, Jan. 11, 1971, p. 49.
- ¹⁰ Pp. viii, 8, 9.
- ¹¹ *The Commonwealth*, 1971, p. 248.
- ¹² AP Dispatch, Oct. 8, 1971.
- ¹³ P. 27.
- ¹⁴ AP Dispatch, Aug. 27, 1971.
- ¹⁵ *U.S. News & World Report*, Nov. 30, 1970, p. 29.
- ¹⁶ P. 12.
- ¹⁷ "Lemming Strategy" by Dr. Stefan T. Possony, *Washington Report*, Nov. 5, 1971.
- ¹⁸ "Soviet Said To Fly Big New Bomber," *The New York Times*, Sept. 5, 1971.

SIX-YEAR PRESIDENTIAL TERM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, former President Lyndon B. Johnson last Thursday on national television again an-

nounced his support for a single-term, 6-year Presidency.

As the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 736, a constitutional amendment to establish a 6-year, single-term Presidency, I would like at this point to submit a statement elaborating on my position.

I introduced House Joint Resolution 736, a constitutional amendment providing for a single 6-year term for President, because I believe that such a change will strengthen the Executive's ability to run his department, that public confidence in the Executive will be increased, and, at the same time, the strength of the Congress in our three-legged governmental structure will be increased.

When the framers of our Constitution agreed in 1787 to 4-year terms, both life and the Government were relatively uncomplicated. Nearly 200 years later, we live a highly complex life on a shrunken globe with our \$250 billion a year government influencing nearly every aspect of our lives. From the standpoint of effective management of our enormous bureaucracy, I believe that a 6-year term is far superior to 4 years.

In addition, in terms of putting Presidential policy to work, 4 years is not enough to develop a legislative program, pass it in the Congress and test it in operation. The leadtimes required now have simply made a 4-year term obsolete.

Back in the old days, 2-year gubernatorial terms were also much in vogue. Many States have found that they had to extend terms for their Governors just as I seek now to extend the term of the President, and for the same reasons.

Perhaps the strongest reason for the 6-year single term is to reduce partisan attacks on the President and Presidential partisanship itself. Now, the President's greatest critics are his competitors in the Congress who are struggling to be elected to his job. It is to their advantage to destroy or weaken the credibility of his program whether it serves the national interest or not. An unfriendly Congress can force vetoes by overburdening good bills or by not allowing the President to achieve any of his programs, particularly in the 2 years before a campaign. Perhaps worse than causing legislative mischief, such action cannot help but undermine public confidence in any President.

On the other side of the coin, the President is always thought to be acting in a very political way prior to the re-election year. Whether he is doing so or not, he is accused of so doing. Rightly—sometimes—or wrongly—sometimes—a President standing for reelection is accused of developing short-run programs which are principally calculated to return him to office.

In addition, every President standing for reelection makes some use of his office for campaign purposes. This is unavoidable even with the best of motivations.

Even a totally unselfish President is supported by a large executive staff which feels a great need to reelect its boss. Even if the President is not taking advantage of his Office, frequently his staff may be.

House Joint Resolution 736, in my

judgment, would enable a President to hire better help. After election it takes a little time to assemble a first-rate team. A 6-year term would open up a larger selection for the President. No appointee would have to accept the uncertainty of a possible second term which may be desired very badly, or, not at all. The maximum work contract term would be fixed absolutely.

There have been times in our country's history where the advantage of the incumbency is almost enough to reelect automatically. There have been other times when it is risky to be an incumbent no matter how good the President is. With a single team, no President need get an undue advantage from his incumbency, nor need he be forced to spend a good deal of his time campaigning for reelection. When all his time is needed to manage the affairs of the country. It is unfair to ask a President to stand for reelection and then begrudge him the time necessary to take his programs to the people. It is unfair to the challenger to have to overcome the obvious advantages which are the exclusive province of the incumbent.

The single 6-year term acknowledges the complexity and difficulty of managing the executive apparatus of this country. We have extended widely the powers of the Presidency over the past forty years. Thus increases in power have been absolutely necessary, but they should now be balanced by a limitation of term to 6 years. The 6-year limitation will, in my judgment, give the Congress a chance to reattain its equality in our governmental decisionmaking. The 6-year term on one hand gives the President a better chance to run his department, and on the other gives the Congress a better chance to reassert itself on prerogatives in determining governmental policy.

Much criticism of the single term has centered on the erroneous argument that the President will be removed from politics. Many people, even those who think politics is a dirty word, acknowledge that politics is necessary to the successful operation of our representative, democratic Republic. The single 6-year term will give the President less interest in personal political survival, and make him less suspect, but it cannot take him out of politics. A political animal, he will naturally be interested in his party's success in future years. He will also be interested in seeing that some of his programs and policies are maintained in the future. He will not be removed from politics, he will simply be elevated from the lowest level of the arena where his motivations are most suspect.

It has also been contended that a "lame duck" President has no power. Every President is a potential lame duck. Certain of our Presidents have not sought reelection even when it was available to them. Every President in his second term is a lame duck. This single 6-year term would force a President to rely more heavily on the merit of his programs and appointments, but that is certainly not all bad.

I concur most heartily with President Woodrow Wilson's statement that 4

years is much too long for a bad President and not nearly long enough for a good one. To that I add that in this day and age 4 years is hardly long enough for any President. The 6-year term has had a variety of supporters which date back as far as Jefferson and extend through such differing philosophies as Presidents Cleveland, Taft, and Lyndon Johnson. It now enjoys the diverse support of Senators AIKEN and MANSFIELD in today's Senate.

The framers of our Constitution gave us a means by which the Constitution could be amended. Properly, it is a difficult amending process. Changes should not be considered lightly. Nevertheless, I do believe that, when the single 6-year term is examined from all standpoints, a majority of people in this country will conclude that it would be advantageous for us to make the change soon.

PRESS ASSOCIATION AWARDS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently the New England Press Association paid special tribute to two very fine newspapers and one outstanding editor in the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

The much-deserved honors went to Howard N. Fowler, managing editor of the Mansfield News, to the Foxboro Reporter, and to the Attleboro Sun Chronicle.

Fowler received a plaque recognizing his 50 years as a newspaperman and the enormous contribution to his town, his State, his country, and his fellow man that represents.

The weekly Foxboro Reporter was given first prize for the best editorial page in its category among New England newspapers.

The judges cited the page's writing imagination, effectiveness and impact, commenting that the Reporter "dares to be different, has good local flavor and impact."

The Reporter also received a second place award for the general excellence of a feature series, entitled "Focus on the Foxboro State Hospital," written by associate editor Jack Authelet.

Of this the judges said:

It is obvious that both the Foxboro State Hospital and the people of Foxboro would benefit greatly from the presentation of such a series.

First prize for the best feature story of 1971 went to the Sun Chronicle for its nine-part series, "Where Did Your Money Go?" which compared municipal spending and analyzed the cost and return of taxes in the Attleboro area. Written by Mark Melady and Oreste D'Arconte, it was hailed as a major journalistic achievement.

Mr. Speaker, the Foxboro Reporter and the Attleboro Sun Chronicle are fine newspapers in the best traditions of American journalism. They cover their communities fairly and thoroughly, present the news imaginatively and attractively and perform a very real service in

their spheres of influence. They were justly honored and I would like to add my congratulations to both and my very best wishes for future achievements and future prizes.

Mr. Fowler is a living monument in his own town. His life and work are his own testimonial. Very little better can be said of any man. He also justly deserved his tribute. I wish him the best.

BIOLOGICAL PERILS OF PROPOSED SEA LEVEL CANAL ACROSS CENTRAL AMERICA JUSTIFY ABANDONMENT OF THE IDEA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1970 the report of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Study Commission under Public Law 88-609, approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), headed by Robert B. Anderson, was submitted to the President. That report took about 5 years to prepare and cost about \$24 million. As required by the terms of the statute and as long foreseen, it recommended the construction of a new Panama Canal of so-called sea level design. It is proposed to equip it with two tidal locks about 25 miles long and locate the canal about 10 miles west of the existing canal. Its initially estimated cost is \$2,800,000,000, exclusive of the costs of acquiring the right-of-way and the inevitable indemnity to Panama, all of which would have to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

To a unique degree the report was the fulfillment of an organized drive for the predetermined objective of a small engineering-financial-industrial group that has long sought authorization of the extravagant and irrelevant sea level proposal, regardless of the costs, biological and other consequences that would inevitably follow.

Serious students of isthmic canal history and problems always find such study a challenging task because it is an inexhaustible subject. Among its newest angles are the indicated ecological one on which an extensive literature is now developing. Among the recognized scientists in this field are Dr. John C. Briggs of the University of South Florida at Tampa, Dr. Anthony T. Tu of Colorado State University at Fort Collins, Dr. Ira Rubinoff of the Smithsonian Marine Research Laboratory in the Canal Zone, Dr. William A. Dunson and Dr. Jon Weber, both of Pennsylvania State University at University Park, and others. Their writings in scientific journals and various periodicals are sources of reliable information concerning the grave biological consequences that would be involved in constructing a salt water sea level channel between the oceans, which have been separated for millions of years and cannot be ignored. Some of the authorities have described the sea level proposal as the conservation challenge of the century.

Since opening of the Panama Canal in 1914 the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have been protected against mutual biological infestations by the fresh water

barrier of Gatun Lake about 85 feet above mean sea level, which has a water area of 163.4 square miles; and ecologists have known that individual specimens of marine life have succeeded in crossing the isthmus. With one exception, they have not done so in sufficient numbers to form colonies and ecological balances have remained undisturbed.

Although the report of the Anderson panel does include consideration of the biological problems of a sea level project it cavalierly dismisses them as an "acceptable" risk and recommends a new canal treaty with Panama as the "first step" toward its construction.

Information on the ecological angle is now permeating the mass news media as illustrated by a recent syndicated article by Francis B. Kent in the Washington Post on "The Biological Unknowns of a New Panama Canal." In this news story, he charges that United States and Panamanian treaty negotiators are nearing agreement for a new canal treaty to authorize construction of a sea level canal "without really knowing what the ecological consequences will be."

Mr. Speaker, as to this I wish to stress that in view of current knowledge so ably summarized in the writings of the previously mentioned authorities and others, a canal of sea level design across the American Isthmus should never be constructed under any circumstances. Hence, the present diplomatic negotiations with Panama for surrendering U.S. sovereignty over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone for an option to construct a water level canal that even some of its leading advocates have admitted may never be built are entirely without merit. The best thing that the President could do at this time is to terminate these ill-advised negotiations as an exercise in diplomatic futility.

At this point, I wish to emphasize that Panama is now under a Communist revolutionary regime, which has liquidated that country's national assembly despite the fact that this agency is the only body authorized by the Constitution of Panama to "approve or reject treaties signed by the executive." Thus any agreement approved by such government would be unconstitutional from Panamanian standpoints and hence null and void. Moreover, the U.S. Constitution, article IV, section 3, clause 2—vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress, which includes the House of Representatives, and the President is bound by oath to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

As to the projected disposal it is safe to say that the House is conscious of its constitutional power in the premises and will never give its consent to the perfidious proposal to transfer any part of the Canal Zone or its invaluable installations either to Panama or to any international agency.

As previously indicated the common-sense, economic, operationally, engineeringly, diplomatically, and ecologically superior solution of the canal problem when evaluated from all angles is the major modernization of the existing

high level canal by providing an additional set of larger locks for larger vessels coupled with the reconstruction of the Pacific end of the canal to eliminate the bottleneck Pedro Miguel locks and to create a summit level terminal lake by consolidating all Pacific locks near Aguadulce, which is just south of Miraflores. This is precisely what was recommended by John F. Stevens in 1906 and strongly supported by Col. W. L. Sibert in 1907. It is the plan contemplated in pending legislation introduced by Senator THURMOND and myself, S. 734 and H.R. 712, respectively, on which subject hearings are now being conducted by the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal under the able chairmanship of Representative JOHN M. MURPHY of New York.

In a recent letter to the editor of the Washington Post, Capt. Franz O. Willenbacher, an able naval officer of extensive experience who while on duty in the Navy Department in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations was charged with the protection of national defense interests during the negotiations of the 1936 Hull-Alfaro Treaty and has subsequently kept in close touch with Isthmian Canal policy matters, corroborates the views expressed in the Kent article and supplies additional information.

Although the Washington Post declined to publish the Willenbacher letter, I quote its full text along with the Kent article as both should be of unusual interest to all concerned with the Isthmian question, especially Members of the Congress:

THE BIOLOGICAL UNKNOWN OF A NEW PANAMA CANAL

(By Francis B. Kent)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—Within a relatively short time, possibly before the end of the decade, U.S. engineers are expected to begin blasting a sea-level canal here from the Atlantic to the Pacific—without really knowing what the ecological consequences will be.

Guesses have been set forth. Engineers with little or no knowledge of biology tend to insist that nothing will happen. A number of scientists have responded with dire predictions that the interchange of marine life will have far-reaching and disastrous effects. No one, however, really knows. The hard information gathered here to date has established only that facts are in short supply, that the subject warrants much more intensive research.

Dr. Ira Rubinoff, a marine biologist at the Smithsonian Institution's Marine Research Laboratory here, has probably examined the problem more carefully than any other scientist. Years of collecting, mixing and observing species from both oceans have convinced him that providing free access from Atlantic to Pacific will indeed produce significant change.

"Some will suffer," he observes cautiously, "others will benefit. To what extent, we simply don't know."

J. C. Briggs of the University of Miami is one of those with a pessimistic outlook. In a paper published by the periodical *Science* he predicts the irrevocable extinction of thousands of species of marine life.

This point of view has been echoed in the U.S. Congress, notably Rep. Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania.

"Why," he demanded to know in a recent hearing before a House subcommittee, "does

the State Department ignore the marine ecological angle involved in constructing a salt water channel between the oceans, which recognized scientists predict would result in infesting the Atlantic with the poisonous Pacific sea snake and a predatory Crown of Thorns starfish and have international repercussions?"

Dr. Rubinoff, an articulate, Harvard-trained New Yorker, concedes that the two predators would probably migrate to the Atlantic and would probably stir up some mischief. How much, he doesn't know, and he thinks no one else really knows.

The Crown of Thorns starfish, he told an interviewer, could cause extensive damage to the Atlantic coral reefs that support much of the commercially valuable shellfish in the area.

The reptile, commonly known as the yellow-bellied sea snake, preys on young fish, is eaten by virtually nothing and could, according to some experts, wreak havoc in the breeding grounds of scores of varieties of marine life.

Because high tide on the Atlantic side of the Isthmus of Panama rarely exceeds one and a half feet above the mean level, as opposed to 18 feet and more on the Pacific side, the migration would be largely from the Pacific to the Atlantic. In effect, Rubinoff said, creatures migrating to the Atlantic would thus get a free ride through the canal.

Once in the Atlantic, he said, the sea snake could be expected to move as far east as the English Channel, where the warm water of the Gulf Stream would permit it to survive. Roughly three feet long at maturity and about one inch in diameter, the sea snake has few equals in virulence. Its venom, Rubinoff estimates, is 50 times as potent as that of the fer-de-lance. Fish that make the mistake of eating the snake die immediately, presumably from internal wounds.

In connection with the project under consideration here, Rubinoff cites as a parallel the construction of Welland Canal, which links the western Great Lakes with the eastern Great Lakes and the Atlantic. This canal he says, gave the Atlantic lamprey access to Lakes Huron and Michigan. In time, the lamprey all but exterminated the lakes' whitefish and trout. The lamprey has forced the U.S. and Canadian governments to spend upward of \$12 million a year in joint efforts to control it, he adds.

To discourage interocean migration, Rubinoff is recommending the construction of a barrier, somewhat similar to the fresh water Gatun Lake that effectively controls the migration of most species in the existing canal. But since a sea-level channel would permit no lake, Rubinoff suggests an artificial barrier of superheated water.

Not only would the barrier reduce and possibly eliminate the odds for a disastrous interchange, he contends, it would provide science with the opportunity to make a thorough study of marine life as it exists on both sides of the isthmus. If the canal is put through without such a barrier, the opportunity would be lost forever.

Time is a factor. Although men have dreamed of a sea-level canal here since the Spanish first came ashore in the early 16th century, the pressure is now mounting rapidly to get one built. The present canal, which was opened to traffic in 1914, is rapidly becoming obsolete. Spokesmen for the canal company say it will probably be adequate through the end of the century but others question this estimate. Already some 1,400 huge bulk carriers are too long or too wide to fit into the canal's locks.

U.S. and Panamanian negotiators are described as nearing agreement on arrangements for the new canal and Rubinoff said the National Academy of Sciences has appointed a committee to evaluate the ecological problems.

JANUARY 21, 1972.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Washington Post and Francis B. Kent deserve high commendation for the publication on Jan. 18 of Kent's timely and informative article "The Biological Unknowns of a New Panama Canal" which warns that a "sea-level" canal across Central America could cause ecological consequences by the migration of marine life, throughout the warmer waters of the Atlantic, extending even to the English Channel, via the Gulf stream. This vital information is timely, since it comes when we are almost daily being reminded that the oceans are dying as the result of man's progressive pollution and natural phenomena.

Fortunately, the question of what should be done to increase canal capacity and improve trans-Isthmian transit of vessels of all nations has, since November 29, 1971, been the subject of extensive hearings, still in progress, before the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It has received extensive testimony concerning predictable ecological consequences from the construction of a sea-level canal, concerning which Subcommittee Chairman, Congressman John M. Murphy (D-NY), said prior to its receipt:

"The ecology of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans will be the subject discussed by other witnesses. It has been said that building a new sea level canal in Panama could result in a 'potential biological catastrophe' due to the passage through the canal of the yellow bellied poisonous sea snake and the crown of thorns starfish. Charges have been made that within a short time after a sea level canal was built predators from the Pacific side of the canal would infest the East Coast and make Florida's famous beaches unsafe for human recreation.

"Dr. William A. Dunson of Pennsylvania State University will testify on the dangers to the fish and the coastlines of the Atlantic if the sea snake were allowed to transverse the canal and Dr. Jon Weber of the same university will testify on the coral consuming 'Crown-of-Thorns' starfish."

Gordon Rattray Taylor, noted author, journalist, a Cambridge student of the natural sciences and a specialist in making use of the findings of the social sciences in order to interpret the trends of contemporary society, and an authority on ecology whose best seller "The Biological Time Bomb" received international acclaim, in his recent (1970) volume, "The Doomsday Book," turned his attention to the nightmare world of modern technology. Concerning the very question of potential ecological disaster to the Atlantic Ocean areas which could be caused by a sea-level canal at Panama, Mr. Taylor wrote:

"Finally, there is the ecological risk. Since the tides on the Pacific side run to much greater heights than the Atlantic tides, strong current would flow through the channel, carrying many species from one ocean to the other, and perhaps lowering the temperature of the Caribbean. Ira Rubinoff, the Assistant Director of the Marine Biology Department of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute at Balboa, says that only one fish is known to have gone through the existing canal and to have bred. The fresh-water lake in the middle is the real barrier, not the locks; similarly in the Suez Canal, the salty Bitter Lakes constitute a barrier. He adds that when two species interbreed, the result can sometimes be extinction of both, if the 'crosses' which result are inferior to the parent lines.

"When the Welland Canal to the Great Lakes was opened, the sea lamprey got in. Nearly a hundred years later, a lamprey population explosion occurred, decimating the white fish and trout in the lakes. The

fishing industry lost millions of dollars, and the US and Canada chipped in \$16m. in an attempt to solve the problem. Says Rubinoff: 'Spectacular as some of these cases may have been, they are minor by comparison with what would be expected to result from the construction of a sea-level canal in Central America. The mutual invasions of Atlantic and Pacific organisms should be much more extensive, numerous and rapid, and their ultimate consequences should be quite incommensurable with any biological changes ever recorded before.'

Taylor further wrote:

"It was only in 1969 that biologists became aware of the fact that a large starfish known as the Crown of Thorns had undergone a population explosion and a change of habits and was eating up, at a rapid rate, all the coral in the Pacific. A rumour that such starfishes were multiplying in the Red Sea had been heard back in 1963 but had not caused much attention. In 1966, reports came in that they were beginning to crunch up the Great Barrier Reef. But it was not until Richard Chesher of the University on Guam wrote to the internationally-read weekly SCIENCE in mid-1969 that the scientific community was shocked into attention. In Guam itself, he said, 90 per cent of the coral had been destroyed over a 38-mile shoreline in 2½ years.

"The Crown of Thorns is a large sixteen-armed spiny sea-star, consisting of a 6-inch disc set with 2-inch spines. It eats twice its own area in a night, and destroys a square metre of coral in a month. In some areas Chesher reported that creatures are as thick as one per square metre. When they have eaten all the coral in one bay they move systematically on to the next. Normally, the Crown of Thorns . . . eats only at night, but the swarming populations of the Pacific have abandoned such leisurely methods and now, with a truly Protestant devotion to work, eat all day too. By the spring of 1968, Chesher noted, all the coral in Tumon Bay was dead; by the autumn the creature had invaded Double Reef. Winter storms prevented observation of its progress between December and March, but when the scientists went out again, another 4 kilometres of reef was missing."

Are we now about to be stampeded into the construction of a sea-level canal in the face of such potentially dire disaster? The predictable result could prove so disastrous as alone to require final rejection of this ancient proposal, even though there might be no other feasible plan to increase transit facilities.

Mr. Kent's first paragraph states that United States engineers are expected to begin work on a new sea-level canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific in the relatively near future—"without really knowing what the ecological consequences will be." His concluding paragraph states "U.S. and Panamanian negotiators are described as nearing agreement on arrangements for the new canal and Rubinoff said the National Academy of Sciences has appointed a committee to evaluate the ecological problems." It should be noted that in the course of the recent canal inquiry the National Academy of Sciences was requested by the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-Oceanic Canal Study Commission to study the ecological problems, but the final report of the Commission, disregarded a warning of the Academy's Subcommittee of the dangers involved which the Commission chose to regard as an "acceptable risk". Is there now to be a new study by another committee of the Academy of Sciences in the hope that a more favorable report can be obtained to overcome the mass of existing highly competent evidence?

At every turn, during the long considerations, both by the Inter-Oceanic Canal Study Commission and by our treaty negotiators with those of Panama, concerning proposals for change in the presently controlling

twice-revised Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, there has been mounting evidence of a predetermination by the negotiators, the State Department and the White House that U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone is to be ceded to Panama and that a sea-level canal is to be constructed come what may and that the Congress should perfunctorily approve a new proposed treaty on faith that our negotiators could do no wrong.

Fortunately, in line with powers under the Constitution (Art. IV, Sec. 3) responsible committees of the House of Representatives have indicated that there will be insistence upon the fullest consideration by the House of any new canal proposal and participation by the House in any proposed disposition of territory and property belonging to the United States by gift to Panama. It is especially to be hoped the House will oppose the construction of any sea-level canal which could have such disastrous ecological consequences.

The protection against infestation of the Atlantic is not in locks or other devices, however cleverly designed, but in maintaining the fresh water barrier between the oceans. When the canal problem is evaluated from all crucial angles, the true solution for increased transit facilities is the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan for the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal, as provided by the Thurmond-Flood bills (S. 734 and HR 712, 92nd Congress) on which formerly congressionally authorized modernization plan \$171,000,000 have been expended, \$76,000,000 on the suspended 1939 Third Locks Project and \$95,000,000 on the enlargement of Gaillard Cut and correlated channel improvements.

The only further consideration that the sea level dream idea merits is to refute its advocates. The Congress, without further delay, should authorize resumption of construction on the suspended third set of locks, modified to include the Terminal Lake solution. Such action would promptly clear away the fog of confusion which has so long obscured that common sense solution of the canal question. This requires no new treaty, would be in the best interests of all nations, including Panama, and, of course, the users of the Canal.

Sincerely,

FRANZ O. WILLENBUCHER,
Captain, U.S.N. (Ret.).

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 92d Congress was a very active period for the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of which I am chairman.

During that time numerous meetings were held by the subcommittee and through the diligent attendance and efforts of the members, the large backlog of pending private bills that existed at the beginning of the 92d Congress was eliminated. That backlog caused much concern, not only to the members of the subcommittee, but to the Members of the House as well, since considerable time—even years—would pass from the time of introduction of a private bill until that bill could be heard by the subcommittee. Now, the subcommittee is able to consider a private bill within a reasonable time.

Furthermore, the subcommittee initiated and commenced a detailed investi-

gation into the very complex and significant problem of the illegal alien. In addition to hearings held in Washington, D.C., the subcommittee has conducted field hearings in Los Angeles, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; El Paso, Tex., and Chicago, Ill. The subcommittee's investigation on illegal aliens has generated extensive press coverage and interest throughout the United States, as well as great concern in the Congress. The subcommittee has scheduled hearings for New York on March 10 and 11, to be followed by concluding hearings in Washington shortly thereafter.

In order that the House may have a comprehensive view of the activities of Subcommittee No. 1, I enclose a report at this point in the RECORD:

**REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 ACTIVITIES
DURING THE 92D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION**

Subcommittee No. 1, Immigration and Nationality, has jurisdiction over legislation on immigration, nationality, and related matters, as well as other legislation which may be assigned. In carrying out this assignment, the Subcommittee must process and consider a large number of private immigration bills, adjustment of status cases, and cases referred to the Subcommittee by the Attorney General in which he has exercised his discretionary authority to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act or his special authority to parole into the United States or to grant conditional entries to certain refugees. The Subcommittee review approved petitions granting preference status in the issuance of immigrant visas to certain workers and specialists, analyzes numerous general immigration and nationality bills and other assigned public bills, and exercises oversight jurisdiction which requires continuous consultation with both government and private agencies, as well as field investigations. Furthermore, the staff of the Subcommittee devotes considerable time in answering telephone inquiries and correspondence from the Members' offices, as well as analyzing individual immigration problems and cases referred to the Subcommittee by Members of Congress.

During the Ninety-second Congress, first session, Subcommittee No. 1 held 34 committee meetings. Fourteen of these meetings were public hearings on pending general legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. Four meetings were full day public hearings to consider proposed constitutional amendments to grant the District of Columbia voting representation in the Congress. Thirteen meetings were held on private immigration bills.

A summary of the activities of the Subcommittee follows:

I. PUBLIC LEGISLATION

A. The following public legislation has been favorably reported by both the Subcommittee and the full Committee:

H.R. 1534—to change the critical age for automatic acquisition of U.S. citizenship by children through the naturalization of a parent or parents from 16 to 18 years. The bill was reported by the Subcommittee on March 18, 1971, was reported by the full Committee on March 30, 1971, and passed the House on April 19, 1971. No action has been taken by the Senate.

H.R. 1535—to exempt any alien over 50 years of age, and who has been living in the U.S. for 20 years or more at the time an application for naturalization is filed, from the requirement of an understanding of the English language. The bill was reported by the Subcommittee on March 18, 1971, was reported by the full Committee on March 30, 1971, and passed the House on April 19, 1971. No action has been taken by the Senate.

H.R. 1729—to give the consent of Congress to consider the land acquired by the United States as a result of the Convention Between the United States and the United Mexican States for the Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal, to be a geographical part of the State of Texas and that that State shall have civil and criminal jurisdiction over the land. The bill was reported from the Subcommittee on March 4, 1971, was reported by the full Committee on March 30, 1971, and passed the House on April 19, 1971, passed the Senate on June 21, 1971, and was signed into law (Public Law 92-412) on June 30, 1971.

H.R. 9615—(1) to make additional special immigrant visas available annually to each country of the Eastern Hemisphere equal to 75 percent of the 1955-65 average of immigrant visas issued, less visas issued each year under the permanent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, but not exceeding 7,500 visas per country per fiscal year; and (2) to reduce the backlog in visa issuance in the fifth preference category—brothers and sisters of United States citizens. Public hearings were held on April 27, 28 and 29, 1971, and testimony was received from various representatives of the Department of State concerning the effect of the Act of October 8, 1965 on immigration from Ireland and Northern Europe and the backlog in the fifth preference category. After a series of executive sessions, this clean bill, H.R. 9615, was ordered reported from the Subcommittee on July 1, 1971, was reported from the full Committee on September 23, 1971, and is presently pending in the Rules Committee.

H. Con. Res. 417—to commend the Inter-governmental Committee for European Migration for successfully performing valuable humanitarian work on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary. The resolution was reported by the Subcommittee on October 28, 1971, was reported by the full Committee on November 1, 1971, and passed the House on November 3, 1971. No action has been taken by the Senate.

B. The following public legislation has been favorably reported by the Subcommittee:

H.R. 213—to repeal the "cooly trade" laws which prohibit the procuring, transportation, disposition, sale, or transfer of Oriental persons as servants or apprentices, or to be held to service or labor (8 U.S.C. secs. 31-339). The bill was ordered reported by the Subcommittee on November 11, 1971 and was approved by the full Committee.

H.R. 6420—to increase the amount of naturalization fees which may be retained by the clerks of state courts from \$3,000 to \$7,500. The bill was ordered reported by the Subcommittee on November 11, 1971 and was approved by the full Committee.

H.J. Res. 253—to amend the Constitution to provide for representation for the District of Columbia.

Public hearings were held on this proposed constitutional amendment on July 19, 20, 21 and 22, 1971. Testimony was received from 34 witnesses. Of this number, 7 were Members of Congress and the remaining were public and private witnesses. The resolution was ordered reported by the Subcommittee on November 11, 1971 and is pending before the full Committee.

II. PRIVATE BILLS

A. Private laws:

House bills.....	15
Senate bills.....	10

Total	25
-------------	----

B. On private calendar:

House bills.....	9
Senate bills.....	1

Total	10
-------------	----

C. Bills acted on by subcommittee awaiting full committee action.

Unfavorable:

House bills.....	206
------------------	-----

Senate bills.....	7
-------------------	---

Favorable:

House bills.....	11
------------------	----

Total	224
-------------	-----

D. Deferred by subcommittee for further consideration:

House bills.....	42
------------------	----

Senate bills.....	7
-------------------	---

Total	49
-------------	----

E. Pending before subcommittee:

House bills.....	81
------------------	----

Senate bills.....	8
-------------------	---

Total	89
-------------	----

F. Preliminary adverse action by subcommittee No. 1:

House bills.....	17
------------------	----

Total	17
-------------	----

G. House bills pending in Senate:

Total	14
-------------	----

H. House bills tabled:

Total	1,057
-------------	-------

I. House bills temporarily deferred pending approval of public legislation which has been favorably reported:

Total	296
-------------	-----

J. House bills awaiting receipt of departmental reports:

Total	49
-------------	----

K. No requests for reports on House bills. (Not considered pending bills):

Total	135
-------------	-----

Total private bills.....	1,965
--------------------------	-------

III. GENERAL LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

In fulfilling its responsibility to oversee the operation, administration and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act by the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, and the Department of Labor, it is necessary for the Subcommittee to maintain close and continuous contact with these departments.

Furthermore, numerous informal and formal meetings have been held with the executive departments to discuss problem areas that have developed in the implementation of this Act. One significant achievement resulting from these meetings was the agreement of the Attorney General on September 30, 1971 to parole Soviet Jews into the United States. This was done at the request of members of the Judiciary Committee who agreed that the Attorney General possessed sufficient authority under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (parole provision), to parole classes or categories of aliens if the public interest would be served.

In addition, consultations were arranged with representatives of the State and Justice Departments and voluntary agencies to clarify the scope of the Attorney General's agreement and to describe those situations necessitating the exercise of parole.

IV. SPECIFIC LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

A. Suspension of deportation cases: Under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General is authorized to adjust the status of certain deportable aliens to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence through the procedure of suspension of deportation. However, such action by the Attorney General is subject to congressional review.

In accordance with the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Na-

tionality Act, the Subcommittee reviewed 267 cases referred by the Attorney General and no cases were disapproved.

Under the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, wherein affirmative action by the Congress is necessary in order to approve the Attorney General's suspension order, the Subcommittee reviewed 20 cases referred by the Attorney General and approved S. Con. Res. 35 (which entertained the cases reviewed) on October 7, 1971. The full Committee approved the resolution on October 28, 1971. The resolution was recommitted to the Committee from the Private Calendar on December 7, 1971.

B. "13(c)" Cases: Furthermore, under the provision of section 13 of the Act of September 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316), the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of certain aliens who entered the United States in various diplomatic categories and who have failed to maintain their official status. The number of aliens whose status may be adjusted under this provision is limited to 50 in any fiscal year. Each of these (13(c)) cases necessitates a detailed investigation of the facts involved, and requires a determination on the merits as to whether suspension of deportation and adjustment of status are warranted. Twenty-five cases in this category were reviewed by the Subcommittee during the Ninety-second Congress, first session.

C. Excludable alien cases: Certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act grant to the Attorney General the discretionary authority to waive various provisions of the Act. In such cases, however, he is required to submit detailed reports on his action to the Congress. Under section 212(d)(6) of the Act, the Attorney General is required to report cases of those aliens who are temporarily admitted to the United States under section 212(d)(3), although they are otherwise excludable. The Subcommittee staff reviewed the 6,349 cases referred to Subcommittee in the first session of the Ninety-second Congress.

Section 212(a)(28)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the Attorney General to admit certain aliens to the United States for permanent residence, who are otherwise excludable because of their former membership in the communist party or other subversive organizations; provided it is established to his satisfaction that they are bona fide defectors. Thirty-nine cases in this category were referred in the Ninety-second Congress, first session.

Each of these cases is carefully reviewed by the staff of the Subcommittee in order to determine whether the Attorney General's exercise of his discretionary authority is in conformity with the legislative intent of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

D. Review of administrative action cases: In accordance with the provision of section 203(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General submitted to the Congress 4,178 reports on January 1, 1971 and 4,515 reports on June 30, 1971 of approved applications for conditional entry. These reports were reviewed by the Subcommittee staff in carrying out the Committee oversight jurisdiction.

Furthermore, under section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Act of October 3, 1965 (Public Law 89-236), the Attorney General is required to submit to the Congress on the first and 15th day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session a complete report in each case where petitions for preferences are approved under section 203(a)(3) or section 203(a)(6) of that Act. During the first session of the 92nd Congress, 21,825 such reports were submitted and referred to the subcommittee.

V. ILLEGAL ALIENS

The Subcommittee commenced on May 5, 1971, a detailed investigation of aliens illegally in the United States, and nonimmigrants who obtained unauthorized employment. During two days of Washington hearings, testimony was received from the following officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service: Raymond F. Farrell, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service; James L. Hennessey, Executive assistant to the Commissioner, and Charles Gordon, General Counsel; and James F. Greene, Deputy Associate Commissioner.

In view of the testimony which was received, the Subcommittee decided to conduct field hearings to consider this problem. As of this date, hearings have been held in the following cities:

June 19, and 21, 1971—Los Angeles, California; June 24 and 25, 1971—Denver, Colorado; July 9 and 10, 1971—El Paso, Texas; and October 22 and 23, 1971—Chicago, Illinois.

Testimony was also received from 114 witnesses.

The Subcommittee has discussed various recommendations relating to the imposition of criminal sanctions against employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens and against nonimmigrants who obtained employment without the permission of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

TAX SIMPLIFICATION BILL CO-SPONSORED BY 70 MEMBERS

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today a bipartisan group of 69 members of the House are joining me in cosponsoring the Tax Simplification Act of 1972.

This legislation would set up a 10-man select joint committee, which would be directed to make recommendations to Congress on specific methods for simplifying income tax returns in time for the filing of next year's returns. This resolution also directs the Government Accounting Office and the Internal Revenue Service to conduct tax simplification studies and report directly to the joint committee.

I am extremely pleased with both the number and bipartisan nature of the cosponsors of this legislation. Of the 70 cosponsors, 24 are Republicans. I think that this is impressive evidence that there is widespread concern on the part of both the public and Congress over finding ways of uncomplicating the entire Federal income tax return process.

The fact that over 50 percent of the people who file tax returns have to turn to professional tax return services for help is convincing proof that the tax return process is far too complicated and that a comprehensive study for radically reforming it is badly needed. I do not think there is any question but that we can make the whole tax return process far simpler and less frustrating to the average taxpayer than it presently is.

Thirty-nine million Americans who turn to professional tax return services for assistance are forced, in essence, to pay an additional tax. The Federal income tax is burdensome enough without making it so complicated that the tax-

payer has to pay to fill out his returns. Congress has a most basic responsibility to make the tax return system as simple, understandable, and rational as possible. I think we should take that responsibility seriously and immediately begin to correct a system that has gotten out of hand.

The following is a list of the cosponsors of the tax simplification legislation:

James Abourezk (S. Dak.), Bella Abzug (N.Y.), Brock Adams (Wash.), Joseph Addabbo (N.Y.), John Anderson (Ill.), Herman Badillo (N.Y.), Nick Begich (Alaska), Jack Brinkley (Ga.), Phillip Burton (Calif.), Goodloe Byron (Ind.), Shirley Chisholm (N.Y.), John Culver (Iowa).

W. C. Daniel (Va.), George Danielson (Calif.), John Dent (Pa.), Edward Derwinski (Ill.), John Dingell (Mich.), Thomas Downing (Va.), Don Edwards (Calif.), Marvin Esch (Mich.), Edwin Forsythe (N.J.), Bill Frenzel (Minn.), Joseph Gaydos (Pa.), Ella Grasso (Conn.).

Charles Gubser (Calif.), Seymour Halpern (N.Y.), Michael Harrington (Mass.), William Hathaway (Maine), Ken Hechler (W. Va.), Henry Helstoski (N.J.), Louise Day Hicks (Mass.), Lawrence Hogan (Md.), Craig Hosmer (Calif.).

Richard Ichord (Mo.), Jack Kemp (N.Y.), Arthur Link (N. Dak.), Manuel Lujan, Jr. (N. Mex.), James Mann (S.C.), Spark Matsunaga (Hawaii), Romano Mazzoli (Ky.), Paul McCloskey (Calif.), James McClure (Idaho), Mike McCormack (Wash.), Joseph McDade (Pa.), Abner Mikva (Ill.), Parren Mitchell (Md.), F. Bradford Morse (Mass.).

Charles Mosher (Ohio), John Moss (Calif.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Tom Railsback (Ill.), Charles Rangel (N.Y.), Donald Riegel (Mich.), Benjamin Rosenthal (N.Y.), Edward Roybal (Calif.), Paul Sarbanes (Md.), James Scheuer (N.Y.).

Fred Schwengel (Iowa), John Seiberling (Ohio), John Slack (W. Va.), Robert Steele (Conn.), Louis Stokes (Ohio), James Symington (Mo.), Charles Thone (Nebr.), Robert Tierney (R.I.), Victor Veysey (Calif.), John Ware (Pa.), Lawrence Williams (Pa.), Sidney Yates (Ill.).

SLAUGHTER IN NORTHERN IRELAND

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and dismayed by the mindless slaughter of 13 civilians Sunday in Northern Ireland. When so many lie dead and a dozen more wounded there can be no question that British troops occupying that shattered country provoke more violence than they prevent.

The long and bitter experience of the United States in Southeast Asia should have taught not only this country but the rest of the world that the intervention of foreign troops into the domestic strife of another nation solves nothing and serves only to increase the bloodletting.

The time is long past for the withdrawals of the British troops from Northern Ireland and for a convening of all parties to this anguished conflict so that further senseless violence may be avoided and the underlying political questions be resolved.

Self-determination is a principle solid-

ly entrenched in the history of the United States and one this country has long honored, if sometimes in the breach. The right of any minority within a country to freely exercise its civil rights, unhampered by political, economic, religious, racial, or any other kind of discrimination, has also long been a bedrock tenet of our society—if also honored often in the breach. I do not doubt that exercise of these principles in Northern Ireland—return of local control to the affairs of the area, and free determination by the people of their own future—will lead to a restoration of peace in that troubled land, as application of the same principles in Indochina on our part would lead to peace there.

One would have thought that Great Britain might have learned from its long history of attempting to deny the right of self-determination in the American colonies, Israel, and India that such a course of action is doomed to failure in Northern Ireland as well.

FULTON SEEKS BROADENED YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, throughout our Nation's history, the lure of freedom in the great outdoors and personal satisfaction of sampling mother nature's goodness while challenging her barriers to man have urged Americans "back to the land."

In the summer of 1971, these considerations plus an interest in conservation and good fellowship helped bring 2,200 young Americans "back to the land"—to serve as first-year participants in the 3-year Youth Conservation Corps pilot program.

Born in 1970 with passage of the Youth Conservation Corps Act, this Interior/Agriculture Department summer program allowed these youngsters "of both sexes, of all social, economic, and racial classifications" to work for not more than 90 days, for about \$300, in national forests, national parks, and wildlife refuges. Operating from 63 camps in 36 States, these 15- to 18-year-olds cleared trails, improved campsites and landscaping, planted trees, restored historic sites, aided wildlife management, and built everything from picnic tables to bridges.

The program proved itself a great success. Certain limitations, however, were noted. While 2,200 young people were able to take part, more than 120,000 other would-be participants had to be turned away. This was at a time when manpower shortages left many Federal and State conservation projects unfinished or unstarted. This was at a time when 17 percent of our teenage population was unemployed.

To bring this YCC effort from its promising experimental stage to an effective, wide-scope program demands "second-step" action, legislation that would:

First. Create for 100,000 15- to 18-year-old Americans—including permanent residents of U.S. territories and possessions—work opportunities maintaining and developing our country's natural resources. To reduce transportation costs, Corps members would work on projects as close as possible to their residences.

Second. Fund these work slots from a \$150 million authorization, made available annually to the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture—program is a joint effort with funding shared.

Third. Establish a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee to administer the YCC. This six-person committee, consisting of two representatives each from the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor, would select work sites, determine appropriate Corps projects and education programs, and set rates of pay, hours, and working conditions for Corps members.

Fourth. Allow the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to contract with any public agency or organization—providing that agency or organization has existed for not less than 5 years—for operation of any YCC project.

Authorize the YCC Interagency Committee to institute a pilot cost-sharing program, making State, territorial, and possession programs, qualified to meet act objectives and requesting program participation, eligible for act funding.

Require that the total of Corps employees involved in cost-sharing programs run by the States shall not be less than 10 percent nor more than 25 percent of the total YCC employees in any program year. The Federal share of the State programs shall not be more than 80 percent in any year.

Fifth. Seek, upon approval of involved agencies, use of such agencies' already existing, but unoccupied Federal facilities and equipment.

Provide that, where possible, YCC camps and facilities be made available to educational institutions for use as environmental/ecological education camps. Such use would take place during periods of YCC nonuse and costs for non-YCC facility operation would be incurred by those organizations using them—not the Federal Government.

Sixth. Require the Interagency Committee to prepare YCC progress report, due within 180 days after each summer's program completion.

Seventh. Keep in force Corps exemptions from title II, Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, and from bans on nepotism.

The YCC program has promise and clearly serves a purpose. As Edward Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, reported to the Christian Science Monitor:

We could use a group of these young people working with each of our rangers across the country right now.

Progress in this program has been made; now the logical legislative second step should be taken. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I now introduce this amendment to the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO BE INVOLVED WITH THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today important hearings have been underway on the administration's request to raise the debt ceiling an additional \$50 billion. If the past is anything to go by, I think we can safely ignore the label "temporary" in their application. This just happens to be the largest single request for an increase in the debt ceiling in the history of the country, and yet, I wish that my colleagues here in this House could have witnessed with me yesterday's performance by the two chief administration spokesmen on economic matters, Secretary of the Treasury Connally and Director of the Budget Shultz. It was an incredible performance. One would have thought after listening to these gentlemen that this request was the most natural thing in the world, so conditioned apparently has the Congress become to receiving requests to raise the debt ceiling.

What could be easier than to take a morning off one's busy schedule of chores in the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget—where such matters as this are supposed to be being regulated and controlled—and to take a run up to the Hill and request a further margin for error of some \$50 billion, answer a few questions which are not supposed to be too tough and avoid giving too many specific commitments about such potentially significant matters as tax increases, further budget deficits, balance-of-payment deficits, revenue shortfalls, unemployment statistics, and then get back to your desk downtown in the early afternoon.

To be serious, I have never witnessed in all my years in the Capitol such a bold performance as that which I witnessed yesterday and today, in the Ways and Means Committee hearing room. As if the prospect of an additional \$50 billion worth of debt in the next 12 months were not sufficient cause for a pause, we were actually invited to speculate with the administration spokesmen that in all likelihood this \$50 billion would not begin to get us through the next fiscal year; that in all likelihood these same administration spokesmen, or some other administration spokesmen, would be back to us to request an additional amount of perhaps similar magnitude before the fiscal year has had 7 or 8 months of life.

I think my fellow colleagues in this House know that it is not my practice to come running to the House with problems that perhaps should well be solved in my committee, but today I am making an exception because to be honest, I am disturbed about the whole atmosphere which has prevailed during these hearings.

I have not been able to detect a serious resolve to take this serious and worsening situation seriously enough, to come

to grips with it, even at a minimum to make those responsible for the conduct of this Nation's economic policies responsive to the elected Representatives of the people in Congress. To question after question, all we got yesterday and today were glib responses. Not one iota of concrete information has been forthcoming. Not one really solid prediction based on the estimates and the figures this administration itself has put together was forthcoming. Certainly nothing was trotted out yesterday which, in my opinion, would justify continuing faith and confidence in this administration's conduct of our economic policies.

And yet, what we were being asked, if you can believe it, was to give this administration a blank check for the next 12 months to continue to operate our economy free of the unpleasant experience of having to come to Congress, hat in hand, to explain and give an accounting for why the national debt should be increased by additional huge sums.

Mr Speaker, I am fearful that we are witnessing the atrophy of yet another one of our forefathers' brilliant insights into how government should operate. I feel certain that in requesting an administration—any administration—to come hat in hand to Congress at regular intervals to justify such a serious request as adding to the Nation's national debt, there was in fact a deliberate decision to make such action as difficult as possible—to give the people one of their rare opportunities to seriously cross-examine, and call to an accounting, the bureaucracy and the administration in power on matters of economic policy. After witnessing yesterday's spectacle, I just do not think that the people have been given that much of an accounting and what is worse, they remain in the dark as much after these hearings as they were before.

Mr. Speaker, because I feel so strongly that the economy is so important to every man and woman in this land, because it leaves none of us untouched with its impact, because I feel so strongly about the economy, I feel strongly that the time has come for Congress to reassert one more area of its abandoned authority and serve notice on this administration, and any to follow, that we intend to be much more a part and parcel of the conduct of this Nation's economic affairs. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that an appropriate beginning would be to cut back on both the amount of increase in the debt ceiling requested today and consequently, to reduce the interval of time before it will be necessary for the administration to have to come back to us with a detailed explanation of what they have done during their stewardship of the economy. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I feel that 1 year is far too long a time between hearings on the debt ceiling.

I am hopeful that not only the committee but this House, will reassert its authority and insist on having this administration come back to Congress in 6 months time rather than 1 year's time. It seems to me that this course of action would have two notable merits: First, in 6 months time we will know much more

about how the administration's policies are working out than we do now. Some of the returns will be in which are missing right now. There will be less conjecture, less guesstimating, less stargazing than is the case now; second, it seems to me September is a better time to have a second look at the economy, an interim report, if you will, than February.

If the administration's conduct of this Nation's economic affairs is going to necessitate a tax increase in all likelihood, further increases in the Nation's debt, further increases in the already staggering unemployment rate, further deterioration in this Nation's balance of trade and deficit payments, then Congress and the people should be presented this information before November of 1972.

If this is being political, then it is being political in the purest, most responsible sense of the word. It is calling those in office to give an account in time for the people to exercise their will with as much information as is possible in our system. Who knows? It might go a long way toward restoring the people's confidence in their Government's ability to level with them to give them the facts. It would give them an alternative to government by deception and subterfuge. It might even narrow the credibility gap. In any event, it seems to me we, the watchdogs of the administration in power, have a responsibility in this area and it is time we begin to exercise it.

Much has been said about restraint. This is all to the good. Such an appeal needs reemphasizing from time to time. But I just want to point out at this time that restraint works both ways. Restraint would advise as much against granting a \$15 billion tax cut to the corporate interests in this country as much as it would against "wild and reckless" spending programs in Congress.

The fact of the matter is that a large part of the reason we are in the hole we are in today with the national debt is that revenues have not lived up to expectation, not because Congress has been on a spending spree. The administration's repeated use of the veto against progressive legislation which would address itself to those in need around the country, to the small man and his tax problems, is not what I feel is meant when the people ask for greater restraint by the leaders of Government.

This \$15 billion tax reduction to our corporate sector is the reason that so many good worthwhile projects in the environmental, social, educational, and health fields are being turned down. Mr. Speaker, it all boils down, it seems to me, once again, to a matter of priorities. And where priorities are involved, then Congress has a vital and constitutional role to play. The debt hearings are a vital element in what must be a continuing process.

INCREASED FEDERAL SHARE IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am intro-

ducing a bill today which would amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to permit the waiver of matching requirements in special and unusual circumstances for schools applying for funds under the nonfood assistance program. At this time, the Federal Government contributes 75 percent of the funds if the school contributes 25 percent of the cost.

A parochial school in my district, St. Francis de Sales, is unable to provide the needed 25 percent toward the purchase of kitchen equipment for the school lunch program. If they had this kitchen equipment, the quality of the lunches could be increased and hot lunches could be supplied to the 450 children in the school giving them a more nutritious meal than they are now getting. The present diet is starchy because it consists of sandwiches and often is less nutritious than the meals offered at public schools participating in the school lunch program and having the equipment. With the equipment, soup and hot meals could be provided.

Since this is a parochial school, the city of New York is barred by law from assisting in the 25-percent local contribution required by Federal law. The parish is comprised of low-income families who would find it impossible to raise these funds. If this were a school receiving public funds, the 25 percent would be available from the school budget. In the school 85 percent of the children are from poor families, many of whom are receiving public assistance. It seems to me that the primary concern should be that these children are receiving good nutritious lunches, regardless of whether they attend a parochial or public school.

I urge our colleagues to support this measure which would in such circumstances as this permit the waiver of the 25-percent local contribution of funds.

AN APPEAL TO THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS ON BEHALF OF NORTHERN IRISH POLITICAL PRISONERS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the tragedies in Northern Ireland continue and one of the most heartbreaking of these tragedies is the continued detention of Irish civilians in British concentration camps without due process of law. They are held without trial and without charges and without the right of habeas corpus or appeal to the courts for release. They are, in effect, prisoners of war.

I have written to the International Red Cross urging that they inspect these prisoner of war camps. Appended is the letter for the information of our colleagues:

NORTHERN IRELAND,
January 31, 1972.
INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS,
Geneva, Switzerland.

GENTLEMEN: I'm writing to you with the hope that your organization would seek to intercede on behalf of the more than eight hundred political prisoners held in British concentration camps in Northern Ireland. It would appear that what is taking place in

Northern Ireland today could be described as a civil war particularly so since the shooting yesterday of thirteen civilians by the British paratroopers. The reports emanating from Northern Ireland indicate that brutalities against the prisoners are taking place in those concentration camps into which civilians are placed without trial and without the right of redress to the courts.

I urge you to consider requesting permission to enter the camps immediately and then on a regular basis to report on the conditions that you find in these camps. Your very presence would have the effect of inhibiting the tortures and brutalities that are alleged to be taking place now.

I would appreciate knowing what, if anything, you can do in a matter of this kind.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

ON THE SENSELESS TRAGIC DEATH OF IRIS KONES

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 in New York City an incendiary bomb exploded in the offices of Sol Hurok at 1370 Avenue of the Americas. This senseless, terrorist act killed one young woman of 27 and injured 13 other persons. For me, this meaningless murder and destruction is especially upsetting.

Yesterday I learned that Iris Kones, the woman who was killed was the sister of a very good friend of mine. In addition to this personally distressing fact, I am further shocked and angered by this bombing because while we do not yet know who is responsible, anonymous callers said the attack was made to protest "the deaths and imprisonment of Soviet Jews."

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I deplore the repressive actions of the Soviet Union vis-a-vis its Jewish citizens, and I seek the liberation of all those Jews who would leave Russia. But what twisted logic can conclude, that the wanton attack on Mr. Hurok's offices, chosen because he brings Russian artistic talent to perform in our country, can in any way improve the plight of Soviet Jewry? To the contrary, they do not help their brethren by this violence; they only make the plight of Soviet Jews worse.

When these so-called acts of Soviet harassment end in the death of an innocent individual who is in no way involved with the Soviet Union's barbarism toward its own people, that terrorist act becomes even more insane.

I believe it to be of paramount importance that the United States use every police resource available to us, including those of the Justice Department and of the FBI to seek out and apprehend those responsible for this tragedy. And when they are apprehended they must be punished to the fullest extent of the law. The senseless death of Iris L. Kones should not and must not be forgotten or forgiven.

ANTIHEROIN DRUG RESEARCH SUPPORTED BY 103 HOUSE MEMBERS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that 102 Members of the House—including the distinguished majority leader and majority whip—have joined the 11 members of the Select Committee on Crime to propose Federal research funds to develop desperately needed drugs to treat the Nation's half million heroin addicts.

We now have a total of 103 sponsors on the legislation. We also continue to get letters of commendation and support from city and State officials as well as newspaper, television, and radio editorials favorably commenting on the committee's latest report "A National Research Program To Combat Heroin Addiction Crisis."

Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel wrote, in part:

I heartily concur in your recommendation to step up funding for research in this area. The problem is one of frightening dimensions and we desperately need solutions.

South Carolina Gov. John C. West said:

The heroin addiction problem has been given considerable attention in South Carolina. . . . I have read your report and strongly endorse the proposed program.

Another Governor, Delaware's Russell W. Peterson, wrote the committee:

I concur with your findings that research in this field is most primitive. The fact that no exhaustive, sustained research effort has taken place bears testimony to the need for such research. . . . I am very much in favor of this approach and feel that this could lead to a major breakthrough in the area of heroin addiction control.

I was particularly pleased with an editorial that appeared in the Denver Post which I would like to enter into the RECORD in its entirety. The editorial follows:

GIVE TOP PRIORITY TO DRUG FIGHT; COSTS OF FAILURE MUCH TOO HIGH

An anti-heroin program which should be given the same urgent priority as the Manhattan Project in World War II has been proposed by a Congressional committee.

In a report submitted to the House last week, the Select Committee on Crime, headed by Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla., said that after more than a year of investigation and study it had concluded that the federal government must launch an immediate and massive campaign against heroin addiction.

The Committee recommended an appropriation of \$50 million for the 1972 fiscal year to be used on an emergency basis.

The Committee said it had concluded "that there is only one solution which has almost universal support and acceptance by all the experts in the field."

That solution, the report added, is "a concentrated national effort of emergency priority . . . to find a nonaddictive, safe, long-lasting drug to combat heroin addiction."

To meet this need, the committee advised that the \$50 million appropriation should be used to:

1. Contract with drug manufacturers for the necessary research, with the government paying 90 per cent and the private firms 10 per cent of the costs. The government contributions would be refunded by the companies if and when they make profits from sale of drug addiction control agents.

2. Expand the clinical testing facility at the government's Addiction Research Center in Lexington, Ky.

3. Accelerate and expand federal anti-drug

programs now being implemented by the National Institute of Mental Health.

Although we have been told often and convincingly in the past several years of the crying need for ways and means to fight drug addiction—President Nixon declared it a national emergency in June—the committee's report adds a new dimension to the message of doom for thousands—perhaps even millions—of Americans unless something is done about it.

Statistics only hint at the story, because they do not deal with the misery and degradation that accompany drug addiction, but even a sample figure is chilling: drug arrests increased 700 per cent nationally during the 1960s.

The extent of drug addiction may be subject to exaggeration, but the effects are not. Every day there is new evidence of horrors that afflict the addict. And they are not the only ones who suffer; so do relatives, friends, and society in general.

The cost to society of heroin-related crime—estimated at more than \$3 billion a year by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—makes the \$50 million program proposed by the House Committee seem small. In addition the country is paying increasingly exorbitant costs annually for the hospitalization, treatment, incarceration and rehabilitation of drug addicts.

As the committee pointed out, "an investment of \$50 million now may well save the expenditure of billions of dollars in the next few years."

For both humanitarian and financial reasons, then, the report of the committee should be given careful and prompt study by Congress. If the recommended program seems as likely to yield results as the committee thinks, the appropriation should be authorized as soon as possible so that work may begin.

The new sponsors of H.R. 11927 are our colleagues JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, HERMAN BADILLO, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, BERTRAM L. PODELL, HOWARD W. ROBISON, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, GEORGE E. DANIELSON, RONALD V. DELLUMS, CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, ROBERT A. ROE, RAY J. MADDEN, FRED B. ROONEY, FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, and DAVID R. OBEY.

As we all know, the legislation to create the Special Action on Drug Abuse Prevention, H.R. 12089, will be before this House this week. I am honored, as a member of the Rules Committee, to have the opportunity to handle the rule for debate on the floor.

For the sponsors of H.R. 11927, there is a significant section that the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, chaired by my friend and colleague PAUL ROGERS of Florida, added to the Senate bill which passed by a 92 to 0 vote in the other body. That section would authorize the expenditure of \$45 million in the next 2 fiscal years for medical research, to find new antagonist drugs to treat the Nation's half million heroin addicts. The section additionally provides that grants and contracts to develop new drugs be made available to private industry, universities, organizations, foundations, and individuals.

I would personally prefer, and I believe I speak for the 103 sponsors of the Crime Committee bill in making this suggestion, that the money be made immediately available. It makes more sense to incorporate that degree of flexibility than to rigidly state that a limit will be set of \$20 million will be set for next fiscal year and \$25 million for 1974 re-

gardless of the demand on the part of those scientific researchers who hold the key to solving this terrible national shame of heroin addiction.

AMPHETAMINE POLITICS ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the January issue of *Trans-Action* magazine contains an article which records the early history of the Select Committee on Crime's efforts to establish reasonable quotas on the outrageous overproduction of amphetamines.

Early in the existence of the Crime Committee we discovered that the production was 6 to 8 billion capsules a year, enough to provide a month's supply for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

As a result of the Crime Committee's investigation, it was shown that many of these amphetamines were being illegally diverted and resold on the black market. The worst of these—methamphetamines or "speed"—was claiming the lives of many young people. In the last several years we have urged that a strict drug quota be imposed by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs on the production of amphetamines. The proposed quota announced in December calls for 8,652 kilograms or 1.5 billion dosage units in 1972, down from 24,991 kilograms or 4.5 billion dosage units in 1969. This is still not good enough.

We recently read of the Justice Department's crackdown on Pennwalt Corporation, the Nation's largest exporter of amphetamines, when it was discovered that most of its capsules were showing up in large quantities in the U.S. black market. As a result, Director John Ingersoll of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs announced that the 1972 quota would be further reduced to 4,680 kilograms—a 50-percent reduction from the 1971 production. Evidence before our committee has led us to the conclusion that amphetamine production should and must be further curtailed. While necessary in the treatment of narcolepsy and hyperkinetic behavior in children, the total medical need has been estimated to be no more than several hundred thousand dosage units.

More than 80 percent of all prescriptions written for amphetamines are for weight control. Witness after witness before the Crime Committee testified to their dubious value in short-term obesity control and their dangerous effects over extended periods. Indeed, when contrasted with their potential for abuse, amphetamines should not be prescribed at all in a bona fide weight reduction program.

While there have been some significant developments—including quotas—since the attached article was written for *Trans-Action* magazine, it is important to recall the activities in Congress that began the drive to limit the production of amphetamines.

The article by Mr. James M. Graham follows:

AMPHETAMINE POLITICS ON CAPITOL HILL

(By James M. Graham)

The American pharmaceutical industry annually manufactures enough amphetamines to provide a month's supply to every man, woman and child in the country. Eight, perhaps ten, billion pills are lawfully produced, packaged, retailed and consumed each year. Precise figures are unavailable. We must be content with estimates because until 1970, no law required an exact accounting of total amphetamine production.

Amphetamines are the drug of the white American with money to spend. Street use, contrary to the popular myths, accounts for a small percentage of the total consumption. Most of the pills are eaten by housewives, businessmen, students, physicians, truck drivers and athletes. Those who inject large doses of "speed" intravenously are but a tiny fragment of the total. Aside from the needle and the dose, the "speed freak" is distinguishable because his use has been branded as illegal. A doctor's signature supplies the ordinary user with lawful pills.

All regular amphetamine users expose themselves to varying degrees of potential harm. Speed doesn't kill, but high sustained dosages can and do result in serious mental and physical injury, depending on how the drug is taken. The weight-conscious housewife, misled by the opinion-makers into believing that amphetamines can control weight, eventually may rely on the drug to alter her mood in order to face her monotonous tasks. Too frequently an amphetamine prescription amounts to a synthetic substitute for attention to emotional and institutional problems.

Despite their differences, all amphetamine users, whether on the street or in the kitchen, share one important thing in common—the initial source of supply. For both, it is largely the American pharmaceutical industry. That industry has skillfully managed to convert a chemical, with meager medical justification and considerable potential for harm, into multihundred-million-dollar profits in less than 40 years. High profits, reaped from such vulnerable products, require extensive sustained political efforts for their continued existence. The lawmakers who have declared that possession of marijuana is a serious crime have simultaneously defended and protected the profits of the amphetamine pill-makers. The Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 in its final form constitutes a victory for that alliance over compelling, contrary evidence on the issue of amphetamines. The victory could not have been secured without the firm support of the Nixon Administration. The end result is a national policy which declares an all-out war on drugs which are *not* a source of corporate income. Meanwhile, under the protection of the law, billions of amphetamines are overproduced without medical justification.

HEARINGS IN THE SENATE

The Senate was the first house to hold hearings on the administration's bill to curb drug abuse, The Controlled Dangerous Substances Act (S-3246). Beginning on September 15, 1969 and consuming most of that month, the hearings before Senator Thomas Dodd's Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary would finally conclude on October 20, 1969.

The first witness was John Mitchell, attorney general of the United States, who recalled President Nixon's ten-point program to combat drug abuse announced on July 14, 1969. Although that program advocated tighter controls on imports and exports of dangerous drugs and promised new efforts to encourage foreign governments to crack down on production of illicit drugs, there was not a single reference to the control of domestic manufacture of dangerous drugs. The president's bill when it first reached the Senate placed the entire "amphetamine family" in

Schedule III, where they were exempt from any quotas and had the benefit of lesser penalties and controls. Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc. had already been at work; their depressants, Librium and Valium, were completely exempt from any control whatsoever.

In his opening statement, Attorney General Mitchell set the tone of administrative policy related to amphetamines. Certainly, these drugs were "subject to increasing abuse"; however, they have "widespread medical uses" and therefore are appropriately classed under the administration guidelines in Schedule III. Tight-mouthed John Ingersoll, director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD), reaffirmed the policy, even though a Bureau study over the last year (which showed that 92 percent of the amphetamines and barbiturates in the illicit market were legitimately manufactured) led him to conclude that drug companies have "lax security and recordkeeping."

Senator Dodd was no novice at dealing with the pharmaceutical interests. In 1965 he had steered a drug abuse bill through the Senate with the drug industry fighting every step of the way. Early in the hearings he recalled that the industry "vigorously opposed the passage of (the 1965) act. I know very well because I lived with it, and they gave me fits and they gave all of us fits in trying to get it through."

The medical position on amphetamine use was first presented by the National Institute of Mental Health's Dr. Sidney Cohen, a widely recognized authority on drug use and abuse. He advised the subcommittee that 50 percent of the lawfully manufactured pep pills were diverted at some point to illicit channels. Some of the pills, though, were the result of unlawful manufacture as evidenced by the fact that 33 clandestine laboratories had been seized in the last 18 months.

* * * * *

The amphetamine wholesalers were not questioned in any detail about diversion. Brief statements by the National Wholesale Druggists Association and McKesson Robbins Drug Co. opposed separate inventories for dangerous drugs because they were currently comingled with other drugs. Finally, the massive volume of the drugs involved—primarily in Schedule III—was just too great for records to be filed with the attorney general.

DODGING THE DIVERSION ISSUE

The representative of the prescription drug developers was also not pressed on the question of illicit diversion. Instead, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association requested clarifications on the definitional sections, argued for formal administrative hearings on control decisions and on any action revoking or suspending registration, and endorsed a complete exemption for over-the-counter nonnarcotic drugs.

With some misgivings, Carter-Wallace Inc. endorsed the administration bill providing, of course, the Senate would accept the president's recommendation that meprobamate not be subjected to any control pending a decision of the Fourth Circuit as to whether the drug had a dangerously depressant effect on the central nervous system. On a similar special mission, Hoffman-LaRoche Inc. sent two of its vice-presidents to urge the committee to agree with the president's recommendation that their "minor tranquilizers" (Librium and Valium) remain uncontrolled. Senator Dodd was convinced that both required inclusion in one of the schedules. The Senator referred to a BNDD investigation which had shown that from January 1968 to February 1969, three drug stores were on the average over 30,000 dosage units short. In addition, five inspected New York City pharmacies had unexplained shortages ranging from 12 to 50 percent of their total stock in Librium and Valium. Not only were the drugs being diverted, but Bureau of Narcotics information revealed that Librium and

Valium, alone or in combination with other drugs, were involved in 36 suicides and 750 attempted suicides.

The drug company representatives persisted in dodging or contradicting Dodd's inquiries. Angry and impatient, Senator Dodd squarely asked the vice-presidents, "Why do you worry about putting this drug under control?" The response was as evasive as the question was direct: There are hearings pending in HEW, and Congress should await the outcome when the two drugs might be placed in Schedule III. (The hearings had begun in 1966; no final administrative decision had been reached and Hoffman-LaRoche had yet to exercise its right to judicial review.)

In the middle of the hearings, BNDD Director Ingersoll returned to the subcommittee to discuss issues raised chiefly by drug industry spokesmen. He provided the industry with several comforting administrative interpretations. The fact that he did not even mention amphetamines is indicative of the low level of controversy that the hearings had aroused on the issue. Ingersoll did frankly admit that his staff had met informally with industry representatives in the interim. Of course, this had been true from the very beginning.

The president of the American Pharmaceutical Association, the professional society for pharmacists, confirmed this fact: His staff participated in "several" Justice Department conferences when the bill was being drafted. (Subsequent testimony in the House would reveal that industry participation was extensive and widespread.) All the same, the inventory, registration and inspection (primarily "no-knock") provisions were still "unreasonable, unnecessary and costly administrative burden(s)" which would result in an even greater "paper work explosion."

For the most part, however, the administration bill had industry support. It was acceptable for the simple reason that, to an unknown degree, the "administration bill" was a "drug company bill" and was doubtless the final product of considerable compromise. Illustrative of that give-and-take process is the comparative absence of industry opposition to the transfer of drug-classification decision and research for HEW to Justice. The industry had already swallowed this and other provisions in exchange for the many things the bill could have but did not cover. Moreover, the subsequent windy opposition of the pill-makers allowed the administration to boast of a bill the companies objected to.

When the bill was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary, the amphetamine family, some 6,000 strong, remained in Schedule III. Senator Dodd apparently had done some strong convincing because Librium, Valium and meprobamate were now controlled in Schedule III. A commission on marijuana and a declining penalty structure (based on what schedule the drug is in and whether or not the offense concerned trafficking or possession) were added.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE—ROUND 1

The Senate began consideration of the bill on January 23, 1970. This time around, the amphetamine issue would inspire neither debate nor amendment. The energies of the Senate liberals were consumed instead by unsuccessful attempts to alter the declared law enforcement nature of the administration bill.

Senator Dodd's opening remarks, however, were squarely directed at the prescription pill industry. Dodd declared that the present federal laws had failed to control the illicit diversion of lawfully manufactured dangerous drugs. The senator also recognized the ways in which all Americans had become increasingly involved in drug use and that the people's fascination with pills was by no means an "accidental development": "Multi-hundred million dollar advertising budgets, frequently the most costly ingredient in the price of a bill, have, pill by pill, led, coaxed

into the 'freaked-out' drug culture. . . . and seduced post-World War II generations. Detail men employed by drug companies propagandize harried and harassed doctors into pushing their special brand of palliative. Free samples in the doctor's office are as common nowadays as inflated fees." In the version adopted by the Senate, Valium, Librium and meprobamate joined the amphetamines in Schedule III.

HEARINGS IN THE HOUSE

On February 3, 1970, within a week of the Senate's passage of S. 13246, the House began its hearings. The testimony would continue for a month. Although the Senate would prove in the end to be less vulnerable to the drug lobby, the issue of amphetamines—their danger and medical justification—would be aired primarily in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Public Health of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The administration bill (HR 13743), introduced by the chairman of the parent committee, made no mention of Librium or Valium and classified amphetamines in Schedule III.

As in the Senate, the attorney general was scheduled to be the first witness, but instead John Ingersoll of the BNDD was the administration's representative. On the question of amphetamine diversion, Ingersoll gave the administration's response: "Registration is . . . the most effective and least cumbersome way" to prevent the unlawful traffic. This coupled with biennial inventories of all stocks of controlled dangerous drugs and the attorney general's authority to suspend, revoke or deny registration would go a long way in solving the problem. In addition, the administration was proposing stronger controls on imports and exports. For Schedules I and II, but not III or IV, a permit from the attorney general would be required for exportation. Quotas for Schedules I and II, but not III or IV, would "maximize" government control. For Schedules III and IV, no approval is required, but a supplier must send an advance notice on triple invoice to the attorney general in order to export drugs such as amphetamines. A prescription could be filled only five times in a six-month period and thereafter a new prescription would be required, whereas previously such prescriptions could be refilled as long as a pharmacist would honor them.

The deputy chief counsel for the BNDD, Michael R. Sonnenreich, was asked on what basis the attorney general would decide to control a particular drug. Sonnenreich replied that the bill provides one of two ways: Either the attorney general "finds actual street abuse" or an interested party (such as HEW) feels that a drug should be controlled" (Speed-freaks out on the street are the trigger according to Sonnenreich; lawful abuse is not an apparent criterion.)

The registration fee schedule would be reasonable (\$10.00—physician or pharmacist; \$25.00—wholesalers; \$50.00—manufacturers). However, the administration did not want a formal administrative hearing on questions of registration and classification, and a less formal rule-making procedure was provided for in the bill.

Returning to the matter of diversion, Sonnenreich disclosed that from July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969 the BNDD had conducted full-scale compliance investigations of 908 "establishments." Of this total, 329 (or about 36 percent) required further action, which included surrender of order forms (162), admonition letters (38), seizures (36) and hearings (31). In addition to these full-scale investigations, the Bureau made 930 "visits." (It later came to light that when the BNDD had information that a large supply of drugs was unlawfully being sold, the Bureau's policy was to warn those involved and "90 percent of them do take care of this matter.") Furthermore, 574 robberies involving dan-

gerous drugs had been reported to the Bureau.

Eight billion amphetamine tablets are produced annually, according to Dr. Stanley Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, and although the worst abuse is by intravenous injection, an NIMH study found that 21 percent of all college students had taken amphetamines with the family medicine cabinet acting as the primary source—not surprising in light of the estimate that 1.1 billion prescriptions were issued in 1967 at a consumer cost of \$3.9 billion. Of this total, 178 million prescriptions for amphetamines were filled at a retail cost of \$692 million. No one knew the statistics better than the drug industry.

Representing the prescription-writers, the American Medical Association also recognized that amphetamines were among those drugs "used daily in practically every physician's armamentarium." This casual admission of massive lawful distribution was immediately followed by a flat denial that physicians were the source of "any significant diversion."

The next witness was Donald Fletcher, manager of distribution protection, Smith Kline & French Laboratories, one of the leading producers of amphetamines. Fletcher, who was formerly with the Texas state police, said his company favored "comprehensive controls" to fight diversion and stressed the company's "educational effort." Smith Kline & French favored federal registration and tighter controls over exports (by licensing the exporter, not the shipment). However, no change in present record-keeping requirements on distribution, production or inventory should be made, and full hearings on the decisions by the attorney general should be guaranteed.

The committee did not ask the leading producer of amphetamines a single question about illicit diversion. Upon conclusion of the testimony, Subcommittee Chairman John Jarman of Oklahoma commented, "Certainly, Smith Kline & French is to be commended for the constructive and vigorous and hard-hitting role that you have played in the fight against drug abuse."

Dr. William Apple, executive director of the American Pharmaceutical Association (APhA), was the subject of lengthy questioning and his responses were largely typical. Like the entire industry, the APhA was engaged in a massive public education program. Apple opposed the inventory provisions, warning that the cost would be ultimately passed to the consumer. He was worried about the attorney general's power to revoke registrations ("without advance notice") because it could result in cutting off necessary drugs to patients.

Apple admitted organizational involvement "in the draft stage of the bill" but all the same, the APhA had a "very good and constructive working relationship" with HEW. Apple argued that if the functions are transferred to Justice, "We have a whole new ball game in terms of people. While some of the experienced people were transferred from HEW to Justice, there are many new people, and they are law-enforcement oriented. We are health-care oriented." Surely the entire industry shared this sentiment, but few opposed the transfer as strongly as did the APhA.

Apple reasoned that since the pharmacists were not the source of diversion, why should they be "penalized by costly overburdensome administrative requirements." The source of the drugs, Apple said, were either clandestine laboratories or burglaries. The 1965 Act, which required only those "records maintained in the ordinary course of business" be kept, was sufficient. Anyway, diversion at pharmacy level was the responsibility of the pharmacists—a responsibility which the APhA takes "seriously and (is) going to do a better job (with) in the future."

Congress should instead ban the 60 mail-

order houses which are not presently included in the bill. (One subcommittee member said this was a "loophole big enough to drive a truck through.") The corner druggist simply was not involved in "large-scale diversionary efforts."

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association (PMA) was questioned a bit more carefully in the House than in the Senate. PMA talked at length about its "long and honorable history" in fighting drug abuse. Its representative echoed the concern of the membership over the lack of formal hearings and requested that a representative of the manufacturing interests be appointed to the Scientific Advisory Committee. Significantly, the PMA declined to take a position on the issue of transfer from HEW to Justice. The PMA endorsed the administration bill. PMA Vice-President Brennan was asked whether the federal government should initiate a campaign, similar to the one against cigarettes, "to warn people that perhaps they should be careful not to use drugs excessively." Brennan's response to this cautious suggestion is worth quoting in full:

"I think this is probably not warranted because it would have the additional effect of giving concern to people over very useful commodities. . . . There is a very useful side to any medicant and to give people pause as to whether or not they should take that medication, particularly those we are talking about which are only given by prescription, I think the negative effect would outweigh any sociological benefit on keeping people from using drugs."

LIMITED MEDICAL USE

There was universal agreement that amphetamines are medically justified for the treatment of two very rare diseases, hyperkinesia and narcolepsy. Dr. John D. Griffith of the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine testified that amphetamine production should be limited to the needs created by those conditions: "A few thousand tablets (of amphetamines) would supply the whole medical needs of the country. In fact, it would be possible for the government to make and distribute the tablets at very little cost. This way there would be no outside commercial interests involved." Like a previous suggestion that Congress impose a one cent per tablet tax on drugs subject to abuse, no action was taken on the proposal.

The very next day, Dr. John Jennings, acting director of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), testified that amphetamines had a "limited medical use" and their usefulness in control of obesity was of "doubtful value." Dr. Dorothy Dobbs, director of the Marketed Drug Division of the FDA further stated that there was now no warning on the prescriptions to patients, but that the FDA was proposing that amphetamines be labeled indicating among other things that a user subjects himself to "extreme psychological dependence" and the possibility of "extreme personality changes . . . (and) the most severe manifestation of amphetamine intoxication is a psychosis." Dr. Dobbs thought that psychological dependence even under a physician's prescription was "quite possible."

Congressman Claude Pepper of Florida, who from this point on would be the recognized leader of the antiamphetamine forces, testified concerning a series of hearings which his Select Committee on Crime had held in the fall of 1969 on the question of stimulant use.

Pepper's committee had surveyed medical deans and health organizations on the medical use of amphetamines. Of 53 responses, only one suggested that the drug was useful "for early stages of a diet program." (Dr. Sidney Cohen of NIMH estimated that 99 percent of the total legal prescriptions for amphetamines were ostensibly for dietary control.) Pepper's investigation also con-

firmed a high degree of laxness by the drug companies. A special agent for the BNDD testified that by impersonating a physician, he was able to get large quantities of amphetamines from two mail-order houses in New York. One company, upon receiving an order for 25,000 units, asked for further verification of medical practice. Two days after the agent declined to reply, the units arrived. Before Pepper's committee, Dr. Cohen of NIMH testified that amphetamines were a factor in trucking accidents due to their hallucinatory effects.

Dr. John D. Griffith from Vanderbilt Medical School, in his carefully documented statement on the toxicity of amphetamines, concluded "amphetamine addiction is more widespread, more incapacitating, more dangerous and socially disrupting than narcotic addiction." Considering that 8 percent of all prescriptions are for amphetamines and that the drug companies make only one-tenth of one cent a tablet, Dr. Griffith was not surprised that there was so little scrutiny by manufacturers. Only a large output would produce a large profit.

Treatment for stimulant abuse was no easier than for heroin addiction and was limited to mild tranquilization, total abstinence and psychiatric therapy. But, heroin has not been the subject of years of positive public "education" programs nor has it been widely prescribed by physicians or lawfully produced. A health specialist from the University of Utah pointed out that the industry's propaganda had made amphetamines: "One of the major ironies of the whole field of drug abuse. We continue to insist that they are good drugs when used under medical supervision, but their greatest use turns out to be frivolous, illegal and highly destructive to the user. People who are working in the field of drug abuse are finding it most difficult to control the problem, partly because they have the reputation of being legal and good drugs."

The thrust of Pepper's presentation was not obvious from the questioning that followed, because the subcommittee discussions skirted the issue. Pepper's impact could be felt in the subsequent testimony of the executive director of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. The NABP objected to the use of the word "dangerous" in the bill's title because it "does little to enhance the legal acts of the physician and pharmacist in diagnosing and dispensing this type of medication." (The Controlled Dangerous Substances Act would later become the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.)

As in the Senate hearings, Ingersoll of the BNDD returned for a second appearance and this time, he was the last witness. Ingersoll stated that he wished "to place . . . in their proper perspective" some "of the apparent controversies" which arose in the course of testimony. A substantial controversy had arisen over amphetamines, but there was not a single word on that subject in Ingersoll's prepared statement. Later, he did admit that there was an "overproduction" of amphetamines and estimated that 75 percent to 90 percent of the amphetamines found in illicit traffic came from the American drug companies.

Several drug companies chose to append written statements rather than testifying.

Abbott Laboratories stated that it "basically" supported the administration bills and argued that because fat people had higher mortality rates than others, amphetamines were important to the public welfare, ignoring the charge that amphetamines were not useful in controlling weight. Abbott then argued that because their products were in a sustained-release tablet, they were "of little interest to abusers," suggesting that "meth" tablets per se cannot be abused and ignoring the fact that they can be easily diluted.

Eli Lilly & Co. also endorsed "many of the

concepts" in the president's proposals. They as well had "participated in a number of conferences sponsored by the (BNDD) and . . . joined in both formal and informal discussions with the Bureau personnel regarding" the bill. Hoffman-LaRoche had surely watched, with alarm, the Senate's inclusion of Librium and Valium in Schedule III. They were now willing to accept all the controls applying to Schedule III drugs, including the requirements of record-keeping, inventory, prescription limits and registration as long as their "minor tranquilizers" were not grouped with amphetamines. Perhaps, the company suggested, a separate schedule between III and IV was the answer. The crucial point was that they did not want the negative association with speed and they quoted a physician to clarify this: "If in the minds of my patients a drug which I prescribe for them has been listed or branded by the government in the same category as 'goofballs' and 'pep pills' it would interfere with my ability to prescribe . . . and could create a mental obstacle to their . . . taking the drug at all."

When the bill was reported out of committee to the House, the amphetamine family was in Schedule III, and Hoffman-LaRoche's "minor tranquilizers" remained free from control.

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE—ROUND I

On September 23, 1970, the House moved into Committee of the Whole for opening speeches on the administration bill now known as HR 18583. The following day, the anti-amphetamine forces led by Congressman Pepper carried their arguments onto the floor of the House by way of an amendment transferring the amphetamine family from Schedule III into Schedule II. If successful, amphetamines would be subject to stricter import and export controls, higher penalties for illegal sale and possession and the possibility that the attorney general could impose quotas on production and distribution. (In Schedule III, amphetamines were exempt from quotas entirely.) Also, if placed in Schedule II, the prescriptions could be filled only once. Pepper was convinced from previous experience that until quotas were established by law the drug industry would not voluntarily restrict production.

Now the lines were clearly drawn. The House hearings had provided considerable testimony to the effect that massive amphetamine production coupled with illegal diversion posed a major threat to the public health. No congressman would argue that this was not the case. The House would instead divide between those who faithfully served the administration and the drug industry and those who argued that Congress must act or no action could be expected. The industry representatives dodged the merits of the opposition's arguments, contending that a floor amendment was inappropriate for such "far reaching" decisions.

"Legislating on the floor . . . concerning very technical and scientific matters," said subcommittee member Tim Lee Carter of Kentucky, "can cause a great deal of trouble. It can open a Pandora's Box" and the amendment which affected 6,100 drugs "would be disastrous to many companies throughout the land."

Paul G. Rogers of Florida (another subcommittee member) stated that the bill's provisions were based on expert scientific and law enforcement advice, and that the "whole process of manufacture and distribution had been tightened up." Robert McClory of Illinois, though not a member of the subcommittee, revealed the source of his opposition to the amendment:

"Frankly . . . there are large pharmaceutical manufacturing interests centered in my congressional district. . . . I am proud to say that the well-known firms of Abbott Laboratories and Baxter Laboratories have large plants in my (district). It is my ex-

pectation that C. D. Searl & Co. may soon establish a large part of its organization (there). Last Saturday, the American Hospital Supply Co. dedicated its new building complex in Lake County . . . where its principle research and related operations will be conducted."

Control of drug abuse, continued McClory, should not be accomplished at the cost of imposing "undue burdens or (by taking) punitive or economically unfair steps adversely affecting the highly successful and extremely valuable pharmaceutical industries which contribute so much to the health and welfare of mankind."

Not everyone was as honest as McClory. A parent committee member, William L. Springer of Illinois, thought the dispute was basically between Pepper's special committee on crime and the subcommittee on health and medicine chaired by John Jarman of Oklahoma. Thus phrased, the later was simply more credible than the former. "There is no problem here of economics having to do with any drug industry."

But economics had everything to do with the issue according to Representative Jerome R. Waldie of California: "(T)he only opposition to this amendment that has come across my desk has come from the manufacturers of amphetamines." He reasoned that since the House was always ready to combat crime in the streets, "crime that involved a corporation and its profits" logically merits equal attention. Waldie concluded that the administration's decision "to favor the profits (of the industry) over the children is a cruel decision, the consequences of which will be suffered by thousands of young people." Pepper and his supporters had compiled and introduced considerable evidence on scientific and medical opinions on the use and abuse of amphetamines. It was now fully apparent that the evidence would be ignored because of purely economic and political considerations. In the closing minutes of debate, Congressman Robert Giaimo of Connecticut, who sat on neither committee, recognized the real issue: "Why should we allow the legitimate drug manufacturers to indirectly supply the (sic) organized crime and pushers by producing more drugs than are necessary? When profits are made while people suffer, what difference does it make where the profits go?"

Pepper's amendment was then defeated by a voice vote. The bill passed by a vote of 341 to 6. The amphetamine industry had won in the House. In two days of debate, Librium and Valium went unmentioned and remained uncontrolled.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE—ROUND II

Two weeks after the House passed H.R. 18583, the Senate began consideration of the House bill. (The Senate bill, passed eight months before, continued to languish in a House committee.) On October 7, 1970, Senator Thomas Eagleton of Missouri moved to amend H.R. 18583 to place amphetamines in Schedule II. Although he reiterated the arguments used by Pepper in the House, Eagleton stated that his interest in the amendment was not solely motivated by the abuse by speed freaks. If the amendment carried, it would "also cut back on abuse by the weight-conscious housewife, the weary long-haul truck driver and the young student trying to study all night for his exams."

The industry strategy from the beginning was to center congressional outrage on the small minority of persons who injected large doses of diluted amphetamines into their veins. By encouraging this emphasis, the drug companies had to face questioning about illicit diversion to the "speed community," but they were able to successfully avoid any rigorous scrutiny of the much larger problem of lawful abuse. The effort had its success. Senator Thomas J. McIntyre of New Hampshire, while noting the general abuse of the drugs,

stated that the real abuse resulted from large doses either being swallowed, snorted or injected.

Senator Roman Hruska of Nebraska was not surprisingly the administration and industry spokesman. He echoed the arguments that had been used successfully in the House: The amendment seeks to transfer between 4,000 and 6,000 products of the amphetamine family; "some of them are very dangerous" but the bill provides a mechanism for administrative reclassification; administration and "HEW experts" support the present classification and oppose the amendment; and, finally, the Senate should defer to the executive where a complete study is promised.

It would take three to five years to move a drug into Schedule II by administrative action, responded Eagleton. Meanwhile amphetamines would continue to be "sold with reckless abandon to the public detriment." Rather than placing the burden on the government, Eagleton argued that amphetamines should be classed in Schedule II and those who "are making money out of the misery of many individuals" should carry the burden to downgrade the classification.

Following Eagleton's statement, an unexpected endorsement came from the man who had steered two drug control bills through the Senate in five years. Senator Dodd stated that Eagleton had made "a good case for the amendment." Senator John Pastore was sufficiently astonished to ask Dodd pointedly whether he favored the amendment. Dodd unequivocally affirmed his support. Dodd's endorsement was clearly a turning point in the Senate debate. Hruska's plea that the Senate should defer to the "superior knowledge" of the attorney general, HEW and BNDD was met with Dodd's response that, if amphetamines were found not to be harmful, the attorney general could easily move them back into Schedule III. In Schedule II, Dodd continued, "only the big powerful manufacturers of these pills may find a reduction in their profits. The people will not be harmed." With that, the debate was over and the amendment carried by a vote of 40 in favor, 16 against and 44 not voting.

Dodd may have been roused by the House's failure, without debate, to subject Librium and Valium to controls which he had supported from the beginning. Prior to Eagleton's amendment, Dodd had moved to place these depressants in Schedule IV. In that dispute, Dodd knew that economics was the source of the opposition: "It is clearly evident . . . that (the industry) objections to the inclusion of Librium and Valium are not so much based on sound medical practice as they are on the slippery surface of unethical profits." Hoffman-LaRoche annually reaped 40 million dollars in profits—"a tidy sum which (they have) done a great deal to protect." Senator Dodd went on to say that Hoffman-LaRoche reportedly paid a Washington law firm three times the annual budget of the Senate subcommittee staff to assure that their drugs would remain uncontrolled. "No wonder," exclaimed Dodd, "that the Senate first, and then the House, was overrun by Hoffman-LaRoche lobbyists," despite convincing evidence that they were connected with suicides and attempted suicides and were diverted in large amounts into illicit channels.

By voice vote Hoffman-LaRoche's "minor tranquilizers" were brought within the control provisions of Schedule IV. Even Senator Hruska stated that he did not oppose this amendment, and that it was "very appropriate" that it be adopted so that a "discussion of it and decision upon it (be) made in the conference."

The fate of the minor tranquilizers and the amphetamine family would now be decided by the conferees of the two houses.

IN CONFERENCE

The conferees from the Senate were fairly equally divided on the issue of amphetamine

classification. Of the eleven Senate managers, at least six were in favor of the transfer to Schedule II. The remaining five supported the administration position. Although Eagleton was not appointed, Dodd and Harold Hughes would represent his position. Hruska and Strom Thurmond, both of whom had spoken against the amendment, would act as administration spokesmen.

On October 8, 1970, before the House appointed its conferees, Pepper rose to remind his colleagues that the Senate had reclassified amphetamines. Although he stated that he favored an instruction to the conferees to support the amendment, he inexplicably declined to so move. Instead, Pepper asked the conferees "to view this matter as sympathetically as they think the facts and the evidence they have before them will permit." Congressman Rogers an outspoken opponent of the Pepper amendment, promised "sympathetic understanding" for the position of the minority.

Indeed, the minority would have to be content with that and little else. All seven House managers were members of the parent committee, and four were members of the originating subcommittee. Of the seven, only one would match support with "sympathetic understanding." The other six were not only against Schedule II classification, but they had led the opposition to it in floor debate: Jarman, Rogers, Carter, Staggers and Nelsen. Congressman Springer, who had declared in debate that economics had nothing to do with this issue, completed the House representation. Not a single member of Pepper's Select Committee on Crime was appointed as a conferee. On the question of reclassification, the pharmaceutical industry would be well represented.

Hoffman-LaRoche, as well, was undoubtedly comforted by the presence of the four House subcommittee conferees: The subcommittee had never made any attempt to include Valium and Librium in the bill. On that question, it is fair to say that the Senate managers were divided. The administration continued to support no controls for these depressants.

At dispute were six substantive Senate amendments to the House bill: Three concerned amphetamines, Librium and Valium; one required an annual report to Congress on advisory councils; the fifth lessened the penalty for persons who gratuitously distributed a small amount of marijuana; and the sixth, introduced by Senator Hughes, altered the thrust of the bill and placed greater emphasis on drug education, research, rehabilitation and training. To support these new programs, the Senate had appropriated \$26 million more than the House.

The House, officially, opposed all of the Senate amendments.

From the final compromises, it is apparent that the Senate liberals expended much of their energy on behalf of the Hughes amendment. Although the Senate's proposed educational effort was largely gutted in favor of the original House version, an additional 25 million dollars was appropriated. The bill would also now require the inclusion in state public health plans of "comprehensive programs" to combat drug abuse and the scope of grants for addicts and drug-dependent persons was increased. The House then accepted the amendments on annual reports and the possession charge for gratuitous marijuana distributors.

The administration and industry representative gave but an inch on the amphetamine amendment: Only the liquid injectable methamphetamines, speed, would be transferred to Schedule II. All the pills would remain in Schedule III. In the end, amphetamine abuse was restricted to the mainlining speed freak. The conference report reiterated the notion that further administrative action on amphetamines by the attorney general would be initiated. Finally, Librium and

Vallum would not be included in the bill. The report noted that "final administrative action" (begun in 1966) was expected "in a matter of weeks." Congress was contented to await the outcome of those proceedings.

ADOPTION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT

Pepper and his supporters were on their feet when the agreement on amphetamines was reported to the House on October 14, 1970. Conferee Springer, faithful to the industry's tactical line, declared that the compromise is a good one because it "singles out the worst of these substances, which are the liquid, injectable methamphetamines and puts them in Schedule II." If amphetamine injection warranted such attention, why, asked Congressman Charles Wiggins, were the easily diluted amphetamine and methamphetamine pills left in Schedule III? Springer responded that there had been "much discussion," yes and "some argument" over that issue, but the conferees felt it was best to leave the rest of the amphetamine family to administrative action.

Few could have been fooled by the conference agreement. The managers claimed to have taken the most dangerous and abused member of the family and subjected it to more rigorous controls. In fact, as the minority pointed out, the compromise affected the least abused amphetamine: Lawfully manufactured "liquid meth" was solid strictly to hospitals, not in the streets, and there was no evidence of any illicit diversion. More importantly, from the perspective of the drug manufacturers, only five of the 6,000 member amphetamine family fell into this category. Indeed, liquid meth was but an insignificant part of the total methamphetamine, not to mention amphetamine, production. Pepper characterized the new provision as "virtually meaningless." It was an easy pill for the industry to swallow. The Senate accepted the report on the same day as the House.

Only Eagleton, the sponsor of the successful Senate reclassification amendment, would address the amphetamine issue. To him, the new amendment "accomplish(ed) next to nothing." The reason for the timid, limp compromise was also obvious to Eagleton: "When the chips were down, the power of the drug companies was simply more compelling" than any appeal to the public welfare.

A week before, when Dodd had successfully classified Librium and Vallum in the bill, he had remarked (in reference to the House's inaction): "Hoffman-LaRoche, at least for the moment, have reason to celebrate a singular triumph, the triumph of money over conscience. It is a triumph . . . which I hope will be shortlived."

Richard Nixon appropriately chose the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs offices for the signing of the bill on November 2, 1970. Flanked by Mitchell and Ingersoll, the president had before him substantially the same measure that had been introduced 15 months earlier. Nixon declared that America faced a major crisis of drug abuse, reaching even into the junior high schools, which constituted a "major cause of street crime." To combat this alarming rise, the president now had 300 new agents. Also, the federal government's jurisdiction was expanded: "The jurisdiction of the attorney general will go far beyond, for example, heroin. It will cover the new types of drugs, the barbiturates and amphetamines that have become so common and are even more dangerous because of their use" (author emphasis).

The president recognized amphetamines were "even more dangerous" than heroin, although he carefully attached the qualifier that this was a result "of their use." The implication is clear: The president viewed only the large dosage user of amphetamines as an abuser. The fact that his full state-

ment refers only to abuse by "young people" (and not physicians, truck drivers, housewives or businessmen) affirms the implication. The president's remarks contained no mention of the pharmaceutical industry, nor did they refer to any future review of amphetamine classification. After a final reference to the destruction that drug abuse was causing, the president signed the bill into law.

THREE GREAT NEWSPAPERS
EXAMINE OUR PRISONS

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

MR. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to three superb newspaper series describing prison conditions and proposals for prison reform which have been published by three of America's most respected newspapers.

Specifically, I refer to the five-part series entitled "The Failure of Prisons" authored by Mr. John Fialka of the Washington Evening Star; a seven-part series written by Mr. Jack Waugh, entitled "Prisons: Changing a System That Doesn't Work," for the Christian Science Monitor; and the articles which began last Sunday written by Mr. Ben H. Bagdikian for the Washington Post entitled "The Shame of the Prisons." I am today placing the articles by these knowledgeable writers into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Prisons, as the 11 members of this body's Select Committee on Crime has learned, are a part of an interdependent system of justice that is failing society from the time an offender is apprehended to the time he is released.

In our hearings last year, we heard firsthand from prison officials, prison inmates, and those observers of prison conditions of the total lack of any form of rehabilitation within the walls of most of our Nation's prisons.

I reiterate what I said at the conclusion of 5 days of hearings which included the incidents of inmate uprisings at Attica, N.Y., and Raiford, Fla., State Prisons:

The prison system in America is a disgrace.

It fails to either deter crime or to rehabilitate offenders. One conclusion appears irrefutable—punishment and punishment alone will not return an offender to a constructive role in society.

The following articles will not be pleasant reading for those who think that more jails and longer terms for offenders are the answer to this Nation's serious crime problem.

You will not find simple solutions in these articles, but you will find truths.

I commend the articles that have been published in the Star, Monitor, and Post to those interested in prison reform. I strongly commend these newspapers for presenting the facts to their readers and hope that other newspapers as well as television and radio commentators will dedicate their talents to bringing the problem of our prisons to the attention of their audiences.

The series of articles follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 12, 1972]

THE PUBLIC JUST DOESN'T CARE

(By John Fialka)

RAIFORD, Fla.—Early in March, a pasty-faced young man with the words "Love" and "Hate" tattooed on his knuckles will walk out of his cell in the solitary confinements section of Florida State Prison.

The man, who has a long criminal record, will make his way out of one of the newest, most maximum security prisons in the country.

Brief pulses of strong light will illuminate him to the closed circuit television scanners as he approaches each gate. The gates, controlled by the unseen hand of a guard pushing a button, will slide open.

And George Baker, 25, will walk to freedom in an ill-fitting business suit with \$25 in his pocket after completing his latest sentence—10 months for conspiracy to commit a felony.

As he finishes his term, his attitudes have not changed. He rejected all paths that might lead to parole, or to a halfway house, and he is "making out" or serving his full sentence.

He has no plans. He says he expects "trouble" on the outside.

Baker (not his real name) is just another statistic in an era when it takes an Attica to dramatize the failures of America's prison system.

The federal government has noted for years that somewhere between 40 and 60 percent of those released from prison will return eventually.

And Florida, which was forced to release over 1,000 prisoners by the Supreme Court's Gideon decision in 1963, has the best evidence showing that the longer a man stays in prison, the more likely will be his return.

But in Florida and in most states across the nation, the message of statistics has never made much of a dent on the problem.

On a given day, there are about 1.3 million people in U.S. jails and prisons.

Of those, 9,500 are in the custody of Florida's Division of Corrections. It maintains nine institutions and a system of road camps, and is fairly typical of penal systems in this country.

It does not claim to be the best, and it is not the worst.

The people who run it have a complaint that could be heard in almost any state: The legislature, which once ran prisons as a sort of farm subsidy program, is still tight with money and the people of Florida are not concerned.

The hub of the system is here at Raiford, a collection of buildings that constitute the state prison and house 2,900 convicts, about 51 percent of them black.

George Baker lives in the "maxi-maxi" joint, the East Wing, which is surrounded by two high chain link fences topped by rolls of barbed concertina wires and separated by a pack of mean, prowling dogs.

A structure in the style that wardens in some populous Northern states have been clamoring for, it is designed for men who can't adjust to life in a normal maximum security facility.

It was built in 1962 and houses 1,206 in individual cells. Baker's cell is at the rear of the building, where the most obvious homosexuals, the prisoners with mental problems, and most of the disciplinary cases are kept.

Baker is one of the disciplinary cases.

Recently, he came before his classification team, a board composed of a guard in his unit, his prison social worker, and his work supervisor. Such a team decides if a man enters or leaves solitary.

Jim Tompkins, the assistant superintendent of East Wing, was showing a visitor through the institution, became interested, and wound up sitting on the board himself.

Baker, in a soft, cool voice, told the team he had 97 days left to serve and that he intended to serve them out in solitary.

Tompkins reviewed Baker's record—four convictions, including larceny and breaking and entering, and three escapes.

"Look, I just hate to see any guy walk out from the back of this building and out the front gate," he began, pointing out that Baker could begin adjusting to life outside by going back into Raiford's other major building, "The Rock." There, inmates live four to a cell, work and have some leisure time activities.

"I just don't like to be around a lot of people," said Baker.

"You know the holiday season will be coming up. We'll be having some long weekends. There'll be a lot of holiday stuff and professional football on television. You won't want to miss that," Tompkins replied.

Baker replied that he would pass it up.

There was some discussion of what job Baker could do if he wanted to work, which he refuses to do. Previously he had the usual prison jobs—auto body shop, the farm, some electrical work.

Someone suggested he might like maintenance. He turned it down.

After some prodding, he said the real reason he didn't want to go back into the regular cells was because he doesn't like Negroes.

"But there are black people outside," George the guard noted.

Baker thought that over for a moment.

"I know, but I can't get along too well with colored people. They get on my case and I get on theirs."

Tompkins tried again. "You should go out and get some sun on you, you're real pale." Baker shook his head.

Tompkins persisted, telling Baker he should at least be making some plans for his release.

"You know the amount of money we can legally give you don't get you very far . . . when you get out your belt might pinch and you might feel you have to do something that will get you into trouble."

Baker shrugged. "That's what always happens."

Tompkins again: "Have you ever taken any thought about what you're doing to your life, Baker?"

"Yes, sir," came the answer, with no expression and no hesitation. "I'm throwing it out the window."

AN OLD IDEA

The story that includes George Baker began about 200 years ago. That is when a group of Americans, primarily the Quakers, came up with an idea for prison reform that had lasting effect.

They reasoned that prisoners should be kept separate, both to reflect on their past failings, and so that they wouldn't corrupt each other, and they added in the idea of hard work.

Today, despite generations of prison "reformers," the basic idea remains largely unchanged. The layman who tours prisons in the United States sees that the 20th century's major contribution to the pattern of everyday prison life has been the television set.

The cycle of prison life survives the most damning exposures. The case of George Baker, for example, comes in a state that has produced the best proof to date that failure is literally built into the system.

The director of the Florida Division of Corrections, Louis L. Wainwright, became nationally known as of March 18, 1963. He is the Wainwright of the landmark Supreme Court ruling then, in the case of Gideon V. Wainwright, that anyone accused of a serious crime has a right to a free lawyer if he can't afford one himself.

The ruling against Wainwright meant that not only Clarence Earl Gideon, but ultimately 1,251 other Florida convicts, had to be freed.

Newspapers and politicians made grave statements about the impending "crime wave." Wainwright decided to do a statistical followup to see what actually happened.

The study showed that only 13.6 percent of those freed later returned to prison. In a statistically matched group of inmates released at the normal end of their sentences in the same period, almost 12 percent more—a total of 25.4 percent—later returned.

The Gideon group even performed slightly better than a matched group of prisoners selected by the State's Parole Board for early release.

The study nailed down a conclusion that criminologists and some prison officials have argued for years: The longer a man stays in prison, the greater the likelihood that he will return.

But "that study hasn't seemed to pick up much reaction," Wainwright told an interviewer recently.

It didn't even have anything to do with the rise in Florida's parole rate the past couple years, he said.

The Parole Board operates as an independent political entity, and Wainwright described his early battles with it.

For years, the conservative-dominated board allowed paroles for only 38 percent of the prisoners, while other Southern states were paroling 63 percent. The rate finally started going up in 1969—"That's when the former head of the Parole Board died," Wainwright said—and now exceeds 50 percent.

Partly because of the low parole rate, Raiford grew to become one of the nation's largest prisons—3,500 men as of last February.

The growth is also attributable to the fact that since 1913, when it was built, until about 10 years ago, Raiford was under the scrutiny of the Agriculture Committee of the State Senate.

According to several longtime observers, the committee chairman and some former governors saw to it that nearly every dollar earmarked for prisons went into Raiford's senatorial district.

"It was sort of an agricultural subsidy, a way to provide jobs," one source commented.

HOW CHANGES OCCUR

Wainwright, a former guard and police officer who grew up in the rural area in north central Florida, near Raiford, became head of the newly organized Division of Corrections in 1962.

As he explains it, he has lobbied for reform vigorously, but change never came until after something happened.

He argued for the closing of some of the road camps because they were wooden and dilapidated. The state didn't close them until after one burned down and a number of prisoners were incinerated.

He argued that Raiford's medical facilities were grossly inadequate. Change didn't come until after newspaper columnist Jack Anderson printed an exposé.

He argued that Raiford's population should be reduced. That didn't come about—by moving prisoners to other institutions—until after a massive disturbance last February.

The disturbance occurred when 1,350 inmates were massed on the athletic field, in part to protest Florida's policy of paying prisoners nothing for labor in prison industries. It ended with six prisoners wounded, after guards were ordered to fire on the crowd.

Wainwright later blamed the disturbance on columnist Anderson and said the men had to be cleared from the field because it was feared they would "sexually attack" each other.

The incident, in which inmates also were gassed and beaten by guards, produced a

storm of public criticism. Wainwright's boss, Dr. James A. Bax, head of the state's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, issued a report that was strongly critical of his explanation.

Bax, now with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, said of Wainwright:

"I have nothing against him. I guess as far as the heads of corrections departments go, Wainwright's a pretty good one."

However, Wainwright labored for years, he said, to close the prison system to public scrutiny, denying access to newspapers and community groups.

Wainwright had close ties to rural elements in the state legislature and in state agencies and "set himself up as the system's only spokesman," Bax said. "If it didn't get what it needed, then I guess he's not a very good spokesman."

Wainwright stoutly defended his role in the demonstration, and he pointed to the bright spots of his tenure, including construction of a string of smaller institutions.

Lately he has been pushing for higher salaries for his guards, who begin at \$461 a month, and have an unnerving job. There have been 27 escapes at Raiford since February.

Wainwright also noted that the statewide system—9,500 inmates—has just hired its first full-time psychiatrist, a man who can devote four days a week to prisoners.

"Of course that's not enough, but remember, before this we didn't have the money to hire any."

"You have to remember," Wainwright added, "the public just doesn't care about corrections."

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 13, 1972]

A TARNISHED MODEL

(By John Fialka)

In California, the prison system is like oranges. You sell it.

"We have the best one in the whole world," the head of the California Department of Corrections, Raymond K. Procunier, told a recent conference of prison experts in Williamsburg, Va.

"If anyone can come up with anything we haven't tried in our system, I'll give them 50 bucks," he added.

There were no takers at the conference. There probably would have been thousands had he made the statement in California.

There, the prison system has been heavily criticized in the two years since January 1970, when a guard at the Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, Cal., killed three black inmates during a fracas in an exercise yard.

A few days later, a white guard was killed. Black revolutionary George Jackson and two other black inmates were charged with the murder. They soon became known as the "Soledad Brothers," and attorneys and a variety of groups, many of them from the far political left, rushed to their defense.

The ferment soon spread through the entire system, which has 13 major institutions, 20,000 inmates, 3,500 guards and an annual budget of \$127 million.

Prisoners in the maximum security prisons at Folsom and San Quentin staged work and hunger strikes.

Suggestions, demands and bombast showered down on Procunier, 48, a clever, tough, former guard who worked his way up through the California system and was named director of corrections in 1967 by Gov. Ronald Reagan.

The controversy quickly spread into the national media. According to James W. L. Park, associate warden at San Quentin, Jackson spent eight solid weeks in the visiting room giving press interviews.

If the prison system was not the most pub-

licized social issue in the state, it became so after Jackson was shot down last August as he led an escape attempt that coincided with the killing of three guards and two inmates.

As the criticism grew, the guards in the prison system responded by forming "safety committees" and offering suggestions of their own. Among the items they have recommended are submachine guns and gas grenades for the gun towers and flack suits for the riot squad.

EXPATRIATION CONSIDERED

Last fall, the California Correctional Officers Association, which claims to represent 90 percent of the guards, issued a straight-faced announcement that it was looking for ways to implement a demand by radicals that political prisoners be allowed to take up residence in a neutral, "non-imperialistic" country.

The general response in the state has shown primarily that, in times of crisis, prison systems are among the institutions most resistant to change.

"Tear Down the Walls" was the slogan most often heard from radical prison critics over the past two years. But other radicals and moderates alike have offered many suggestions that have been both possible and reasonable.

For instance, Fay Stender, the San Francisco lawyer who first defended Jackson, argues that the basic problem of California's prisoners is powerlessness. She suggested one relatively simple way to give them some basic rights. Let them choose ombudsmen to bring their grievances outside the walls.

The idea currently is being considered by prison administration in at least six states as a way to prevent crisis situations.

FAIR HEARINGS URGED

Another suggestion she has made is to reform the disciplinary process to assure a fair hearing before an inmate is thrown into "the hole," or solitary confinement.

These two ideas were among 75 bills drawn up last year by the California Legislature calling for administrative reforms of the prison system.

Procnier opposed nearly every one of them, arguing that the changes either were unnecessary or would interfere with proper management of his department.

One bill was passed, that to provide ombudsmen. However, it was vetoed by Reagan, supporting Procnier's stand. A much-modified version of that idea later was adopted.

Despite its resistance to demands from the outside for changes, California's prison system often comes out on top in comparison with other state systems.

It has and uses more resources.

It has, generally, a higher education and training level among its staff. There are more psychiatrists working there than in any other system, including the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

It also has pioneered many educational and community programs in corrections.

ONE OUTSTANDING PROGRAM

There is one program that has overshadowed all others. It is a relatively unpublishable venture, begun in 1966, called probation subsidy. Under it, California pays its counties not to send people to prison.

Currently, 46 of the state's 58 counties are participating in the program. They receive up to \$4,000 for each offender they agree to keep on probation under county control.

The state has been pumping as much as \$14 million a year into county probation departments and other services designed to rehabilitate people in the community.

The result has been that the California prison population has dropped from 28,000 to 20,000 in two years and is going steadily downward.

For the first time, each inmate has a single cell. Reagan has announced that San Quentin will close in 1975, and portions of Folsom already have been shut down.

Washington recently adopted a similar subsidy system and other states have expressed interest.

Because of the program's size and its impact on the system, Floyd Feeney, director of the University of California's Center on Administration of Criminal Justice, calls it the "largest single correctional experiment ever undertaken."

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT GRANT

Feeney is working under a grant from the Justice Department to determine how the experiment has worked out. Among the things he hopes to find out are how many people it has kept out of prison and the effectiveness of the subsidized community programs.

The impact on the California Department of Corrections has been, as one official puts it, "unbelievable."

Ten years ago, the department worked up a master plan that resembles the growth patterns and ambitions of most prison systems in the country.

The inmate population would go up rapidly as the population grew and street crimes increased, they reasoned, so new prisons would have to be built at the rate of one every few years. By 1972, they projected, there would be 32,000 inmates in the system—12,000 more than the number now there.

The reversal of the growth trend was an accomplishment that many criminologists long had believed to be impossible.

Probation subsidy is believed to have produced one terrible side effect, however. Corrections officials argue that it is the principal cause of the increase in prison violence, because it has tended to produce concentrations of inmates charged with violent crimes.

NO COUNTY GUIDELINES

There are no guidelines to the counties under the program as to which criminals they keep on probation, and which go to state institutions. They are keeping the good risks and sending to prison the poor ones.

In 1960, 30 percent of the prison population was there for homicide, robbery and assault. Today the proportion has risen to 45 percent.

The rate of violence against guards has soared. From 1953 to 1970, only four prison employees were killed. In 1971 alone, seven were murdered.

In 1970, 11 convicts were killed, most of them murdered by other convicts. Last year, 15 convicts were killed.

"Ten years ago we had the alcoholics, and checkwriters and small-time burglars. Those were guys that when you got them clean and stabilized, they helped you run things. We haven't got them anymore," said Philip Guthrie, information officer for the Department of Corrections.

The new potential for violence is coupled with mounting evidence that there are some organized revolutionary groups both inside and outside the walls bent on directing violence.

NO PAT FORMULAS

"It's not like racial disturbances," says San Quentin's assistant warden, Jim Park. "We've got that goddamn near down to a formula. You start having race hassles and you lock everybody up and feed them sack lunches for a couple of days."

"But with the revolutionary ethic, you're faced with a perimeter problem."

Guthrie believes troublemakers are still a relatively small percentage of the prison population. But until ways are found to isolate them, he said, many reform-minded programs will have to wait. "The violence has almost ground us to a standstill."

Some reforms, including a program to allow inmates' wives and family to visit them for up to three days in special apartmentlike areas inside the institutions, are continuing.

According to Guthrie, this conjugal visiting program has been implemented in eight

facilities, including San Quentin, and there are plans to install it at Folsom, the state's most secure prison.

"We want to do it in the security areas because some guys who have just blown their top might benefit from a visit with the wife and kids."

But the state's most lenient institutions, the work camps in remote areas, mainly for fighting forest fires, have been crippled by the change in the nature of new inmates.

TEN CLOSED RECENTLY

Ten of the 35 camps have been closed in the last five years.

"These old alcoholics and check-writers were real good campers," lamented George Winters, the man who designed the work camp system as a basic reform in the 1950s. "They still try to get the nonviolent types in the camps, but that's getting to be tough."

In the turmoil following Jackson's death, people who previously had no contact with prisons went to San Quentin's main gate to offer their help. Several asked to just talk with an inmate. They were turned away.

"We don't accept outside volunteers unless they have some specific skill," Park said. "Do-gooders can't help. They don't know what they're talking about."

"Waves of public concern about prisons are periodic in this country. They come and go every 30 years. With each one, there is some advance. There will be with this one. But afterwards the public will forget and we'll be left again with the problem," he said.

In the wake of this concern, two new programs were announced recently by the department—an "ombudsman" system and a "reform" in the disciplinary process.

SELECTED BY DEPARTMENT

Unlike most outside suggestions, which contemplated an ombudsman selected for each prison by the inmates, the state's plan provides for the ombudsman at each institution to be an employee selected by the department.

The new disciplinary process will not give the accused inmate a jailhouse attorney, or someone from outside, to help defend him against charges that may send him to the "hole."

Instead, he will be able to choose from a list of "staff assistants," or correctional employees who volunteer to aid prisoners.

"We have top-notch people," said Guthrie. "It may be we are doing the best job possible with this kind of a system."

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 14, 1972]

MENTAL LOCKSTEP

(By John Fialka)

"The only thing the prison system cannot stand would be the free enterprise system."—David Fogel.

The lockstep was once the hallmark of American prisons. Long lines of prisoners walked single file, their heads cast downward, each man with his hand on the shoulder of the man in front.

Silence was strictly enforced. The only sound was a slow shuffle.

At daybreak, the men shuffled off to breakfast and then to work. After work ended in mid-afternoon, the lines shuffled to dinner, the exercise yard, then back to the cells.

They don't use the lockstep anymore. But in many prisons, the same routine goes on without it, in a mental lockstep of resistance to new ideas and directions.

Those who have broken this routine have often come from outside.

The idea of probation and parole, for example, came from a Boston bootmaker, John Augustus, in 1841. And it was a manufacturer of chemicals, Louis Schweitzer, who came up with bail reform, in the late 1950s.

Now comes a college professor, David Fogel, who hopes to change the nature of the major feature of life inside prison walls, the work day.

He wants to bring in private enterprise. He hopes to pay the "outside" prevailing wage to prisoners making goods to compete in the open market.

If his ideas take hold, it could revolutionize prison industry, a vast wasteland of human endeavor where wages are pennies per hour, and where people are often trained on obsolete machinery to produce goods that cannot be sold.

Unlike most college professors, Fogel is in a position to implement his idea. Last year he took over as head of the Minnesota Department of Corrections, taking leave from his post as a criminologist at the University of California at Berkeley.

Inmates who work under the present system in Minnesota earn 75 cents a day. They make a variety of goods including the "Minnesota line" of farm machinery which is sold within the state on the open market.

Fogel plans to expand the farm machinery line and introduce more manufacturing processes using new technology, including the production of polypropylene rope.

Once the products develop a sufficient market, he will attempt to raise the pay to the wages prevailing outside.

Prisoners would be required to pay for their room and board. They could be in a position to take their families off welfare.

When they left prison, they would be equipped with training in proven, marketable skills such as welding, design, painting and plastic extrusion, skills that could help them stay outside the walls.

And instead of the bare savings some now manage from prison labor, plus the prison "farewell" which around the nation runs up to \$50, they might have enough cash to make a new start.

For the prison, the pressure of outside competition should keep the equipment and the processes from becoming obsolete.

"It is a new ballgame," Fogel says. "The only thing the prison system cannot stand would be the free enterprise system."

SYSTEM IN USE ABROAD

Prison industry is used effectively to teach trades in Sweden and Japan.

In this country, however, the potential for industry as a training device was severely restricted during the depression. Most states—Minnesota being an exception—passed laws requiring that prison industries produce only goods that are needed by state and local government agencies.

Pressed by organized labor, Congress followed suit in 1941, prohibiting shipment of convict-made goods across state lines.

The tangle of restrictive laws and the lack of imagination to overcome them has led to a world of work behind bars where wages begin—as they do in California—at two cents an hour, and men learn noncompetitive skills such as license plate manufacture.

There are some scenes that seem straight from Charles Dickens.

When the whistle blows in the early morning darkness at the Illinois State Penitentiary at Menard, inmates still file into the chewing tobacco factory.

An assistant to the warden, taking a visitor on a tour of the facility, admitted that the inmates, many of whom are young men from the city, do not have much interest in either making or chewing tobacco.

"But you know, we send a lot of it over to the state mental hospitals. Some of the patients over there still like it," he said.

An elderly guard who watches over the process spoke fondly of the past, when long prison terms were more common.

"You don't get inmates you could work with like you used to . . . I remember . . . one of them we called old Dry Bones. Dry Bones would work all the time. He was here for 38 years. No sir, you didn't have to watch over him."

At Menard, the most industrious workers can make up to 45 cents a day.

In some state prisons, that would be an extremely high wage. Florida, for example, pays nothing. Even there, prison industry does not always save state money.

At the Florida Correctional Institution, a facility for women at Lowell, the superintendent of the sewing factory showed a newly made sheet to a visitor.

"That's good stuff, we send them to the state hospitals. They don't always get them from us, though. Sometimes we are underbid by some of the big outside outfits."

At Growlersburg, Calif., a visitor was given a tour of a state forestry camp for prisoners in which there was a completely outfitted shop for cabinet-making. Only persons who had had cabinet-making experience before they were convicted could use the facility, he was told, because there was no money in the budget for a teacher.

YEAR'S LOSS OF \$181,000

A recent study of the prison industries in the California system, which pays between 2 cents and 35 cents an hour, found inmates learning jobs on obsolete machinery in a cotton textile mill that produced a net loss of \$181,000 in one year.

The study, prepared by the State Assembly's office of research, found that several other prison industries, despite their cheap labor costs, could not compete with private industry. The "employment provided is little better than idleness," it concluded.

(Compared to some systems, the D.C. Department of Corrections is fat city. Inmates receive 8 to 60 cents an hour for a variety of jobs such as manufacturing license plates, fire hydrants and manhole covers.)

It is not surprising that low or nonexistent wages have been a major issue in recent prison disturbances. One of the first complaints raised at Attica Prison in New York during the revolt there last year was that inmates received only 25 cents to 30 cents a day making metal office furniture.

In fact, controversy over work and wages has helped undermine innovations in other areas of prison life.

One place this happened was Colorado State Penitentiary at Canon City, where Warden Wayne K. Patterson had established what was possibly the nation's largest program of self-help projects.

Patterson, a former state trooper and parole system administrator, did not set out to be an expert on cost-free prison reform.

But over the years, as his prison population dropped from 2,200 to 1,330 due to more enlightened parole procedures, he found that the Republican-dominated state legislature was steadily cutting his budget.

"You can't really cut security very far because the guards get edgy and the danger is still there. So you have to (cut) elsewhere," he explained.

Elsewhere, it developed, was the prison school and vocational training programs, which suffered budget cuts of as much as 35 percent a year.

Patterson looked around for a solution. It began, he believes, with an outside offer of a free Dale Carnegie course.

The Dale Carnegie graduates, full of speech training and positive thinking, had to have something to do, so Patterson began a series of self-help groups that met at night and grew to cover 18 subjects, from black and Chicano culture to behavioral research.

MOVIE PROCEEDS USED

To finance the self-help groups, Patterson developed what he calls a "benign form of socialism," charging inmates a small fee for weekly movies and turning the gate over to the self-help club treasuries.

Patterson also began bringing in tourists during the daytime, charging them 50 cents a head for tours of the 83-year-old prison. Last year there were 40,000 paying visitors.

The tourists were taken through a cellblock and into the penitentiary's craft shop, past

displays of painting, sculpture and other work done by the "Walled-in Art Guild," one of the self-help groups. The money earned by the craft shop, several thousand dollars a year, went into inmates' savings accounts and toward purchase of more art supplies.

Another self-help group was the Behavioral Adjustment Research Society (BARS) which held panel discussions on various intellectual topics. One recent panel discussion included representatives of women's liberation groups and three convicted rapists.

DROPOUTS DROP IN

LADS, the Latin American Development Society, brought in high school dropouts from nearby Pueblo for weekly evening meetings. Tom Cordova, a Pueblo mailman who escorted the teen-agers into the prison, told a visitor that "as far as juvenile delinquency goes, this is the only thing I can think of that will work."

"I mean these guys inside are these kids. There is this thing they have, you know, manliness or machismo. These guys inside can show them how that can get them in the penitentiary."

In the prison, LADS held the state's first Chicano consilio, a meeting of more than 100 representatives from various Spanish-American groups.

During the last week of October, a reporter who was allowed to roam freely inside the penitentiary found general agreement among the 20 inmates he talked to that Patterson's efforts were respected, even admired.

They said homosexuality, once rampant, had become infrequent, and there had been only two fights in recent years.

Perhaps inmate Jerry Nemnich, editor of the prison magazine, the "Interpreter," put it best. Several Chicano youngsters, overflowing from the LADS meeting next door, were playing in his office one evening as he stuffed inserts into his latest issue.

"There is an almost constant presence of people from the outside going in and out. We come to think of it as a normalizing factor, a safety valve. The first time anybody hurts anyone from outside it will be all over, for him I mean. He'll have to deal with us first," Nemnich said.

Patterson brooding over a cup of coffee in the prison's snack shop on Oct. 29, acknowledged he had some problems. Permitted a modicum of freedom for the first time, inmates had begun to demand more.

"Once you get something like this going," he added, "you wonder where it will end."

Most of it did end soon after. On Nov. 2 more than 1,000 inmates began a seven-day work strike. Although there were a number of issues, including inadequate food preparation, the main one, it developed, was that most inmates received only about 20 cents a day for working in the prison's license plate factory, soap factory and cannery.

The guards, backed up by state police, broke the strike by locking the men in their cells and feeding them sandwiches until tempers cooled. Prison buildings were damaged some, and there was one injury, an inmate who attempted to slash his wrists, according to Patterson.

The major casualty was Patterson's self-help programs. The penitentiary again shuts down at dusk, as it did before the Patterson era. Tourist season is over.

"We'll just have to keep things quiet for a while," he said. "This seems to be a nationwide kind of thing."

Prison systems may be the most difficult social institutions to change, as several wardens and prison administrators agreed in interviews.

Some blamed the "rigid" bureaucracy of prison staffs. Others pointed to the prison system's central position within the larger state bureaucracy as the producer of the license plates, the metal office furniture, the very wares of bureaucracy itself.

One administrator, M. Robert Montilla, who recently resigned as deputy director for administration of the D.C. Department of Corrections, said that because change is difficult, many prison administrators concentrate on the "posture" of change.

"The history of reform so far has been tokenism. A lot of leaders like to have a posture of progressivism. One, because it's satisfying professionally; and two, because it helps in dealing with the inmates."

"If their leader is always advocating change, it is difficult for inmates to organize against the system," Montilla said.

REMAINING ON THE EDGE

"The successful correctional administrator always tries to remain on the edge of the reform movement. But he does not go so far as to actually do anything."

But change is coming.

Recently a wave of lawsuits, brought by ACLU attorneys, radical groups and sometimes the prisoners themselves, has begun to bowl over prison administrators.

Two have occurred in the Washington area. Judges have rewritten the administrative rulebooks for Maryland's Patuxent Institution and the entire Virginia prison system.

Radicals and other activists, departing from the waning anti-war movement, have begun to focus on the inadequacies of prisons.

They are finding much in the way of ammunition: Disciplinary systems that depend on the whim of a guard, parole boards that do not keep track of prisoners, a lack of effective inmate grievance mechanisms, and a morass of mail censorship rules and visiting restrictions often not directly related to security.

The Supreme Court ruled for the first time that prison inmates have a constitutional right to force prison administrators to publicly justify routine disciplinary measures including solitary confinement.

The unanimous opinion reversed the traditional rule that courts will not inquire into the internal operation of prisons except in "exceptional circumstances."

The lawsuits and the threat of lawsuits to come have begun to weigh heavily on wardens' minds.

Elza Brantley, warden of the Illinois State Penitentiary at Menard, recently ordered his guards to carry little plastic cards with the warnings required by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Miranda* decision.

The guards read them to inmates charged with serious infractions of prison rules. The cards, identical to those used by Illinois state police, carry out the court's mandate to tell the accused he is entitled to keep silent, to have an attorney and to have an impartial trial.

Not that inmates at Menard will really have an attorney or even another inmate to support their version of an incident before they are sent to "the hole." That decision is still made by a panel of guards.

"Some day, we might have to do the whole thing," Brantley told a recent visitor. "I'm afraid of it."

Philip J. Hirschkop, the local attorney who successfully attacked the Virginia system, recently told a group of lawyers interested in prison reform that they should never lose a prison suit, because they are so "easy."

"All you have to do is get the warden or the superintendent on the stand, rob them of their veneer and then ask them why. Why? Why? Keep pounding it in. Why do they do it this way? Why?"

"I haven't found one yet who could answer," he said.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 16, 1972]

THE MACHINE

(By John Fialka)

Like some giant machine that no one knows how to turn off, America's prison sys-

tem keeps building large new prisons in rural areas.

A team of experts that is completing what may be the most thorough study of modern prisons yet undertaken has visited 100 prisons in 31 states, all built in the 1960s and nearly all standard products of the machine.

"You know, we heard a lot about community-based programs. This has been the rhetoric lately. We heard a lot about small institutions, too," said William Nagel, a former prison administrator who heads the team for the American foundation, which undertook the project for the Justice Department.

"But what we have seen has been quite large, quite isolated and quite traditional."

A reporter who visited prisons across the country and talked to more than 51 wardens and prison system administrators found no one who would defend the process.

Before beginning their travels early in 1971, Nagel and his colleagues, an architect, a psychologist and a researcher, steeped themselves in the literature of corrections.

It is established dogma, they found, that new prisons should be small, with a capacity of 300 to 500 inmates. The presence of a larger number of prisoners thwarts individualized treatment and brings on an almost constant preoccupation with security.

Furthermore, according to National Crime Commission reports and nearly all other writing done on corrections in the 60s, prisons should be close to major cities, where the prisoners largely come from and where educational, medical and other necessary resources are located.

Yet most of the team's travels have been from remote airports down country roads to places that are difficult to find, even on state maps. The capacity of the facility at the end of the road was almost invariably, between 500 and 2,000 inmates.

"Everywhere we would go we would ask them, 'Why the hell did you put it out here?' They would always tell us it was one of two things," Nagel explained to a visitor in the foundation's Philadelphia office.

BETTER EMPLOYEES

"It was either 'The head of the (state senate) judiciary committee lives around here,' or 'You get better employees out here,'" said Nagel. "That's code for white employees."

Nagel is convinced he has discovered who runs the machine.

"Almost universally the heads of corrections are white, rural, middle-class Americans, and they like to work with white, rural, middle-class Americans

"It is a self-perpetuating sort of thing. The rural high school athlete gets a degree and goes into the system. He becomes a lieutenant, captain and then goes into the central office, takes charge of recruiting and the whole thing starts over again."

This cycle, he says, makes it impossible to mount effective programs to recruit guards from urban minority groups, the groups that in many states make up a majority of prison inmates.

The goals of the white, rural, middle class often shape the program and even the architecture of new prisons, Nagel asserts.

"We have seen a lot of make-believe programs. For instance, the college degree programs. That's the kind of window dressing that looks and sounds good."

"But in this world where, God knows, we are terribly short of every kind of artisan and craftsman, they don't begin to address the problem."

CHAPELS FREQUENTLY PROMINENT

In the many slides the Nagel team has returned with, the most splendid part of a new prison depicted is often the chapel.

"Chapels burn me up. More window-dressing. They should be a multi-purpose area. Everybody seems to have an input into this stuff except the inmate," Nagel said.

According to Romaldo Giurgola, the architect who accompanied Nagel, the great majority of new prisons visited were merely refinements of models of prison buildings devised in the last half of the 19th century.

"Most architects have never built a prison in their lives. So they'll sit down with a correctional official and he'll say, 'Well, we don't want to use a lot of people to guard them.'

"Then they go to the people who know most about that, the iron grillwork people."

Both Giurgola and Nagel feel that the "hardware experts," invariably called in by architects as consultants, often have the major influence on how a new prison looks and feels.

Security, because it is often seen as the sole purpose, dictates long, sterile corridors, much grill work, and cells where even the steel toilet is visible from a distance.

Nagel suspects these "new" prisons create "an almost Kafka-like lack of reference" that tends to inhibit rehabilitation by making the prisoner feel like a number.

WIRE ADDS TO THE EFFECT

Sometimes he has found wardens who are quite honest about it.

"I found one who had strung concertina wire all over the place and I asked him 'Why do you need this stuff? It makes the place look like a concentration camp.'

"'Well,' he told me, 'that's what it is.'"

There were only a handful of new "correctional institutions," the team found, that looked like they could be places for correction. But even the best of these are in the hinterlands.

New Jersey has just opened one of them, a barless, campus-like facility in Leesburg, N.J., near Delaware Bay, about as far as possible from the state's most populated areas.

Another is the Correctional Center at Vienna, Ill., a minimum security facility for no more than 500 inmates that looks more like a new town than a prison.

Nagel and others who study prison construction say Vienna is one of the best, despite its rural setting. According to Peter B. Bensinger, director of the Illinois Department of Corrections, the facility was built in southern Illinois, near Paducah, Ky., and more than 300 miles from Chicago where most of the prisoners come from, for a familiar reason: "Vienna was Powell's hometown."

LEGENDARY STATE FIGURE

The reference was to the late Illinois Secretary of State Paul Powell, a legendary figure in state politics who amassed a fortune of \$2.8 million while in office and in control of much of the state's patronage.

But Bensinger, a wealthy, 36-year-old, Yale-educated businessman, who recently took over the Illinois prison system, says the days when the Powells commanded the prison planning machinery are over, at least in Illinois.

He plans to develop four more Vienna-like facilities, each to be located near a major city. For now, his showplace is at Vienna (pronounced Vy-enna), a town of 1,325.

When the planners and archeologists of the 21st century set about to trace the peculiar evolution of the U.S. prison system, they will find it all there.

It was planned to be a work farm, in the early 1960s. In the first building constructed, there is a six-sided cement pillbox, complete with bullet-proof windows, gas-proof air vents and rotating gun ports. The pillbox was designed so one can hold off the prisoners in the building's maximum security cells.

Pictures now hang over the gun ports. The pillbox has never been used because a change in administrations brought a change in plans for Vienna.

It was transformed into a fenceless minimum security facility, where inmates live in single, dormitory-like rooms in structures that look like townhouses.

Walking through Vienna, an outsider finds himself wondering where the real estate salesmen are, or why they haven't put up the signs for the model home.

There are still some signs of the old order. For instance, there is not one but two chapel buildings. These structures helped run the cost for Vienna up to \$18 million.

According to Donald E. Hood, the assistant warden, the distinction among inmates, guards, counselors and teachers at Vienna has purposely been blurred to create a community feeling.

The guards wear green blazers and pastel dress shirts that have only a tiny insignia pinned on the collar. They often can be found working with the prisoners, dishing out food in the dining hall serving lines or helping out in the vocational shops and in the farming operations.

CROSS SECTION OF INMATES

Since the first prisoners arrived in 1965, Vienna has seen a cross section of the system's inmates, some charged with the most violent crimes. The typical inmate is one who has obeyed the rules in one of Illinois' four large, walled prisons and is rewarded with a transfer to Vienna.

Vienna has gone as long as 2½ years without an escape. Recently, however, there have been eight successful "walkaways," and the townspeople have been talking about the need for a fence. The administrators don't want it.

"In an institution like this, your best security is good programming," said Hood, as he showed a visitor through the vocational area, which includes a typewriter repair shop, an automotive shop, and a laboratory where a course is taught in the technology of water pollution control.

Despite its philosophies and its price tag, however, Vienna is still lacking the organization it needs to become the "therapeutic community" that Warden Vernon G. Housewright envisions, with "neighborhood" inmate committees helping to run things.

"So far," he said, "about all I can say is I can't remember the last time we had a fight."

The United States may see more Viennas, not because state prison planners necessarily want to build them, but because new federal aid is likely to have a major influence over design.

In a 1970 amendment to the Safe Streets Act, the new aid was made available for states and local governments who want to remodel or rebuild their jail and prison systems.

The U.S. Senate's main prison buff, Sen. Roman Hruska, R-Neb., and a former aide, Omaha lawyer Robert J. Kutak, who drafted the legislation, earmarked the money for small, community-based facilities.

As a result, the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has set up a clearinghouse where architects, working with criminologists, must approve plans before they are funded.

They are now reviewing plans for more than 300 institutions, including designs to remodel the entire prison systems of Maryland, Maine and Hawaii.

According to Fred Moyer, the 34-year-old architect who heads the clearing house, located near the campus of the University of Illinois in Urbana, those who want to build a prison or jail with a population larger than 400 or costing more than \$8 million can go elsewhere.

NEW BARGAINING POSITION

For an architect, it is an unusual position. "The architect always had problems dealing with the local sheriff. If the sheriff didn't get what he wanted, he'd go find another architect," said Moyer.

He rifled through a sheaf of plans on his desk, coming up with the design for a new regional detention center.

"Look at that. Here is an example of what we're talking about. What they want is a steel tank. We'll have to press them for some modifications."

Dr. Edith E. Flynn, a criminologist who works with Moyer, agreed: "So often the local jail people have come up through the ranks and all they know is they need security, tool-proof steel."

"What we want to do is have the security, yet remove the 24-hour statement of security that you get with bars. And the design should be based on treatment rather than the least possible heat loss."

Moyer is looking into modular, prefabricated units, used for college dormitory construction, that can be adapted for prison use.

After touring many prisons, including several where he saw evidence that inmates can tear up "destruction-proof" steel plumbing fixtures when they are angry enough, he is convinced there has to be another way.

"When you make it out of steel, you are almost asking some one to try and destroy it. What we have to do is try and make things likable."

FUSSY ABOUT TRADEOFFS

Moyer is fussy. When tradeoffs are made for increased security, there must also be an effort, he believes, to develop services that will help get people out of the system, such as alcohol and drug treatment programs.

The clearinghouse may be in for a brisk business. Eighty percent of the local jails in this nation are more than 100 years old. Most of its prisons approach that vintage. Local governments are running out of money.

What will happen in the millennium when the machine that keeps building fortresses in the hinterlands finally runs down?

"You know, it might seem odd, but I've thought about that," said Moyer. "A lot of those places have considerable land. They would make excellent wildlife refuges."

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 17, 1971]

THE PSYCHIATRIC GAP

(By John Fialka)

A few months ago, a scruffy young man with a hunched back walked back and forth in his tiny cell in the adjustment center of the Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, Calif.

He made strange, animal-like noises, refused to listen to the guards and covered the floor of his cell with garbage and excrement.

A psychiatrist, Dr. Frank Rundle, happened by and discovered that the man had an untreated arthritic condition, causing him to stoop.

The filth and the insane acting out, was "because he felt embarrassed and didn't want people around him," Rundle explained as he described the case to a recent conference on prisoners' rights.

In this age of sophisticated treatment, such a diagnosis should not be considered miraculous. However, the chance that a man locked in the "hole" will even get diagnosed is close to that.

In California the hole has the euphemism "adjustment center"—whatever it's called, it is the end of the line in a prison system. It is the place where men are sent who do not or, often, cannot adjust.

It is usually an isolated row of solitary cells where men may spend all day sitting on a mattress on the floor, counting the spots on the wall and waiting for a few minutes of exercise in a tiny yard or runaway outside.

Some of the men are there just for specified periods as a result of isolated disciplinary infractions. But generally, about 4 percent of inmates in a given prison system spend most of their time there.

Even if all the prison reforms under con-

sideration were suddenly implemented, it is doubtful that these men would be reached.

They are often battered, broken men who have led violent lives both inside and outside the walls.

There is mounting evidence that their behavior is a result not only of mental attitudes, as has long been thought, but also of physical problems—and that these are interrelated.

Prisons across the nation have thousands of psychologists and counselors on their staffs, but their role is restricted. They can deal with mental problems, but not physical problems.

The man who can best deal with both, the psychiatrist, is more than likely not there.

According to the best available statistics, there are fewer than 100 psychiatrists working full-time in prisons—of a total of about 25,000 psychiatrists in the United States, which has about one-third of the psychiatrists in the world.

In California, which has 26 psychiatrists working in its prison system, more than any other state, Rundle was the only one for the 2,400 men at Soledad.

Florida has one psychiatrist for 9,500 prisoners. Virginia has none for 6,500. Maryland has one for the 5,000 people in its prison system. (The Patuxent Institution, which has seven full-time psychiatrists for 550 patients, is not considered part of Maryland's prison system.)

The District of Columbia has none for the 1,800 men in the Lorton correctional complex, although it has recently received a grant that will allow it to contract for psychiatric services.

According to Dr. E. Fuller Torrey, a psychiatrist at the National Institute of Mental Health who keeps track of such things, the great majority of psychiatric service goes to "a small elite at the upper end of the socio-economic and intellectual population."

Torrey's statistics are jarring. There are more psychiatrists in three office buildings on New York City's Upper East Side than in all of the nation's prisons.

FEDERAL SYSTEM

There are 21 full-time psychiatrists at a private, 84-bed hospital in Rockville. There are 13 full-time psychiatrists in the federal prison system, which housed 21,117 inmates at the end of December.

Many of the psychiatrists working in prisons are either "there because they were drafted into the federal system by the government, or there because they are foreign-trained and unable to get a job elsewhere," Torrey said.

He cited a study showing that 34 percent of the psychiatrists in Massachusetts would not accept a juvenile delinquent as a patient.

It is not only money that dictates the dispersion pattern of psychiatrists, he believes.

"In this business the typical patient is the Vassar-trained housewife, a moderately depressed middle-aged woman. Part of it is that psychiatrists like to talk to people who are in their own class."

Torrey, who has worked as a physician in the Peace Corps and in an antipoverty program in the Bronx, has put forward a plan to cut the federal education subsidy to students of psychiatry who do not plan to devote at least part of their time to public service. The United States spends \$40 million a year on psychiatrists' education.

"It would not seem unreasonable to me that 1,000 psychiatrists should be dealing with the most severe problem in this society," Torrey said.

To say that those psychiatrists working in the system have their hands full would be a gross understatement.

At the California Medical Facility in Vacaville, which is believed to be the best equipped prisoner treatment facility in the

February 1, 1972

nation, there are 9 full-time and 10 part-time psychiatrists.

CHRONICALLY VIOLENT

They and their staffs must deal with 1,200 broken men, culled from all the California prisons. Among these are the human wreckage of the drug culture, people who have gone on permanent LSD trips and young men who suffer from methadine (speed) psychosis.

There are schizophrenics, and there are about 100 of the prison system's more aggressive homosexuals.

There are those who want to mutilate themselves, and those who are chronically violent against others.

Medication is often an answer.

One of the chronically violent, a man in his early 40s, sat calmly on a window ledge as a Vacaville guard showed a visitor through a section of vault-like cells where the most dangerous inmates are kept.

"He's on medication," explained the guard. "If they don't take their medication, we put them in solitary. Most of them eventually come around to see it our way."

Medication at Vacaville usually means thorazine, stelazine, mellaril or any one of a large variety of powerful tranquilizers. A relatively new one, prolixin, can keep a patient tranquil for two weeks.

"We use a tremendous amount of medication in this place," said Kenneth Britt, assistant superintendent. "People used to argue that drugs only masked the problem. But look at the epileptic. We know for a fact that a lot of people can make it on the outside with medication."

According to Dr. Arthur G. Nugent, acting assistant superintendent for psychiatric services, who worked with mentally disturbed patients previously at Veterans Administration hospitals, the staff at Vacaville has had to resort to "much larger doses (of tranquilizers) than we ever used in the VA."

"I don't know whether it's because they're sick when they come to prison or what, but when they reach the California Medical Facility, they know they're at the end of the line. Sometimes we have to reach a level that would stone a normal person," he added.

According to Nugent and Britt, the field of "chemotherapy" offers the most promise in treating the disturbed criminal offender. Using volunteer patients, the staff has been experimenting with a variety of new drugs, included lithium carbonate, which Nugent described as a "normalizer."

The drug has had some promising results with prisoners who have histories of violent outbursts.

The most ambitious experiment at Vacaville involves construction of a special unit designed to house 84 inmates selected from adjustment centers in prisons throughout California.

SYSTEMATIC STUDY

According to Max May, program director of the new unit, it will provide the Nation's first systematic study of the men who live in the "hole."

The unit will have a staff that, for prisons, is incredibly rich: two psychiatrists, a psychologist, two counselors and 31 guards.

They will reject preconceived notions of why men are violent and self-destructive, May said. "We will begin with an open mind."

It is only recently that testing has been begun to try to understand what it is in the body and mind of a prisoner that makes him violent or incorrigible.

According to one psychiatrist who has specialized in treatment of violent patients, the lack of such testing may be one of the main reasons 40 to 60 percent of the men released from prison eventually return on another charge.

He is Dr. Frank R. Ervin, associate clinical professor of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School.

The traditional thinking in corrections has been that people become criminals because they have character disorders brought about by their environment, Ervin said.

"It's not surprising then, that the system is set up to detect character disorders and to provide group therapy, remedial education and halfway houses to correct that," he said.

A substantial number of people being channeled through these programs can never be reached, he suspects, because they have undiagnosed physical disorders, primarily brain disease and sex chromosome abnormality.

His theory is based on tests of 134 people who came off the street into the emergency rooms of Boston hospitals saying that they were about to commit some violent act.

The hospitals turned away the majority. "Most psychiatrists won't take these people, and hospitals don't like to work with violent patients," Ervin said.

The only institutions that regularly had room for them were the prisons and jails, Ervin found. Sixty percent had criminal records, including eight murders.

EVIDENCE OF DISEASE

After a series of elaborate tests, Ervin concluded that 25 percent of the group had evidence of disease in the limbic lobe, the most primitive part of the human brain, the part that controls violent behavior.

Another 25 percent appeared normal but complained of a "funny feeling," a warning signal much like that experienced by an epileptic, that an urge toward violence was about to begin.

Ervin now hopes to take his research team, which includes a psychiatrist, a geneticist, an endocrinologist, a neurologist, a research psychologist and a statistician, into a prison to test its entire population. The Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has given tentative approval for funds for the project.

There is no known cure for limbic disorders. Ervin and a neurosurgeon, Dr. Vernon H. Mark, have had some success with brain surgery on patients who had intractable epileptic symptoms along with the limbic disease.

But Ervin believes surgery should be used only as a last resort. Once the disease is more clearly understood, he hopes, a drug may be found to control it.

SEX CHROMOSOME TEST

Ervin hopes the testing also will reveal whether some prisoners in "the hole" are there because they have an extra male sex chromosome, the abnormality that is believed to cause antisocial behavior.

Based on preliminary studies done at the federal prison at Lewisburg, Pa., Ervin believes 7 to 10 percent of the population of a solitary confinement section may have the chromosome abnormality.

"Look at it this way," he said. "Until 100 years ago, criminals and the insane went into the same institution. Somewhere along the way someone made a distinction between the criminal and the mentally ill."

"Then people came along and further sorted out the mentally ill and made some progress. A lot of the physical causes were sifted out... but nobody has ever done that job for the prisoners. They still wind up in one big box."

"If I don't do anything else," Dr. Ervin added, "I'll produce an accurate medical survey of a prison. They don't even have that at the moment."

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 13, 1971]
SAN QUENTIN LIFE-STYLE—KNIFINGS, NOT RADICALISM, "NORMAL"

SAN QUENTIN, CALIF.—Talk about the new, radicalized prisoner who rages against the system infuriates Willie.

"You get a lot of bulls (guards) in here

that think every convict is a George Jackson. I'd say that 98 percent of us don't want to get involved," he told a recent visitor.

Willie (the only name he will give you) is a product of what many people believe to be the most progressive prison system in the United States: The California Department of Corrections.

"FOUR-TIME LOSER"

At age 32, he has come to accept the solid rhythms of life at San Quentin as home.

He has spent 6 years of his life behind bars and introduces himself to outsiders, not without a little pride, as a "four-time loser."

He is a "good convict," an example of the thoroughly institutionalized inmates who, most experts agree, still constitute the bulk of the nation's prison population.

Willie lives on the honor block and has a "baronoo" (soft) job as a clerk for a guard.

Now he talks about the "good old days," when he used to spend his leisure time strutting around the Upper Yard, a partially roofed open area that was, until recently, the center of the prison's social life.

Sometimes as many as 1,900 inmates milled around there. It was where reputations were made and rumors started. It was the place where some of the "tips," the inmate gangs, would square off, usually on racial lines.

JOINED THE NAZIS

A former prison boxer whose puffy face testifies to many hours spent in fights both in and out of the ring, Willie belonged to the Nazis, one of the major white tips.

The Nazis frequently clashed with the blacks. Some blacks, especially the Muslims, remained aloof from the fights unless one of their number was attacked. Some whites, particularly the "Angels," a group composed of members and sympathizers of the Hell's Angels" motorcycle gang, did the same.

The Chicanos had three or four tips which fought among themselves most of the time, according to Willie.

Score was kept by knifings. "Say two blacks were knifed. Then they'd come back and try to shank (knife) two whites," Willie explained. San Quentin has had as many as 20 knifings in a year.

Often those stabbed were not part of the warring tips. They were "loners" or the elderly or men who simply had "wrong" color skin.

KNIVES ALWAYS PRESENT

Knives are almost impossible to keep out of the system, according to prison officials. Even a steak bone, sharpened on the cement of a cell floor, has been used as a weapon.

The last confrontation in the yard occurred early in the summer when blacks and whites faced each other after two black convicts were knifed. Guards quickly broke it up, but Willie recalls it vividly.

"Yup. There we were. The blacks had us surrounded, five or six to one. The Muslims and the Angels stayed off."

"Social hour" in the big yard has ended. Part of the reason was the violence of Aug. 2, when George Jackson was killed as he led an escape attempt from the maximum security section, the "adjustment center."

Two other inmates and three guards were killed. It was the most violent incident in San Quentin's long, violent history.

SANDWICHES IN BAGS

Since then, even Willie and other inmates of the honor block, the men who follow all the rules, have spent many days locked in their cells, eating sandwiches out of paper bags.

Things have gradually begun to loosen up. Now inmates cross the big yard in long lines, on their way to work or to the dining hall. There, for the first time, armed guards supervise mealtime.

Willie does not like the lines, the increased scrutiny. He says not to believe rumors that many prisoners are now "politicized," or acting in concert against the system.

"Things have to get back to normal," he concludes.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 13, 1972]
COURT REQUIRES HEARINGS ON PRISON
ABUSE PLEAS

A unanimous Supreme Court today gave prison inmates the chance to prove in federal court their complaints that they have been abused by guards and other officials.

In a two-page, unsigned opinion, the court gave an Illinois inmate the opportunity to try to convince the federal judge that he was physically injured and was mistreated by being put in solitary confinement for 15 days after a fight with another prisoner.

While insisting that it was not, settling the issue of the power of federal courts to probe how prisons are run, the court did say that complaints like those made by the Illinois man "are sufficient to call for the opportunity to offer supporting evidence."

FORMALITY NOT CRITERIA

The court said that complaints written out by the prisoner himself are not to be rejected out of hand merely because they are not as formal or as well-argued as they would be if a lawyer had drafted them.

Lower federal courts had dismissed the Illinois inmate's complaint on the ground that prison officials had "wide discretion" to discipline inmates under their control.

The case involved Francis Haines, 69, who is serving a life term in Illinois State Penitentiary for burglary.

He was given solitary confinement in 1968 for striking another inmate on the head with a shovel.

\$500,000 ASKED

Haines later went into federal court seeking \$500,000 damages on the basis of his complaint that he suffered physically from the conditions in solitary confinement. At the Illinois prison in Menard, Haines said, a man put in solitary is kept in a dark cell with three blankets to sleep on and no bed, and is given no articles of "personal hygiene." His evening meals are limited to bread and water, the prisoner said.

Besides challenging the conditions of his disciplinary confinement, Haines said that it was unconstitutional for prison officials to send an inmate to solitary without giving him any chance to defend his conduct.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 16, 1972]
ENCOUNTER IN PRISON—RAP SESSIONS GET ROUGH

VIENNA, ILL.—Bernard was in what currently may be the best of all possible worlds for a convicted felon.

He was living, with a dozen other convicts, in one of the townhouses at the minimum security Vienna Correctional Center here in Southern Illinois.

Unlike the center's other townhouses, which are simply dormitories, this one has been organized by a Catholic priest into a community, with self-improvement as the members' goal.

Nearly every day they sit down and tear into each other in group encounter sessions designed to isolate and correct character faults.

The men make up a sort of racial cross section of America. There are three blacks, including Bernard, a young street dude from Chicago. There are eight whites, from both urban and rural Illinois. There is one Puerto Rican.

They also represent a cross section of the crimes people fear most. Their records include convictions for murder, sex crimes, robbery, drug selling and burglary. Bernard (not his real name) is serving time for armed robbery.

In the encounter sessions, the men often

rage at each other, using gross, multi-syllabic profanities, picking at faults that run the gamut of human failings.

One day it was Bernard's turn. According to his housemates, Bernard is lazy and physically dirty. But he is cool, as cool as Victor Green, the 33-year-old white psychologist who conducts the therapy sessions.

"Hey, are you dirty?" Green asked him

"Am I what?"

"Are you dirty?"

"No."

"You're not dirty? Well, then your sense of reality is pretty messed up. I'm talking about your skin and your hair. You can't see how dirty you are?" Green asked.

"These are my working clothes, man," came the answer, drawled slowly, expressionlessly.

It was discouraging to know that Bernard couldn't see "anything as obvious as the crud on your skin," Green snapped back.

The answer was slow, almost menacing. "Yeah, well, you know, all black people, got uh . . ." Bernard was drowned by a chorus of abuse, damning him for bringing up race as a way to avoid the question.

"Are you through rappin'?" he asked, after the shouting subsided. "I took a shower last night."

Again, the room exploded. Bernard was caught in a lie. Three of his housemates denied he had taken a shower.

A slim, intense young man from southern Illinois temporarily lost his head. The veins stood out in his neck as he ripped off a string of epithets at Bernard. His shouting continued long after the others had finished.

"You know, man, you're screwed up," said Bernard, quietly.

"We are all screwed up," came the reply.

"It's a very simple question," said Green, getting back on target. "Are you dirty?"

"Am I dirty? I hadn't noticed."

This was too much for the man sitting next to Bernard. Because he was also black in his early 20s, the rest of the room listened intently.

"Do you sleep in your shirt? Are your fingernails dirty?" he asked Bernard.

In a long, rambling monotone, Bernard shifted the argument, blaming the verbal attacks against him on the attitudes of three of the whites sitting in the room.

This was rejected by the third black, a man in his early 40s who had kept silent.

Again, Bernard tried to change the argument, wondering aloud why the older man rarely criticized him.

"I don't talk to you like that much because I don't like your verbal abuse. When somebody brings you something valid or invalid they gotta take some verbal abuse from you," said the older man.

"You mean you don't like it?" Bernard asked, a hint of mockery in his voice. Another storm of abuse broke over him.

When the silence returned, the older man began talking with an intensity that seemed painful. "Suddenly he's runnin' around like he's extrollin', his black manhood."

"Well I'm a black man and I'll be god-damned if I want to be like you, personally. And if my daughter married anyone like you, I'd disown her."

"Would you explain that more clear?" Bernard asked, the mockery again there. The room erupted once again.

Bernard never lost his cool.

"This is gross, man," said a young graduate student in psychology who had come with Green to observe. "Who taught you how to be so defensive?"

"I wasn't taught to be so defensive. This is how I am, man," replied Richard.

"I mean how can you ever learn to be aware about anything?" continued the student.

"Well, listen, man, have you ever heard the saying that, uh, Rome wasn't built in one day, man?" came the reply in the same

drawled monotone, the one voice that did not change throughout the session.

Again the room exploded in profanity, in impotent rage over Richard.

One night last week, Bernard was expelled from the townhouse by its director, Father William Kelly. He explained that the young man "refused to cooperate fully" in the unit's programs.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 16, 1972]

"THE HOLE" CLOSED IN OKLAHOMA

MCALISTER, OKLA.—"The Hole," a dungeon-like detention facility for women inmates at the state prison here, will be sealed tomorrow and its occupants moved above ground.

The announcement came Friday from Jim Cook, commissioner of charities and corrections, less than 24 hours after a letter about alleged conditions was smuggled out of the underground cellblock and delivered to newsmen.

Cook took newsmen on a tour of the facility Friday and allowed them to interview the eight women inmates.

He said afterward that the cells, generally used to discipline prisoners, will be closed.

Prison officials denied that conditions in "The Hole" were as bad as portrayed in the anonymous letter. Cook said the underground character of the facility probably caused the women more psychological stress than physical harm.

RATS AND SNAKES

The letter, typed on prison stationery, said the cells were "dark, dank, overrun with vermin, rats, snakes, cockroaches and unhealthy." It also said the inmates could not get adequate medical care.

Cook said he hopes the entire women's building of the prison can be vacated with the addition of two new wings for the modern Women's Ward No. 2 west of the old building.

He said Gov. David Hall's proposed budget, pending before the legislature, contains \$150,000 to \$175,000 to build the new wings.

One inmate told the newsmen, "We get no visits, no newspapers, no radio, no TV, no magazines and one letter a month."

"AIN'T SEEN DOCTOR"

Another said, "I busted up my finger 14 days ago and I ain't seen a doctor yet."

Only one girl interviewed by newsmen who visited the facility claimed to have seen a snake. She described it as "a long, green one."

One inmate who said she had been there a long time said, "If I hadn't prayed, I would have gone out of my mind."

Reporters saw no rats but many inmates complained of them, as well as frogs, tarantulas and scorpions.

Each cell has one cot and a mattress. All except one had water.

Cook said he believes the disciplinary measures can be carried out sufficiently in a second-floor cell block which is similar in construction but is dry and better lighted.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 13, 1971]

THE SWING OF THE PRISON PENDULUM

(By Jack Waugh)

"In Japan we hate crime, but not criminals. They are part of our family and they are treated as such," Atsushi Nagashima, Japanese Ministry of Justice.

"It oughta be bulldozed into the bay." An ex-inmate, pointing toward San Quentin.

NEW YORK.—"The Day I came out of prison," says Clyde Thompson, "17 other men came out with me. My sweetheart was there with a suit of clothes for me to wear. But not another man was met."

Once a murderer, Clyde Thompson is now a minister. Never in his long years in the

penitentiary did he think that he would ever walk out from behind those walls.

Now, 13 years later, every morning of every weekday, he stands outside the bus station in Huntsville, Texas, meeting the unmet.

At about 9, the convicts let out of the Texas Penitentiary that day begin to drift down from the Walls Unit. Clyde Thompson's knowing eye spots them instantly in their prison issue, their unpressed grays and tans, their lives as wrinkled as their clothes. If they have no job, he finds them one, if no place to go, takes them into his home.

FLOTSAM TURNED LOOSE

Every day, like flotsam, the unmet walk out from behind the walls of 200 U.S. prisons, tarnished testimony of the failure of the walls that have held them.

David Rothman, a penal historian from Columbia University has said: "The rebellion and the hesitant, finally bloody, put-down of the inmate uprising at Attica last September was curious. Traditionally no warden would have waited so long to move in. Hostages or not, there would have been no pause, no delay, as there was at Attica."

"Why did the correctional authorities withhold, then? They held back because prisons are losing their legitimacy. There was a feeling that the demands of the inmates were sane—and the authorities were right [prison officials granted all but three of the 30 inmate demands at Attica]; indeed, people thought all those things had been instituted long before."

Attica was violent testimony that they had not. More than a hundred years of prison "reform" has left the United States still with Atticas and San Quentins and Soledads and Rahways.

Criminologists and penologists now are beginning to think the unthinkable; that prisons, in their existing form, indeed have lost their legitimacy, that there is no evidence that reform has worked and that prison systems must be totally transformed.

RELENTLESS CYCLE

Prisons, like pendulums, make repeated arcs through time. Since their beginnings 200 years ago, they have swung again and again through seven-step cycles: There is always (1) brutality and neglect inside the walls, triggering (2) inmate rebellion, which is (3) quelled, stirring (4) outrage without the walls when the public gets wind of it and demands (5) immediate reform, which is followed by (6) quiet again, in the asylum and (7) lapse back into public forgetfulness.

Today prisons are winging again through Phases 2, 3, and 4, headed for 5, en route to 7 via 6 unless the cycle is broken as it never has been since prisons began.

For nearly all of the two centuries since the Pennsylvania Quakers founded the first penitentiary in the United States, the legitimacy of prisons and their reasons for existing and the manner in which they are run have never basically been questioned. And Phase 1 in the cycle always, inevitably, has ended in Phase 7. What may be new in the cycle that is repeating itself in the 1970's is that prison reformers now are not merely questioning the operation of the present prison system but its basic legitimacy, its reason for being.

Prisons, long viewed as walls of fear and terror and punishment, are potential gateways of promise.

There is a way ultimately to transform prisons, and it calls for the best from the society that is outside the walls. The solutions are implicit in the problems. And avenues of action will surface throughout this series. But here is the heart of the matter, as sifted from scores of interviews across the U.S., inside and outside prison walls:

Problem: Half of the six million people arrested every year, as well as half who languish behind prison bars today are there for so-called "victimless" crimes.

By criminologists' definitions, drunks, gamblers, prostitutes, drug addicts and others who fall into this category commit crimes where there is no immediately visible victim—apart from the offender himself. Thus, in the legal sense, these crimes are said to differ from violent crimes like assault.

Solution: "Decriminalize" the law, and send the committers of "moral crimes" where criminologists now are demanding more and more they be sent—elsewhere but to prison.

Where? Perhaps, as in Massachusetts, to drying-out tanks overnight, or as in Sweden, turned over to specially established temperance boards, or to narcotics rehabilitation centers.

Problem: Offenders are sent to prison to do unequal time for equal crimes. Out of the crazy quilt of criminal justice comes a tapestry of sentencing and parole dictated by the arbitrary whim of judges, juries, and parole boards.

Solution: Make uniform the law that sends people to prison and make just and sensitive the decisions that let them out. If necessary, take sentencing out of the hands of judges and juries and put it in the hands of a special prison admissions board, which could also take into account extenuating circumstances and probation where it seems necessary.

Problem: Prisons are the most shrouded and unopen public institutions. So closed off from society's eye are the walls that prison officials can do anything to anybody inside, and nobody outside will ever know.

Solution: Open up the prison walls to unlimited community and press scrutiny.

Traditionally prison officials and the press have not trusted one another. One solution: a Code of Ethics" to govern both administrators and newsmen. Administrators would grant free access to inmates and guards; in return, newsmen would confront administrators with evidence of oppressive conditions and also write the administrators' side.

This idea is already beginning to take shape in correctional and press circles.

Problem: Men and women still go out of prisons unmet, homeless, penniless, and jobless, foredoomed to return again.

Solution: Programs should be devised to ensure that no convict goes back on the streets without a job to fill and a place to go.

Problem: Prisoners are consigned to forced pariahship, with no contact and no continuity with the community that banished them. They forget how to be part of it because they aren't allowed to be.

Solution: Make prisons a part of society. The community should not only be allowed to see inside the walls, but to reach out, to visit, to encourage, to change, to reaccept, the convict it has banished. Every prison should have its own citizen advisory committee.

These are more than reforms. They are the beginning of the dismantling of the prison itself as it has traditionally been for two centuries. Ultimately only the hardest of criminals need to go to prison—and once there, be grouped into small enclaves and made the subject of intensive campaigns of human rehabilitation and salvage.

This is already beginning to happen. Some U.S. penologists see indications that only the most difficult convicts are coming into their institutions now.

BIBLE GIVEN TO A KILLER

The man who now meets the unmet at the Huntsville bus station was himself once the most feared and hardened inmate in the Texas Penitentiary. Clyde Thompson killed two men to get there, and at least six others were slain because he tried four times to escape. He was sentenced twice to be executed in the electric chair and finally given three life terms and thrown into isolation with not even a spoon to eat with, so bad a man was he considered to be.

For 13 years he lay in roach-ridden isolation at Huntsville, with only a single hole in the door of his cell and with cockroaches to eat the food off his hands at night.

In isolation he had about five hours of daylight each day with nothing to read until a guard brought him a Bible which at first he angrily tried to refute, couldn't, then started to memorize, and, finally, to live by.

"The time was," he says, "when I would have killed any man who stood in my way to breaking out of that penitentiary, and the time came when those prison walls could have fallen down around me and I would not have left unless I was told I could."

ONLY JULIA WROTE

After he was released from isolation and cautiously put in with the general inmate population, he began conducting Bible classes behind the walls. A Huntsville minister heard of him and urged the congregation to write him. Only one did, a woman named Julia. She went to visit him. And for seven years she devoted her life to getting Clyde Thompson out of prison. One day, 13 years ago, she succeeded. He was paroled. And the warden came down to help him tie his tie, and put the French cuffs on the shirt Julia had brought him because he didn't know how. He had spent 28 years behind bars, all his adult life.

Once the deadliest killer in the Texas Penitentiary, the Rev. Clyde Thompson is now an ordained minister in the Church of Christ "and married to Sister Julia." He has returned to Huntsville and made the prisoners his ministry.

No amount of prison reform got Clyde Thompson out of prison. He and Julia did it with little help.

Before prisons were invented, society whipped convicts too poor to fine, and fined those too rich to whip. For misdemeanors and minor felonies—the stocks; for more serious felonies—banishment; for capital offenses—the gallows.

Cut and dried. No confusion. No prisons.

FRIENDS DEMAND PENITENCE

Then one day the Friends decided prisoners ought to be penitent as well as punished. So why not a "penitentiary"?

Make the walls four feet thick. But the walls were not only to keep the convict in, but the community out. The theory was: That's the only way a man can be penitent in perfect peace.

Not so cut and dried.

And people have been confused ever since. They flat-out don't know what prisons ought to be for. To keep society safe from criminals? Or criminals safe from society? For vengeance? For punishment? How do we treat them when we do keep them—bad? Good? Do we love them until they are better? Or hate them forever? Do we try to rehabilitate them? Educate them? Reform them? Just throw away the key and forget it? Or do we do all those things?

We do all those things.

Keeping the convict strictly in and community influence strictly out is still the basic slab of penal philosophy on which modern prisons in the U.S. rest.

Upon it was built the highly regimented, isolated systems that exist today and only now show signs of cracking. Prisons still are built away from the community. Inputs and outputs are still strictly curbed. The two worlds kept as separate as possible. "Inside" and "outside" are still the lines of demarcation of prison life.

POTENTIAL FOR CHANGE

The potential opportunity is to change these traditional lines of demarcation, and to make prisons unnecessary for all but the most hardened and murderous of felons.

And even they are an opportunity. For to say some men are good only for throwing away is to deny Clyde Thompson.

Some prison reform has spun out from

the repeated cycles of upheaval. Probation and parole measures have been changed, indeterminate sentences adopted, halfway houses started, furloughs instituted, even convict self-government tried.

Some of these, billed as reforms, have come up Frankensteins, the indeterminate sentence, for example. Criminologist Gresham Sykes looks at the rest of them and says, "They may not have made a wit's bit of difference. There is no hard evidence that they have."

These reforms and countless others are still being tried within the nation's prisons. Some of them have bettered conditions within the walls, but all of them together have not slowed the crime rate or made significant inroads in what is still the major problem—how to keep a man out of prison the first time, and if he is released, the second, third, and fourth times.

MOST-TALKED-ABOUT REFORMS

The two rising stars of modern reform, the ones being talked about most in the '70's, are to build more but smaller, more specialized, more manageable prisons; and to bring prisons and—more importantly—inmates closer to the community.

The first of these is as old as reform itself. And it is subject to bursts of "what good will that do?" Counter to this trend, Texas is building a new unit that will house 2,000 prisoners, and George Beto, director of the Texas Department of Corrections, is saying, "It isn't size that matters—it's how the place is run that matters."

Another prison director, Winston Moore of the Cook County Jail, is saying that what is needed is, "not smaller prisons but an end to inept prison administration."

And Carroll Waymon, a psychologist in California, is saying, "We can build a new prison on every street corner. All that means is that we'd then find ways to fill them all, even if it meant devising some new offenses we haven't yet thought of, just because the new prisons are there and need filling. That's the way it works."

The second of the "new" reforms—bringing inmates and prisons closer to the community from which they came isn't new either. But it is the one that departs from the old-as-prisons philosophy of keeping the convicts in and the community out, and both separate.

It is the one that holds promise of breaking the pendulum's basic swing. It is the one that may, if any can, make prisons as we know them obsolete. Because men and women who reform in prison are those, like Clyde Thompson, who have felt the touch of something better. Something better almost always means the touch of someone better. And that something and someone is rarely found within prison walls.

Criminologist Norval Morris has said: "Reform is faddy. We always want quick and simple and cheap solutions, and there aren't any. Reform is not short-winded."

It isn't very long-winded either.

Just a century ago, the nation's foremost reformers met in Cincinnati as the first national prison association and adopted a Declaration of Principles. It said nearly everything that has been said since:

Reformation, not vindictive suffering, should be the rule of inmate treatment; prisoner classification must be modernized; reward a prisoner for good conduct; stop making corrections jobs political, since that is the chief obstacle to reform; officers should be trained; disparities and inequities in prison sentences should be removed.

WORDS FROM THE PAST

It said a prisoner should be disciplined so as to win his goodwill and preserve his self-respect; prisons should make for industrious freemen rather than orderly and obedient prisoners; prisons should be small with like offenders put with like; the law should lock

up "higher-ups" in crime as well as lesser operatives; there should be a more judicious exercise of the pardoning power; there should be better prison architecture geared for humanity and inhabitation; prison management should be centralized; prisoners should get social training by proper association; and society-at-large should be made to realize that it is responsible for crime too.

Today criminologist Hans W. Mattick gazes at that list of lofty goals and snorts: "They haven't been realized yet in 90 percent of the institutions."

Gresham Sykes also contemplates that list from a century ago and says: "It makes me think that maybe the old liberal solutions to this prison problem make sense. What is wrong is we haven't been applying them. What if we did just what we always said we would do—make society better?"

VOICES FROM BEHIND THE WALLS

(By Jack Waugh)

"Prison? It's like the world has stopped and you've lost contact with life; like you've stopped living—yet you are."

Inmate, Texas Woman's Prison

"There's only one step beyond jail—and that's the graveyard."

Inmate, Cook County Jail

SAN FRANCISCO.—The voices from behind the walls are the voices of felons and sinners mixed together, of murderers and child molesters, burglars and bad-check passers, rapists and robbers, dope pushers and dope takers, draft evaders and parole violators, wife beaters and husband slayers.

They are the voices of the poor (many) and the rich (few), of the reformed and the unreformed, the angry and the apathetic, the guilty and the innocent; of those who should never be there and of those who, some say, should never be let out.

Their common bond is doing time. Their common goal is getting out. Their common condition is that they got caught. Their common jailer is the inconsistent criminal-justice system that sent them there.

They speak with no common tongue. But here is why some of them are there and how they feel and what they say:

He is black, had a wife, and couldn't find a job on the outside, so he took up burglary. He has been in prison 11 years, serving out a 42-year sentence of four counts of robbery:

"We're all here because we have limited backgrounds. I have it broken up into thirds—one-third of the inmates shouldn't be in prison at all. Another third should only be here a very short time. And the last third should die here because they are detrimental to themselves and everybody else."

"Now, in this prison, 80 percent of the problems we have are inmate instituted. Man, I tell you there has been a time when you gave the inmate over you more respect than you gave a guard. The worst part about prison is that when you are all thrown into the same coop this way it contributes to your wrong-headed education. Here you not only learn to burglarize—from experts—but you enlarge your talents. You can learn to become an expert safe cracker if you want and you can learn to shoot dope if you don't know how."

He was 18 when he was first sent up on a narcotics conviction in 1953. He has been out twice for eight months each and back in again for burglary and theft. He was a tough, rebellious inmate, a hard case, so he spent nine years on the "line" in the Texas Penitentiary picking cotton and hoeing the ground. He has passed more days than he cares to remember in solitary. He is a Mexican-American, now 37, and about to be paroled:

"Prison has been a home where I stayed while I was young and growing up. I made a parent out of the penitentiary. It has been a

career for me. And when I went out I was unable to adjust to the free world. I had become dependent on this place and I wasn't prepared for the outside. I didn't want to come back, but I couldn't get adjusted outside and I fell right back into my old way of life. I wasn't forced to do it; I just wasn't prepared for anything else."

"The penitentiary has changed. There is still brutality here if a man needs it and they wouldn't hesitate to beat your brains out if you insulted an officer. And it's probably still worse in other pens. But there are methods now to discipline a man without brutality, little things—shelling a gallon of peanuts, strict rules, no talking in the dining hall. To me it's worse than going to solitary."

She is white, 22 years old, pregnant, and in prison, sent up four months ago on a bad-check charge:

"It's lonely here. I get depressed and want a friend I can talk to. But you can't make friends with anybody or the matrons assume it's a homosexual relationship and they break it up. You go to the mess hall four times with the same girl and they separate you."

"The women in prison, they play house. One is the daddy, one is the mother. There is a brother, sister, and grandparents. Most of the women have families on the street and they do it just to occupy their minds or to aggravate the matrons."

"What I am afraid of most is being locked in that cell at night by myself, going into labor and not being able to get a matron there on time. But I am luckier than some. My mother will come and get my baby after it is born, and I won't have to put it in a foster home or up for adoption."

He is black and he has been in prison in two states, Texas and California, since 1951, most of his adult life, and each time on a narcotics charge, the last time in Texas:

"I pled guilty as most of us do in Texas. To fight a charge without money is out of the question. And here you work, pardner, you work. You begin to realize how much work a human being can do. But like any other form of prison life, it is left up to you whether you become bitter or not. Eventually you become conditioned to the point you can cope with it."

"I was doin' it out there, man, and I know I had to pay. But you have got to know if a man commits a crime it's not the end of the world for him."

"By getting into this bag so early I didn't know what else to do. I had this fixation the first time I got out of San Quentin—I refused to do time out of the pen and in, too. I couldn't accept the fact that parole was just a change in custody, rather than a release."

"Now it's reached the point if I get out and get in trouble again, I'll get thrown away. The struggle I have is still with myself. Can I get out there and make it? But I believe now I am ready and I have never said that before."

He was an Iowa farmer. He had served time in his home state for burglary in the 1950's. Then traveling through Texas alone in his camper in 1965, he was stopped by two state troopers, got angry, hit one, got in a running shootout with both, and got 17 years. Away from home, the lawyer assigned him by the court was a law partner to the District Attorney who prosecuted him. His children have since grown up back in Iowa, his wife has divorced him, and I was his first visitor in 6 1/2 years in the penitentiary.

"It makes you bitter. I can't see no benefit in keeping a man in so long. It doesn't deter others from committing a crime. They keep you the longest possible time. I came up for parole in 1968, but the parole board wrote me a form letter saying it would review my case in one year and I haven't heard back since."

"She is white and only 28. But she has seven children on the outside and a husband in prison. The family couldn't make ends meet so she passed bad checks twice and this

is her second time in. Her mother has two of her children, her mother-in-law has another, three others are in a boys' home and she is fighting the adoption of her 18-month-old daughter.

"I've learned all about homosexuality here. I didn't know anything about it before. I have learned to shoot dope, and with what I have learned since I have been here I could even be a better check buster now."

He is one of 42 men on death row, a condemned multiple murderer. Five years ago he was only 19 and he killed his common-law wife, her brother, her father, and a state patrolman. A Mexican-American, now 24, he faces a capital sentence, four 99-year sentences, and one 25-year sentence. His crime—murder with malice—is the most serious a man can commit.

He is an outcast, considered too bad to live, and he awaits execution. Sitting in the cross breeze of the "death row" day room, he says:

"I can spread my arms and touch both sides of my cell, and that is my whole life.

"We are looked on as the scum of the earth. But 90 percent of the men on death row are no worse than the rest of the prison population. It's hard to get a death sentence. Most of us, if we had money, a proper defense, or friends, or anyone to fight for us, would have never gotten death.

"Most of us have no objection to being punished for our crimes. But justice is unequal. Men who can't fight back are bound to get a more severe punishment than those who can. The 'D.A.' isn't out to see justice done, he wants to get a conviction and build a record. He was white and I was brown. He was well off and I was poor. His social status was high, mine low. He knew the D.A., I didn't. He is going to believe the state, not me. So we—most of us here—went into court without a chance in the world."

Another on death row, white, condemned to the chair for murder, now 44 years old, no longer hopes, is no longer optimistic, and no longer wants to live—if the choice is a commuted sentence:

"I pray every day the Supreme Court doesn't abolish the death sentence like they're talking about doing, because then every man on death row—650 of us in this country—will get a life sentence automatically. I am too old for that now. I would rather sit in 'Sparky' (the electric chair) and get it over with. When they electrocute me they can't do nothing to me then but bury me."

Few people knew who Robert Apablaza, a housepainter, was—or cared. Four years ago he was arrested for selling a matchbox full of marijuana to undercover agents in New Orleans, and a judge sentenced him to 50 years with no provision for parole.

It was not until four years later, after he had escaped once, fled to New York, been recaptured and was under threat of extradition that the case caught the eye of one man, William vanden Heuvel, chairman of New York City's Board of Corrections. And when that happened extradition was dropped and Mr. Apablaza was set free.

The world knew who the sons of TV-personality Johnny Carson, and the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, were. They, like Robert Apablaza, were arrested on charges of drug possession. Neither went to prison.

Possession is not the same as selling drugs, of course; observers doubt, however, that children of such prominent citizens would receive a 50-year sentence even for selling.

In Odessa, Texas, last March, a jury found Bentura Flores guilty of selling \$10 worth of heroin to an undercover agent and sentenced him to 1,800 years in prison—the penalty District Attorney John Green had asked. Sentences of 60 years, 88 years, 99 years, and 250 years for crimes similarly uncovered have issued recently from Odessa courtrooms. All have been laid on Mexican-Americans. All were arrested selling drugs to the same undercover agent.

A jury in Dallas, Texas, going Odessa 600 years better, last April sentenced Robert Floyd Angel, a black criminal with a past record, to 2,500 years for armed robbery and murder. In Dallas other sentences of 1,000, 1,000, and 1,500 years have been handed down.

An inmate's time in prison continues to be at the whim of judge, jury, and parole board. Reformers call for the unbending force of consistent punishment for like crimes across the United States, even to establishing elected boards of administration, sentencing, and release above and beyond the courts and parole boards.

The boards would have the same latitude judges now have to consider extenuating circumstances. The aim of the reform would be to end the wide divergence of sentencing now found in the U.S.

This would confine the court's function to saying guilty or not guilty.

The boards should include prominent local citizens along with penitentiary officials. Membership should be regarded as a prestigious as well as a responsible position—rather like local school boards are today. Boards should be set up for each state prison system.

As yet, most talk among specialists deals only with taking sentencing out of the courts. The concept of the new boards is not yet widely discussed, or accepted; it has not been tested; but prison reformers agree that it appears to be at least one logical way to tackle the current patchwork of sentencing procedures, which often turns up bizarre results.

Another approach, already begun, is to work to upgrade the quality of judges; such efforts continue.

Most criminologists, prison officials, and inmates agree that unequal sentencing is among the first orders of business in any prison reform—more pressing than all the internal reform of prison life behind the walls, more critical and urgent than all the rehabilitation and work-release programs and half-way houses put together.

The fact of uneven justice lands hardest of all on the black and minority poor. Blacks and Mexican-Americans alone now make up more than 50 percent of the inmate population of some of the nation's prisons—California for one. And as many as 85 percent of the inmates in some prisons in large urban states are black. These ratios run far in excess of black and Chicano percentages of the total population.

Moreover, most prisons, as they have always been, are cesspools for the poor, their walls and pickets holding men and women without money or influence, who had committed their crimes in the first place for that reason, and who went to court with a poor legal defense or no defense at all.

Eighty percent of all crimes in the country are committed for money. And the poor constitute an overwhelming majority of the inmates now in United States prisons.

John Irving, an ex-inmate turned sociologist, who has been out of prison for 15 years but has made its study his life work ever since, says: "The poor inmate is seeing more sharply than ever before that crime is rampant throughout the system, committed by rich and poor alike. And he is asking why am I the only one going to prison."

Not only are the accused unevenly sentenced for identical crimes but one half of them are sent to prison for crimes that are not crimes against persons or property in the strictly legal sense.

These are crimes which are said to have no immediate, visible "victims." As criminologists see it, no one has had his property or person violated against his will in such crimes, which are not seen as crimes against society as such.

There are 200,000 inmates in U.S. prisons, 15,000 of them women. Six million adults are arrested every year in the United States for nontraffic offenses. More than 3 million of them are for what George Beto, director of the Texas Department of Corrections calls "sins instead of crimes."

Among them according to legal definition: drunkenness (which accounts for one out of every three nontraffic arrests every year), drug addicts, gambling, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, abortion, juvenile delinquency, and a mix of sex offenses—adultery, statutory rape, carnal knowledge, prostitution, pornography, and obscenity.

Washington, D.C., has a sextet called the Washington Six, a half dozen drunks, who have been arrested 1,409 times among them for public drunkenness. Collectively they have spent 125 years in the city's jails and prisons.

Several states are mulling the decriminalization of their laws. At least one, Massachusetts, has acted. Governor Francis W. Sargent in November signed a law making public drunkenness without an accompanying felony a medical matter rather than a criminal offense.

Velda Dobbs, for 20 years Warden at Goree, the Texas women's prison, says, "There was a time when the black narcotics case just wasn't in this prison. In the last two years it has become the No. 1 offense of the inmates here. Murder used to be, but now it is only No. 4. Theft and bad-check passing both rank above it as an offense women are committing."

Crime at any given time is what leaders define it to be. Criminologist Gresham Sykes, of the University of Denver says: "Remember, in his time, Jesus Christ was a criminal, too, convicted and sentenced to crucifixion. What would you do with a 'criminal' like him today—put him through psychotherapy and rehabilitate him?"

For blacks, prison is an extension of the life they live in the ghettos. Ninety percent of all black males can expect to go to jail or prison sometime in their life. "And what acts society now calls criminal," says Jose Paris, a black Attica ex-inmate, "are the very acts we call survival."

FROM LOCKSTEP TO CLENCHED FIST

(By Jack Waugh)

"What do you do to rehabilitate a political prisoner—brainwash him?"—Criminologist Gresham Sykes.

ATTICA, N.Y.—1821. Prisoners moving down the dimly cell-block row, single file, each looking over the shoulder of the man in front, their faces inclined to the right, their feet sliding and shuffling in demeaning unison. The lockstep. The trademark of the convict that was.

1971. A single inmate's arm upthrust through the bars in defiant anger and outrage. A clenched fist—the trademark of a convict that is.

Most of the 150 years between the lockstep and the clenched fist were the years of the prison warden, guard, and corrections officer. He was unquestioned authority with unquestioned power. Now the inmate is beginning to question that authority and that power—and he has listeners outside the walls.

Behind this turn smolders an active new element in prison life, which, while there before, was slumbering. Modern criminologists and penologists called it the politicizing—also known as the radicalizing—of the prisoner. And it is as active in prisons now as a charged electron.

Nearly every warden and prison director in the United States believes with Russell G. Oswald, the unsmiling, sad figure of Attica, director of the New York Department of Corrections, who said: "It is the most difficult problem we face in prisons today."

A TWO-SIDED PROBLEM

It can be viewed from two angles: It is straight-out agitation, fomented from the outside, nurtured from the inside, highly-organized, conspiratorial, and destructive of the prison as an institution. That is how most guards and corrections officers see it.

Or it can be seen as a wave of hope. That is how the prisoners themselves and critics of prisons outside the walls see it. Those biv-

quacked in the latter camp believe with the prison psychologist from California who says: "What politicizing has done is give greater hope and determination to an inmate to resist becoming a vegetable and a robot behind those walls."

There are also two ways to look at whether prisoners are truly political or not. One viewpoint says flatly, "The robber who holds up the service station and shoots and kills the manager—he's a political prisoner? That man is a criminal."

The other point of view: Society made him do it, whatever it was. Poor, he has no job, no money, he faces a wall of discrimination, a world on the outside that to him is cruel and puts him down. The crime that he committed was against a corrupt society that puts him down politically. No matter what he did, he is a political prisoner.

This view sets Winston Moore's teeth on edge. The black director of the Cook County Jail in Chicago says, "You let that philosophy prevail and what you've got is an out for every prisoner, no matter how heinous his crime. It's the system's fault, therefore he doesn't have to do anything for remorse. Now he can go out and kill you again. Rehabilitation is impossible when you tell a man it wasn't his fault."

The rise of the political-prisoner syndrome parallels the development on the outside of black militancy.

Buffalo law professor Herman Schwartz says: "Prison is for blacks just a stopping point through life, a natural extension of his existence on the streets." Or as one ex-Attica inmate puts it: "Our communities are already prisons to us. Jail is just a concentration camp."

All sides agree that some prisoners are truly political, especially now that draft resisters and others who in some way bridle against the system are occupying more cells than ever. And so are such convicted political assassins as Sirhan Sirhan and James Earl Ray.

RADICAL LEADERSHIP STRONG

And whether all prisoners are political is an academic question because, as criminologist Gresham Sykes says, "Whether they are or not, they believe they are, and that is what matters. You can't arrest a black man in San Francisco today without it being considered a political act."

From the beginning, the political movement in the prison cellblock and yard has had black leadership, dating back to Malcolm X, the slain Black Muslim who served time in Massachusetts prisons in the late '40's and early '50's. He was to become the father-philosopher of the radical movement in American prisons.

Since his time, the Black Muslims, joined by the Black Panthers and the Puerto Rican Young Lords, have grown to make up the nub, nucleus, and leadership of the radical movement behind prison walls. The Panthers are still a force inside prisons, though their importance has declined outside. The arm with the clenched fist is predominantly a black arm.

The focus of the militancy on the streets which shook the nation's cities in the '60's has shifted now behind the walls. Indeed, a case can be made that one of the reasons the streets are now quiet is that much of the black leadership once active in the ghettos is now in prison.

While the political revolt in the cellblock broke out in the '70's, it incubated for a full two decades.

John Irwin's goatee twitches when he tracks back into the roots of the movement. Though white, he was a part of it. Now an associate professor of sociology at San Francisco State College, he was for five years—from 1952 to 1957—an inmate in the California prison system.

FROM PRIVILEGES TO RIGHTS

He says: "It started with a few books. We read behind those walls, those of us inclined

that way. And we got ourselves into little intellectual cliques. We traded books. It was going on in prisons all over, and the reading was remarkably the same from prison to prison—most of it running to literature, the humanities, history. I was reading the same books Malcolm X and later Eldridge Cleaver were reading—among them J. B. Bury's "History of Greece," Will Durant's "History of Civilization," H. G. Wells' "Outline of History," and Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

"That was the foundation. It was what we were all all reading, but we were just the beginning. Now it has gone to the more radicalized Marxist stuff—Mao, Guevara, and the black protest literature. We didn't have that black rage smoldering in us. It was a socialist dream I had. These new convicts have the radical dream."

The lockstep inmate wanted privileges. The clenched-fist inmate wants rights. And that's the critical difference between the convict world of then and now. That difference kept prisoners in lockstep then; it is firing the political rebellion now.

John Irwin believes that the only right that should be denied the convict is the right to roam. Besides living under the shadow of punishment—which every inmate considers denial enough—the felon is denied the right to vote in some states even after he has served his time. In many prisons, his mail is censored throughout his prison life. He has none of the rights inherent in the "free world"—free speech, the right to assemble, the right to advocate, in some cases not even the right to worship as he wishes.

California psychologist Carroll Waymon says there is "a deep dichotomy about prisons. We are taught from the time we are born that this is a democracy. We are taught to protest, to take our grievances to the proper authorities. We are schooled to believe we have rights and we are taught we should caucus, apply pressure—anything to protect them."

"But when you go to prison, you are to stop all that at once, cut it off. Yet you are the same person who went in only suddenly everything you were taught was right becomes wrong."

The American Civil Liberties Union and the National Committee for Prisoners' Rights (NCPR) are spearheading a legal war raging now within and without the walls. It aims to restore such rights to inmates in the penitentiary cellblocks.

LEGAL ATTACK CLARIFYING

The legal action so far centers on what the lawyers in the briefs call "cruel and unusual punishment"—solitary, bread and water, physical abuse, and the myriad of traditional mental hardships convicts are heir to.

The Landman decision, handed down in Virginia on the last day of October this year, has successfully attacked some of these basic breaches of human rights and become a model for the legal push inside the walls.

In it, the court ordered the Virginia State Penitentiary System to halt a host of "cruel and unusual punishments"—bread and water diets; the use of chains, handcuffs, or tear gas unnecessarily; holding inmates nude for extended periods of time.

It forbids prisons to clamp inmates in a solitary cell with any other inmate except when necessary and then only for a short time. The court ordered the penitentiary to hew to minimum due-process standards and it guaranteed convicts sole, unimpeded access to the courts and to counsel.

Other ever-more-sophisticated cases are headed for court dockets in the country, addressing the civil rights of due process, speech, and freedom from censorship. And cases are now mounting to break open the prison walls to greater press and community scrutiny. The ACLU in New York has just initiated a court suit aimed at forcing the federal prisons to permit press interviews

with individual inmates, a practice they have never permitted.

UNIONS A GOAL NOW

This basic drive for fundamental rights for convicts has spawned a natural extension—prisoner's unions. They are working outside the prison walls to become the bargaining agents for inmates within.

The leading prisoner's union in the country was founded in California just last spring by a group of ex-inmates headed by John Irwin. Its program are nearly identical to demands that surfaced in the Attica rebellion last September. The union wants to become the inmates' collective bargaining agent not only for human and civil rights but for such alien ideas to prison life as a liveable wage.

Canada is even now experimenting with higher wage scales for its inmates; Sweden has long paid its prisoners relatively well.

This new, cresting wave of civil-rights demands is viewed by corrections officers with puzzlement. To them, basic inmate's rights are what one warden says they are: "The right to food, lodging, and clothing, and the right to do time without interference from others. But decisions about what is good for him and not good for him—they can't be his to make."

1961 STRIKE BECAME POLITICAL

It is the abrupt veering away from the basic philosophy of "do your own number and get out" that shakes prison officers everywhere. The new number is collective action. And that is what politicization and radicalization is. Officers in every penitentiary are resisting it with every device at their command. They believe it represents a serious threat to the stability of the prison and to the well-being of other prisoners.

Some 140 years have passed on American penal history since the shuffling lockstep was the pervading sound of prison life. During those years the struggle behind the walls was for better food, better living conditions, and freedom from brutality.

Then in February, 1961, inmates at California's Folsom prison went on strike. It started as a traditional rebellion against prison conditions, but it mutated into a set of demands that were political in nature. It was the first. And the subsequent Folsom Manifesto has since spread through the penitentiaries of the country.

Elements of the manifesto surfaced in full-blown view in the Attica uprising last September. The political issue was, with that, clearly out in the open.

The demands for amnesty for offenses committed during riots, the call for deportation to a "non-imperialist country" (to which societies before prisons would have said, "Why not?"—banishment was a chief tenet of correction then) are all ideas of the age of the politicized prisoner.

The genesis of the clenched fist was Folsom. But its end is nowhere in sight.

TWO VIEWS OF ONE SYSTEM

(By Jack Waugh)

THE OFFICERS

"There is no good penitentiary. To be confined, to be restricted, to not be able to make any decisions that affect your future—if that's your future life, then being locked up 30 years in the Shamrock Hilton would be bad."—Robert Miers, inmate, Texas State Prison.

HUNTSVILLE, TEX.—They call him "walking George." And it's a name he earns. George Beto is director of the Texas Department of Corrections, the czar of Texas prisons. His domain is \$25 million-a-year business. His constituency is 15,600 convicted felons—murderers, sex offenders, rapists, robbers, and dope pushers.

He has brought the Texas prison system about as far into the 20th century as any in the country.

A big-shouldered Texan, he leads a constant round through the system's 14 units. He walks anywhere within the walls without fear, watching, talking, available to any inmate who wants to approach him—and many do. There is no unit in his empire he doesn't visit in his big black Fury III at least once a month—and most of them more often than that.

His philosophy of corrections reaches down to the last cell in the uttermost unit of the system because he literally takes it there himself. And it is a simple one:

The enemy is inmate idleness, so you put him to work. It is also permissiveness, so your discipline is swift and sure. But even in security, the atmosphere is relaxed. They may be the waste of society, but they are still human beings, so listen to what they say and help them if you can. Understand them, know them. There are only two ways—either you run the prison or the inmates run you. And there are only two kinds of prisons—clean or dirty.

Working that philosophy, George Beto has built the Texas prison system into a Beto-run, clean, highly disciplined industrial dynasty. Every inmate who is able bodied works, and gets no salary. Every prison structure in the system has been built by the inmates themselves—many of them are highly skilled.

There are no less than a dozen prison industries within the system. The Texas Department of Corrections runs textile mills and a box factory. It makes brushes and furniture, brooms and mops, soaps, waxes and detergents, garments, mattresses, shoes, belts, and license plates. It retreads tires, cans food, repairs Texas school buses, and makes dentures. From September, 1970, through August, '71, it generated \$7,083,077 in industrial sales. Besides this, it maintains machine shops, printshops, and wood-working shops for exclusive in-prison use.

FARMING JUST AS VAST

A Texas work-use law permits the prison to produce industrial products for other tax-supported activities in the state. And unlike many prisons it gets little static from labor unions. (California law forbids its prisons to build anything worth more than \$2,000 with inmate labor.) The machinery and equipment used in the penitentiary shops is modern and up to date. "The secret of good prison industry," George Beto says, "is good equipment. You can't 'poor-boy' it. This is no horse-and-buggy operation."

The agricultural side of the Texas prison system is just as vast. Some 200 inmate cowboys wrangle 20,000 head of cattle on penitentiary ranges. And from its crop rows, tended by inmates on the line (3,000 inmates work as farm labor), comes most of the food that feeds the system's 15,800 inmates.

From the penitentiary's fields and pasture-lands, mills, and refineries come 16,000 head of hogs every year, 3,500 head of cattle to slaughter, 80,000 dozen eggs, 100,000 chickens, 9 million pounds of milk, 100,000 pounds of cheese, 50,000 gallons of ribbon cane syrup, 120,000 pounds of peanut butter from prison-grown peanuts, 3½ million pounds of Irish potatoes, 2 million pounds of sweet potatoes, 360,000 pounds of milled rice, one-quarter million pounds of corn meal, 400,000 gallons of canned products, and 6 million to 8 million pounds of fresh vegetables.

Of the 60 cents' worth of food each inmate in the system consumes a day, only 13 cents' worth has to be bought. Everything else is produced within the penitentiary's 105,000-acre empire, and all of it by inmate labor.

The first job every inmate gets coming into the Texas system, if he is able bodied, is six months on the line—hard, back-bending labor in the fields, and recalcitrant, rebellious prisoners are often sent back to the line as punishment. On-the-line inmates labor under a gun. Armed bosses on horseback supervise as the inmates stoop in the fields. A boss

called the "long arm," with a high-powered rifle over the saddlehorn, watches from a distance for any sign of an attempted break.

"The thing our critics criticize us hardest for," says Byron Frierson, the man who for 25 years has superintended the system's vast agricultural program, is that "George Beto makes inmates work. And to a lot of people work is a dirty word. But permissiveness and idleness are the powderkegs of prison life. We don't admit either one here."

CELLBLOCKS HAD BEEN CALDRONS

It has taken George Beto 10 years to build the Texas penitentiary into the industrial-agricultural barony it is, picking up where his predecessor, O. B. Ellis, had left off in the early '60's.

In the pre-Ellis days before 1948, the Texas system was a sump tank of deterioration. Prisoners ran the units, and the tanks and cellblocks were caldrons of terror, extortion, and forced rape. Pictures taken during those years line the corridors of virtually every unit in the system, and George Beto smiles as he passes them and says, "I hang them there lest we forget the way it used to be."

The Texas system also reflects George Beto's fixation with education. A classics scholar and former college president who reads Greek and Latin, he maintains an education program that goes up through the junior-college level and is manned by educators from Texas school systems. Many inmates who are illiterate when they come read before they leave—they are forced to go through school up to the eighth grade. Other inmates with deficient educations have gone all the way through the junior-college program. One-half of all Texas inmates are involved in the educational program on some level.

George Beto likes to remind visitors whom he personally—and often—tows along in his wake that because of the education program the average IQ of the Texas inmates has jumped 10 points in 10 years. It was 85. Now it's 95.

The 14 units in the Texas system range from the maximum-security Ellis unit, where the toughest prisoners, the high-escape risks, are incarcerated, to the prerelease center called the Jester unit, a prison without walls where convicts about to be paroled or discharged roam on an institution that looks like a campus, attending lectures geared to helping them make it back in the "free world." There are no high-towered pickets with searchlights at Jester or "long arms" or tracking dogs. The only guns are locked up in a gun case in the warden's office.

But as much as George Beto walks, it is the bosses and officers, men such as C. L. McAdams, who has been a warden in the system for 30 years, who must deal with him day by day. White, rough hewn, with little formal education, authoritarian, with the nickname "Bear Tracks" ("big as a bear and he leaves tracks in every prison where he goes"), he has a legend about him that transcends Texas borders. C. L. McAdams is the most feared warden in the Texas system.

Three inmates I talked with who had served under him considered him the ultimate sadist. But others said that he runs a tight, tight prison and respect him for it. Clyde Thompson, an ex-inmate who served 28 years in the Texas penitentiary, says of him, "If you keep your business straight, you have nothing to fear from McAdams. If you don't he's the last warden you would want over you."

"TREAT 'EM FIRM, BUT FAIR"

He has spent a career in the corrections system trouble-shooting in the toughest of the Texas units.

He says: "I got one philosophy, you treat 'em firm, but fair. And you treat 'em all alike and you keep 'em working because idleness is the devil's workshop."

Warden McAdams is the perfect example

of the strict authoritarian prison boss. His relationship to the inmate is as parent to child. As we walked the corridors of the Wynne unit in Huntsville together, the prisoners who approached him, or whom he called in because they wanted to see him, were treated as errant kids, and they acted that way. If they had had hats, they would have been in hand.

His tactics, though he came by them naturally, are textbook methods in the successful handling of the defiant and undisciplined child.

In 1948 when he was sent to the Retrieve unit in south Texas, it was run by prisoners and out of control. The month before he came, one inmate had beheaded another with a meat cleaver in the dining hall. And only three days after he arrived the inmates "struck" in the mess hall and demanded to negotiate with the warden.

McAdams strode into the hall, didn't say a word, but picked up the nearest inmate by the scruff of the shirt and dragged him out into the corridor alone and demanded what his grievance was. One by one he took the inmates out, not permitting them to negotiate as a group, but isolating them, separating them, until he had found the leaders and thrown them into solitary.

One Texas inmate has said of C. L. McAdams, "The man knows the inmate so well that there is almost no difference between us. He can look down into that cell tank and tell you what you're thinking. Bear Tracks would make a perfect convict."

Of prisoners, Bear Tracks says, "Those that don't like me don't like me because I don't let them do what they want." Moreover, in any confrontation C. L. McAdams, like any parent, one way or the other, always holds the upper hand.

And in Texas, so does the entire prison system.

THE INMATES

Mike Middleton got out of the Texas penitentiary four months ago. He had been in nearly two years, and the memory of it is still heavy on his mind, the taste of it still bitter on his tongue.

"In dehumanizing men," he says, "Texas has got to rank with the worst."

"They have a system in Texas called 'the big bitch' and it ought to be outlawed. A man can be convicted and go to the pen three times on felony charges. Then he can be out three days, be picked up on the street for the smallest infraction, and with those three convictions behind him be sent back again—and this time for life. There are hundreds of men in Texas prisons on 'the bitch.'

"And in there, you don't know the things the bosses (guards) do to degrade and make you less than a man. Your life is a constant strip-down. Every man that works goes through a strip shakedown twice a day in all weather, when he comes in for lunch and when he comes back in the evening. On construction jobs you can get strip shakedowns four times a day—to keep you from taking anything in and bringing anything out."

"And there is nothing stopping bosses from taking off on convicts. A whole squad of men back from 'the line' could have done something to make a boss mad, and they are put up against the wall and that means you are going to solitary, too."

"YOU AREN'T WORKIN' FAST ENOUGH"

"One day I was chipping rock with a ball-peen hammer," he says, "and this boss—we had had trouble before, he didn't like me—kept watching me and said, 'You aren't workin' fast enough.' He said, 'Use the sledge in one hand and the chisel in the other.' Well, that meant having to swing a sledge one-handed. That sledge weighed 30 or 40 pounds and I couldn't swing it. And that boss went into a screaming fit, put me on the wall, and called the assistant warden. He

charged me with never working and doing some agitating—a bad offense in a Texas prison.

"I went to trial before the assistant warden, the captain, and a sergeant and explained I physically couldn't swing that sledge. I spent 8 hours on that wall and then went into solitary. I was there 7 days. And the warden came in and said, 'You ready to come out?' and I said, 'I'm not going to swing that sledge, warden,' and he said, 'Then you stay in there some more.' And I was in there another 15 days."

In the Texas prisons, the bosses maintain a system of building tenders— inmates put in charge of tanks and cellblocks, and handed a measure of power and authority over the other inmates. It is a hark-back to the old days of giving power to selected inmates.

Every inmate I talked to within the Texas system complained that at one time or another he had been brutalized by building tenders, or knew men who had, while officers turned their backs or gave tacit approval."

"It's the way the bosses get to a man they don't like without having to lay a hand on him themselves," Mike Middleton says. "Man, I know if they get a real bad agitator, they send him to solitary and his chances of getting out of there without being beat up are slim. The building-tender system can lead to real violence and even death for somebody."

"One tender got killed in our unit over a newspaper. This Mexican kid named Frank wanted to read the paper, but the building tender took it and gave it to a white inmate instead. Frank went and got a shank—there were a dozen or more knives stashed away in that tank—and stabbed him 15 times. And instead of taking him into Houston 40 miles away they headed with him to Huntsville 180 miles north. The tender died that night."

"They put Frank in lockup for 60 days, but he never came to trial and he was finally put back into the general population. I guess to this day he literally believes he can get away with murder."

"KILL-OR-BE-KILLED" IMPRESSION

"To survive in the penitentiary," Mike said, "you have got to radiate the impression that you are willing to kill or be killed, that men can't push you and get away with it. You are being tested all the time. Prison life is full of strong inmates preying on the weaker. And forced rape is the way one man subjects and shows his authority and status by subjecting another to his will. You save yourself from this by instant violence yourself, establishing yourself immediately as a dangerous man to fool with. Or you just radiate an aura of superiority of 'I-don't-care-about-any-of-you'—in effect isolate yourself from the general population. You are there, but you're not there. Either way you have got to let other inmates know that you wouldn't hesitate to creep up on a guy and slit his throat if you are pushed hard enough."

"There is a strict unwritten inmate code in the penitentiary. And it has got to be strictly obeyed. Men are not in a good mood very often in prison, if ever. Asking a man, 'What's the biggest score [robbery] job you ever pulled?' or sitting on his bunk uninvited, or rapping with a man without finding something about him first—those are things you never do. And when you brush against a man, you had better apologize. If you don't then the man is free to do what he wants to you. I have seen a shank put in a man's back for that."

"MAKE YOURSELF SMALL"

"And the only way to really make it with the bosses is to withdraw into yourself, both mentally and physically—literally make yourself as small as possible. It's another way they dehumanize you. They want you to make no waves in prison and they want you to make no waves when you get out."

"On the surface the Texas prison system seems to run with few attempted breaks—there are about a dozen each year—without sit-downs, without backs against prison authority, without riot or rebellion."

Mike Middleton says such things happen, but officials have so much strength it never gets out.

"A man," he says, "must realize when he revolts against prison authority that he is putting his life on the line."

"In Texas they have the full power to use any weapon in any way to put down any rebellion. It is a rule—by any means necessary, a wipe-'em-out attitude."

"And convicts have a low threshold of boredom. It's usually a case of 'what are we doing today, rioting today, huh?' The monotony is ever present."

"And if a man stays in that place long enough he becomes as docile as sheep. Eventually they break most men—not all of them, but most of them."

A black inmate who had served time in the Retrieve unit, where Mike Middleton also made time, and who had been in both the California and Texas prisons, says, "The man is right. I see it in the blacks. The difference is they all get domesticated here. Those black brothers become like house cats in this penitentiary."

THE JAILER AND THE JAILED

(By Jack Waugh)

"In the big prisons there are still areas where guards won't go."—Criminologist Norval Morris.

"We were set for a guided tour of the prison and the warden asked if he could go along because he was afraid to go by himself."—Winston Moore, executive director, Cook County Jail.

CHICAGO.—Since Attica, every prison officer in the U.S. today pays a price—the price of an uneasy mind.

Guards in particular, on the line with inmates day in and day out, live in a state of tension. It is having two effects:

It is driving them to be tough, but it is also driving many toward advocating reforms inside the walls—for their own safety. A radicalizing of guards has accompanied a radicalizing of inmates.

Some guards in some prisons are very tough indeed. They tolerate not the slightest deviation from rule. The next step beyond that is brutality.

More moderate guards believe that strict discipline is indeed necessary—but that reforms are an equally necessary part of an overall answer to conditions that produce an uprising like Attica. Guards who become liberal in demanding prison reform find themselves aligned with inmates against prison administrators.

Says P. J. Clampa, director of organization for the Correctional Officers' Union in New York:

"The foot dragging in prison reforms is at the top. You wouldn't believe some of the meetings I've been to with wardens. You could close your eyes and swear you were hearing a cheap Edward G. Robinson movie."

DEMANDS SPELLED OUT

After Attica, the International Union of American Federal, State, Local, and Municipal Employees, which is the bargaining agent for New York's correctional officers, angrily spelled out a list of demands:

Greater safety; better restitution to the families of guard hostages; improved conditions for inmates; better training for officers; better radio communication within the walls; more decisive firepower with which to put down an inmate uprising. All were granted.

Most prisons that run without visible trouble and rebellion are citadels of authoritarianism. In some cases it is tempered with humanity; in other cases not. The inmate,

in any case, is clearly the caged and the guards the keepers.

Wardens who run their prisons that way tend to look on the delay in moving against rebelling inmates at Attica, and on experiments in inmate self-rule, such as is being practiced now at Washington State's maximum security prison in Walla Walla, with horror. The Walla Walla inmates have an elected inmate government and sit in councils of self-determination over their prison life.

FAILURE FORESEEN

At least three wardens and prison directors of totally divergent backgrounds—Winston Moore, black warden of the Cook County Jail; George Beto, white director of the Texas prisons; and James Park, San Quentin's associate warden and a clinical psychologist—look at the Walla Walla experiment and predict certain disaster.

The prison walls attract certain kinds of men as guards just as they attract certain kinds of men as inmates. Though there are marked exceptions, the prison systems of the U.S. draw heavily on men in their late 30's or early 40's who have retired from the military services.

As we walked down the long, near-empty corridor toward death row in one prison, the correctional officer assigned as my escort, said, "I've only been here a few months. Just got out of the Marines after 20 years. Had to have something to do and this seemed kind of natural."

In the New Mexico state prison, for instance, a veteran gets preference when he applies to be a guard. Five points are added automatically to his test score, whatever it is, and often make the difference between his being hired and not hired. Most of the guards in the prison are ex-servicemen. In San Quentin, also, many of the guards have a military background.

SERGEANT-PRIVATE RELATIONSHIP

There is a lot of intellectual and emotional comfort in prisons—despite the tentative terror there—that the guard with a military bent can slide into quickly. The relationship of guard to inmate is one of sergeant to private, drill instructor to raw recruit.

Few men live closer—yet farther apart—than the jailer and the jailed.

Some 95 percent of guards are white; half of all inmates in the U.S. are either black or brown, and in some prisons in urban states, the ratio of black inmates reaches as high as 85 percent.

Twenty-six percent of all guards are over 50 years old; the average age of inmates is under 30.

Most guards and officers are middle class; most convicts are lower class. Most inmates in American prisons come from the big cities; most guards still come from the isolated back country where many prisons are situated.

SALARIES HAVE BEEN LOW

Salaries for guards have been low, though some have risen in the last two or three years. Across the U.S., 21 percent of all guards make more than \$8,000 a year. A breakdown shows that 36 percent earn less than \$6,000 a year; 43 percent earn between \$6,000 and \$8,000 a year; 16 percent earn between \$8,000 and \$10,000; and 5 percent earn more than \$10,000.

Albert Curtis earns \$10,500 a year as a sergeant in the Cook County Jail. White, he works in a world that is 85 percent black. Most unusually, his prison director is black, his lieutenant is black, and all of the officers under him are black. More typically, 8 out of every 10 inmates are black.

He is a studied, skilled practitioner of the guard-inmate relationship.

We stood in the cellblock together, our backs against the bars as the inmates began to pass through the mess line, their tin plates in their hands. The menu was beans and frankfurters and bread.

Sergeant Curtis always stands inside the cellblock when the men eat, "to make sure the weaker don't get left out."

BANTER OF THE "PUT DOWN"

His banter is the banter of the "put down": "Don't push off me again," he growls in mock threat to one inmate, "or I will make you look like those beans." Then to another passing inmate making a remark about the food. "That's all you ate at home. I don't know what you're griping about."

"Come on," he shouted out into the cell-block, "all you black Muslims [who don't eat pork for religious reasons] come up here and get those hot dogs."

As the inmates filed by, he said to me: "I rap to them. I put them down in a way. They are all different. Some I know from the neighborhood on a first-name basis. Some I don't talk to at all or speak respectfully to. Others, if I don't call them dumb and rap on them, they would be hurt."

Breaking off, he said, "OK, you two, in a minute I'm going to slap both of ya. And if that cigarette falls in the food, you're goin' to eat it all."

GUARD KNOWS PATOIS

Lt. Ned Lenoir comes from a different world than Albert Curtis. A black man, born in Mississippi, raised in the ghetto, he is one of the less than 5 percent of the correctional officers in U.S. prisons who are not white. As a lieutenant, he earns \$11,500 a year.

He moves through the tiers and the corridors of the Cook County Jail, a two-way radio crammed into his hip pocket, the clatter of the cellblocks and the steady drone of prison life competing with much of what he says.

From the streets originally himself he instantly catches the near-whispered patois of the black inmate. He believes being black in a largely black inmate world gives him an advantage most white correctional officers don't have. But he also insists that color doesn't basically matter. He says:

"We treat the inmates like human beings. Most of the time we ask them to do something rather than rapping them alongside the head. That's why we have had no riots. No matter what their crime, it isn't your job to judge them, but to keep them safe."

Lt. Lester Sykes, black, only 27—about the same age as the average Cook County inmate—is Ned Lenoir's peer. He also earns \$11,500 a year. Together they supervise much of the day-to-day routine in the bleak old prison on Chicago's California Avenue.

EVEN REVOLUTIONARY HANDSHAKE

If anything, Lt. Sykes is even more attuned to the patois and rhythms of the inmates than Ned Lenoir, down to greeting a stranger with the revolutionary handshake. Easy and smiling, he moves up the catwalks that face off into the cells of his units. He is a stickler for order. By jailhouse rules, inmates may stuff a Bible, a dictionary, law books, and an ashtray between the bars of their cells. But everything else must be kept inside away from the bars. A violation brings on a Sykes dress down:

"You sleep here, man?"

"Yeh."

"You know better than to put your shoes in those bars, man, take 'em down."

It is like a father chastising a wayward son.

As Lt. Sykes moves down the catwalks and out into the corridor again he says, "We make a big thing out of a man keeping his cell clean, because if we don't, he starts to thinking he is finished."

Some black guards can develop a rapport with black inmates, but increasing the number of black guards in the U.S. is no guarantee of instant solutions, experts point out. Many blacks don't want to be guards for a number of reasons, and some prison administrators simply discriminate against any black who might want to become a guard.

MORE BLACKS MIGHT HELP

More black guards might help, however, in jails where white inmates are in a small minority, reformers say.

Better training is also desirable, they say. Today, most training for guards is on the job. It ranges from about two weeks to six weeks. Sometimes a new guard is simply told where to go—and he goes, on his own.

Conscientious prison officials are looking for better methods, mixing in classroom instruction. In New York, correctional officers themselves have pushed for reforms, and every guard in the New York system now receives some form of training.

On discipline, the correctional philosophy of a black guard who successfully keeps order and a white guard who does is remarkably the same.

In the Cook County Jail the ring "61" on the interprison phone system is a Mayday call. It means trouble in some cellblock. Within 20 seconds Ned Lenoir and Lester Sykes can be in any cellblock in the prison.

When five inmates two years ago took guards hostage and put knives to their throats in an isolation cellblock, Ned Lenoir was beaten to the scene only by Winston Moore, the executive director himself (also black). In a rush of running officers they stormed the cellblock without hesitation and disarmed the inmates.

NO TALK, NO HESITATION

There was no negotiation, no talk, no hesitating over hostages. It was no different than what a hard-nosed white warden would do in the Texas penitentiary.

A primary reason for increased tension between most guards and most inmates is that the social structure of life behind the walls has been sharply realigned in the decades since the 1940's.

Traditionally, prisons were run in relative quiet within the structure of a guard-inmate trade-off. White guards handed over limited power to selected white inmate leaders in return for keeping prisons calm and riot free.

But now "inmate power" has changed color, from white to black. Blacks are now the leaders in the cell blocks and prison yards, and the guards, still overwhelmingly white, don't want to give power to them.

That fact, criminologist Gresham Sykes says, "is breaking down traditional institutional and social patterns in American prisons." The result is instability in prison yards everywhere and prisons on the edge of riot and rebellion. Dr. Sykes says, "Twenty percent or 30 percent of any inmate body acting as a unit can bring a prison to a standstill." There is scarcely a penitentiary in any major urban state today that hasn't that potential just in its black inmate population alone.

ANOTHER SHIFT UNDER WAY

Another critical shift is under way behind the walls. And it issues from the same fountainhead—the rise of young black inmates. Largely through their eyes, prisoners are looking at guards differently than ever before.

Tony Newland, a white ex-inmate who has spent nearly half of his life behind bars at Folsom, Soledad, and San Quentin, describes it this way:

"Inmates have redefined the enemy. And he is the correctional officer. He is now considered an oppressor, and that is new in prison life. Before, a guard was no more significant than a prison wall. No inmate knew the names of more than one or two officers and didn't care. But today, to blacks, the prison guard is no different from the cop cruising the ghetto street. Therefore he is an enemy. Prison guards, looked at in that way, no longer have the protection they once had."

BUT BY DESIGN

"Now you are beginning to see guards being killed behind walls, not by accident, but by design. [Nine correctional officers have

been slain in California prisons alone since 1970. In the prior 17 years four had been killed—and three of them in one incident in 1953.] Now many prisons are divided into armed camps—guard and inmate—with both waiting for it to happen. It's raw, naked human fear on both sides and you can't run a prison on that."

Yet the relationship between the keeper and the caged is an interdependent one. "Each," says a close observer of the California prison system, "is playing a part in a game. The men must stay behind the walls, the guards must have the appearance that all is well. It is a symbiotic relationship. The guards have to depend on the inmates to follow the rules—and vice versa. When either one fails there is either brutality or rebellion."

THE REFORMED AND THE UNREFORMED

(By Jack Waugh)

THOSE WHO CHANGE

"I hesitate to use the word 'incorrigible.' Today a man may be incorrigible, but who knows what he will be tomorrow?"—George Beto, director, Texas Department of Corrections.

LOS ANGELES.—Robert Ernest Miers came up to death row in Huntsville, Texas, on Aug. 25, 1952, a condemned killer. The sheriff of Bexar County where he was held for 18 months until convicted, said of him: "In my humble opinion I know that he is the most insincere, vicious, and dangerous prisoner I have ever known."

Dr. Karl Menninger, Topeka, Kans., psychiatrist, made the point previously when he asked at a workshop session, "what institution can do anything for a man who has been through the average local jail?"

Exceptions, of course, abound, and Rep. William J. Keating (R-Cincinnati), member of the House Judiciary Committee, talks gratifyingly of the cut in the prison population that had long glutted the Workhouse—where county prisoners are also kept—with its mixture of teen-age traffic offenders and hardened criminals.

Presumably, too, the Kenton County, Ky., Jail, with its nationally-recognized system of prisoner work release, may be an exception to the general rule of such prisons.

But regardless of physical facilities or the separation some county systems laudably may require for adults and juveniles, the mere incarceration of offenders for many months before they are brought to trial must end if Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and other outstanding legal authorities have their way.

Almost certainly, the report of Ohio Gov. John J. Gilligan's Task Force on Corrections will have something to say on this score when he receives it Wednesday.

One of the most commendable results from the Williamsburg conference could be an "opening up" of the prison system to press and public.

"The problems and deficiencies of today's corrections facilities and procedures should be openly and freely admitted and discussed," Francis L. Dale, president and publisher of The Enquirer and discussion leader for one workshop, declared.

"Secrecy and mystery must be swept away. The institutions and programs belong to the people, they are not the private property of the politicians or the personal domain of the corrections official."

"The public should be invited inside to see for themselves. Newsmen should not have to sneak in as an imposter to get an 'inside' story. There should be no inside story."

Dale was far from alone among conference leaders who appealed for greater "openness" of corrections systems—and prisons, particularly.

"We must end the kind of tours in which a group is taken to the chapel and then has coffee with the warden," O. J. Keller, director of the Florida Division of Youth Serv-

ices, told the conference in the wind-up session. "Be honest with reporters, and they will be honest with you."

Listening were heads of many of the nation's toughest prison systems—and the former inmates of a few. Exaggerated, perhaps, and blatantly offensive to many prison officials, "The Cage," a daring drama based on life at San Quentin, opened the conference with its focus on the homosexuality, bestiality and wanton murder that occur among prisoners and guards.

"It (The Cage) was pure garbage," said Sanger B. Powers, administrator of the Wisconsin Division of Corrections. "I got up and walked out when it was halfway over. I know of no prison in the country that operates that way."

Conceivably, the ex-convicts of the "Barbed Wire Theater" group overdrove their message. Many prisons, undoubtedly, function a lot differently than the one they portrayed. San Quentin itself may be in better shape. But in their favor, one could say the actors made the inmates appear at least as sorry a lot as the guards who beat them without mercy and treated them as some kind of jungle beasts.

On Jan. 9, 1953, before he could be sent to the electric chair, the then Governor, Allan Shivers, commuted his sentence. But so mean was Bobby Miers then that the Governor said he should never be let out of prison.

One November evening this year, nearly 19 years later, Bobby Miers sat in a small office on the Ramsey unit of the Texas penitentiary and talked.

"When they took me off death row," he said, "they locked me up in isolation. And I made it a point to be a troublemaker. I knew the inmates expected it of me and the warden expected it of me. All the things I was accused of I had done. And if I hadn't, I was going to do them anyway. The inmate population looked on me as a leader, even though I was only 21, a youngster. I had known a lot of them from before. I had spent five years in a federal reformatory before I came to Huntsville. It was their concept of me, and I had to hold my position.

ISOLATION WAS . . . HORRIBLE

"Isolation was mentally a horrible place. We were physically laid up there on two meals a day. I broke my arm, and cut my heel strings in protest—as much to have something to do as anything.

"Then in the early '60's they turned us all out of isolation and put us to work. But I was so mean the only man who would take me was John Durbin (then chief steward at the Walls unit in Huntsville, now director of food service for the Texas Department of Corrections).

"So I was put to work making the noon and supper meals. Mr. Durbin kind of raised me, put the responsibility on me, and said it was up to me whether I lived up to it or was a failure.

"Well, in the process, a lot of things happened to me. The man made me understand it was more important to be a human being than it was to be a big-time professional convict. He had a different concept of me. And suddenly I wanted to start living up to what he expected of me instead of what others did.

MY GOALS WERE PRISON GOALS

"Before all this I had done a lot of reading. When I first went into isolation it was about the time of the hearings involving Sen. Joseph McCarthy. And I was fascinated. It proved to me that an accusation carried more weight than a denial. And I read and read.

"But despite all that reading, my mind was still in the penitentiary, my goals were prison goals—winning the esteem of my fellow inmates and the respect and the fear of the warden. And I had both.

"But then I started working for Mr. Durbin like a dog—16, 18 hours a day. I stayed at that job about six years until one day he took a vacation and while he was gone I had a disagreement with one of the officers and I was sent here to the Ramsey unit to a hoe squad. I caught that line and beat on that ground for a year. And while I was on that line I didn't pay much attention to what I was doing except to keep out of trouble.

"Then this major on the Ramsey unit made a remark to me one time and what he said made me understand in no uncertain terms I had to learn how to think—not what to think, but how to think. Do you understand? I suddenly realized few of us do any thinking.

"With it I realized I didn't have enough words at my command even to think with. After you use the 300 words you have, then you have nothing to do but react and when I reacted it was always violent. It had happened to me all my life: I was one big ball of emotion. And when my vocabulary was not such as to allow me to explain to anybody how I felt or what I was up against, the only thing I could do was rap somebody alongside the head or start cussing.

"It had me miserable all my years—just a little thing like that. I wondered why I hadn't come up with that earlier, why somebody hadn't told me."

Bobby Miers, totally hung up behind that word "think," started taking courses in the education program at the prison while officers watched warily. He has worked his way from 10th grade to within only two courses of a junior-college degree.

And something else happened to him: "Somewhere in all this I realized I was a person instead of a convict, that I still had my pride and self-respect. Before, I had always been a professional convict. When I changed, I still had the advantage of knowing how my fellow convicts felt and thought, and it gave me an edge. But if I had used that edge to my own advantage, you see, I would still have been a professional convict. Anybody who realizes that difference will probably never come back to the penitentiary.

ON THE BRINK OF PAROLE

"I realized that it was not a matter of bad luck with me or that I was a victim. It was a lack of standards, man, of values. I wasn't like the square on the outside. He's not on an emotional elevator. A convict is. When my emotions rose, I went out to satisfy them. A square doesn't."

Bobby Miers has gone now from the meanest man in the Texas penitentiary to the brink of possible parole. He isn't the same man whose sentence was commuted to life in the penitentiary. He isn't the same man who went to death row 20 years ago.

It isn't that the prison changed him. He himself says, "A penitentiary brings out the worst in a man, it just isn't designed to bring out the good. A man has got to reach down inside himself, take hold, and change."

That's what happened to Bobby Miers. Now he is where nobody ever thought they would find him—up for parole. And the same prison officers and wardens who once feared and hated him are hoping he gets it.

THOSE WHO DON'T

"Punishment doesn't cure a man. Punishment made me worse."—Clyde Thompson, ex-inmate, 28 years in the Texas Penitentiary.

"The penal system made me a better crook."—Robert Davis, ex-inmate, New York prison system.

Not every prisoner finds the self-revelation to save himself that Bobby Miers did.

Every third prisoner who walks outside a prison wall, either free or on parole, will be back. There is a fraternity of inmates. Bobby Miers calls them professional convicts. He was one. "I had friends," he says, "in every prison in the United States. I came into the

prison system as a young man and was raised by it."

Tony Newland, an ex-inmate, who spent 15 years in the California prison system and is now studying sociology at San Francisco State College, was another professional convict. "As individuals," he says, "we considered ourselves thieves. Prison was but an occupational hazard with us, like falling might be to a bridge painter. We went to prison to do our own number, get out, and go back to doing what we do."

SOME EXPECT TO COME BACK

Some inmates in this fraternity of inmates go out expecting to come back. One inmate for instance, stood in a prerelease room at the Walls unit of the Texas penitentiary early on a November morning this year. He had spent 17 years off and on in prisons in Alabama and Texas for robbery and he was about to be released again that morning. He said: "Am I going to stay out? I don't know. I am going to steal again, I know that."

"There's a fellow out there says he is coming to meet me. And I hope he doesn't, because I promised him if he did I would do this robbery job with him. I don't really want to do it, because I don't want to come back. But if it's the only ride I have to Houston and if he's there, I promised him. And I guess I'll go with him."

Some inmates who leave not only know they are coming back, they are relieved when they do. Isaac Easley, who has served 11 years in the Texas penitentiary for robbery, says, "Fifty percent of the men I have seen come back actually seem to be contented. 'Yeah, man,' they say, all jolly and full of thrills, 'I just couldn't make it out there.' And it doesn't seem to matter about the time they bring back with them, whether it's two years or 30 years."

PRISON SYSTEM CRITICIZED

Criminologists universally indict United States prison systems for doing little to halt this cycle. Prisons, they say, do not reform, deter, or rehabilitate.

Hans W. Mattick, director of the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice at the University of Chicago, says: "Prisons isolate and incapacitate. We have contradictory expectations of them. Simultaneously we expect them to rap a man alongside one ear while whispering reform to him through the other. We call this rehabilitation? You don't train aviators in a submarine. Indeed, in proportion that a man adjusts himself to prison life he unfits himself for any other life on the outside."

Carrol Wayman, a black psychologist who works with prisoners in the California system says: "The most telling point of all about correctional institutions is that they can't correct. They are run on contradictory concepts. When men and women are prodded at the end of a stick or a gun there can be no rehabilitation. The agenda is survival, period."

SEE YOU IN 90 DAYS

No inmate or ex-inmate will say a prison ever helped him. "Prisons," says Jeanette Spenser, an ex-inmate in the Westfield women's prison in New York, "are geared to failure". There is no rehabilitation there, no help for you. If you get help, you do it yourself. Ten years ago 70 percent of the women doing time were in there for drug and drink-related crimes. There was no narcotics-rehabilitation program then—or today. The percentage now is up 15 percent. All that happens to you is you serve your time, you're given a set of clothes, and the officer says, "Goodbye, I'll see you in 90 days."

"It's that great sense of injustice convicts feel," says Tony Newland. "After you finish your time you are told that wipes the slate clean. But meanwhile they have robbed you of every means to survive in this world. It becomes a vicious circle of in-and-

out for the rest of your life. We come out, feeling we have paid our debt, whatever it was. But on the outside it is the same thing in a different form. We are discriminated against in countless ways. We find a rationale out there to commit other crimes. Hardened criminals? Man, prison is where they make them hard. That's the forge up there—in Soledad and in Quentin or wherever."

YOU EITHER REBEL OR SUBMIT

Michael Middleton, a Texas ex-inmate, describes the deterioration that sets in on convicts that don't resist it.

"If I had a life sentence in that place I would agitate for the sake of agitating. With time that long you either have to rebel or submit. Years in the penitentiary make a vegetable out of a man. I have seen men 40 years old who started out human, but now can't discuss the weather. They can't even read a pocketbook any more. They look for comic books to read instead."

"And they walk around with vacant looks on their faces. If they were turned out to society now, they really couldn't make it. They have deteriorated so far they can't even be paroled."

Pat Wood, a white ex-inmate in both the Women's House of Detention in New York and Santa Rita women's prison in California, says: "The thing is you are treated like an animal for so long you begin acting that way. And then they tell you when you get out to go and lead a middle-class life. Given that kind of training, it's impossible to do."

THEY HAVE TAKEN ALL HUMANNESS

A black inmate in Goree, the Texas prison for women, convicted of murdering her husband, says: "The problem is, they keep you so long you become like an animal. The walls make animals out of you. They expect you to go back into society as human beings when they have taken all humanness out of you. They keep you so long it affects you mentally and physically."

"What happens time and again is that you come in angry, and then there comes a point when you decide to live by the law—when you actually are rehabilitated. Then is when you should be let out. But they don't, they keep you until you pass that point and lapse into an animal."

That is the chorus of complaint from the inmate side. There is hardly a dissenting note to be heard from any cellblock in any American prison. In Sweden the longest a criminal, even the most violent of men, is held in prison—with few exceptions—is ten years. Then he is released under a carefully prepared program of community supervision. The penalty for pushing heroin would likely not be prison at all, but probation.

INNOVATION BECAME NIGHTMARE

An innovation pioneered in the California prisons in 1917 hailed at first as a great liberal reform—was the indeterminate sentence. It has turned into a nightmare. Envisioned as a means to let the deserving out early, it has been used by prison officials instead as a weapon to keep men who bridle at prison ways incarcerated indefinitely. It has maximized the discretionary powers of the California Parole Board. Now even reformers, who once thought it a good idea, are calling for its end. And the California Department of Corrections, pressed by the outcry, is charting changes that will guarantee inmates that they will be told six months after coming to prison when they can expect to get out.

Convict George Jackson, one of California's "Soledad brothers," convicted originally of a \$71 robbery, spent 10 years in prison under an indeterminate sentence and was finally shot and killed in the San Quentin prison yard last August.

Clearly it is difficult for prison or parole officers to tell if a convicted murderer or rob-

ber or rapist is truly a changed man, that he will go out and not come back.

CHANGED BY A NEW THOUGHT

Convicts—particularly the most violent—are men who need help, not just to be punished, dumped in the "hole," or locked behind bars for a lifetime. There are others whose experiences parallel that of Bobby Miers, men who were changed in a moment of self-awakening and maturity. It is something that can be sparked by the smallest incident, idea, or particle of help. Bobby Miers was changed from a killer by a new thought about himself. Clyde Thompson, a man considered in his time—the '30's—as the most dangerous convict in all of Texas, was changed in isolation by reading the Bible. And he got out only because one woman, who was later to become his wife, spent seven years trying to get him out.

Howard King was a contemporary of Bobby Miers and perhaps even more of a prison terrorizer. Serving two concurrent sentences of life and 99 years, he once said he was "harder than concrete" and that he would break any warden in the Texas system. He has just been paroled. Before he left he had become a "model" prisoner.

Nobody "broke" these men. Nor did any of them receive systematic help from society or from the prison system.

What they did they did for themselves or with the help of perhaps one lone, interested individual who may have just passed briefly into and out of their prison lives.

How many other violent men, presumably lost forever to society, can find that moment of change—with help—there is no way of knowing.

PRISON REFORM OVERSEAS

(NOTE.—This article was compiled by staff writer Florence Moulcky from dispatches written by Monitor correspondents Robert Nelson in London and Harry B. Ellis in Europe and from special reports by Ben Tierney in Ottawa and Thomas Sterling in Rome.)

Hair worn long—not shoulder length but over the ears . . . casual clothes, not drab prison uniforms . . . 10-to-12-man dormitories instead of cells . . . day paroles to take a job outside . . .

That's prison reform in Canada.

Five hundred and fifty of the nation's 2,000 most hardened prisoners working in regular jobs outside prison walls. . . .

That's prison reform, in Italy.

"Open punishment"—confinement without bars . . . a choice of work or study . . . furloughs for family visits. . . .

That's prison reform, in Sweden.

Working in the community to "pay" for crimes . . . day training centers to help inmates understand their problems. . . .

That's the future of prison reform, in Britain.

In a wide-ranging Monitor survey of how major industrialized nations handle their convicts, all the countries analyzed had one prime target: rehabilitation. Mere incarceration, they found, just does not work.

The vast majority of their convicts are repeat offenders, just as in the U.S.

Most prisoners, it is widely believed, can be rehabilitated and returned to a constructive life.

Said one Italian expert: "Most people who do wrong . . . are not one person but two. If you can make them one person again it's all right. If not there isn't much hope."

There are many ways to reach the common goal of rehabilitation.

CANADA

The government, led by Solicitor-General Jean Pierre Goyer, has launched a broad program of reform that aims to end the "depersonalizing" of prisons and their "total isolation from society."

No longer are large, maximum security prisons being built. (Two were recently completed, but construction on a third was stopped.) They are to be replaced by "mini-prisons" accommodating no more than 150 inmates each.

To create smaller communities within large existing prisons, "living units" of 10-to-12 prisoners are to be formed. Inmates will live in dormitories rather than in cells. To build constructive relationships between supervisors and prisoners, one set of guards will be assigned permanently to one unit of prisoners.

The communities will try to function independently of the rest of the institution.

Prerelease centers will be set up within existing penitentiaries, to allow prisoners nearing the end of their sentences gradually to spend more daytime hours "outside." Just before release, they should be using the institution solely as a dormitory.

More paroles are being granted, to allow prisoners to take a job or attend school "outside."

Military-type furloughs will be granted to inmates on a merit basis.

Other attempts, too, are being made to improve life within Canada's prisons.

Inmate committees, selected by inmates themselves, have been formed in each of the country's 36 federal institutions, with access to the office of the institution's director (the title of "warden" was scrapped recently). They can make complaints and give advice, though final decisions remain with the director.

The committees have also proved useful in pinpointing potential trouble spots. They've complained about the treatment of particular individuals by guards, or by other inmates, and about attitude and performance of prison staff generally.

Another channel for airing frustrations: mail addressed by prisoners to members of Parliament cannot now be opened by prison officials.

Smaller changes, but nonetheless important, have taken place in prison regulations detailing personal appearance. Inmates can, within limits, wear their hair in up-to-date styles. "We won't go along with over the shoulders, but over the ears is okay," one official said.

Prison clothing has been changed to resemble outside casual dress. Inmates can vary it from time to time by adding a sweater or other items that they themselves choose.

Canadian prison reform does not include conjugal visits; but the aim is to give more privacy when family members visit prisoners.

The biggest problem in Canadian prisons, as in others around the world, is how to deal with sexual behavior of prisoners who are cut off from contact with the outside world. Officials want to reduce and end homosexuality; but they see no easy solution yet.

ITALY

A remarkably successful experiment has been carried out over the past two years with 550 of the country's 2,000 habitual criminals.

The prisoners—in two workhouses where habitual offenders are sent after serving their formal sentences—were split into two groups. Jobs were obtained for them on the "outside." Once they started working they had complete freedom to come and go, subject only to a return to the workhouse by 10 o'clock every night.

They could take up any activity, or study, as well as work. They could keep whatever money they earned, although they had to pay for their quarters at the workhouse and for the food they ate there.

Earning money "outside" made a significant difference. A skilled electrician inside the workhouse made less than a dollar a day, and would have to contribute some of this

for his support. Outside he could earn 5-to-10 times as much.

The most important aspect of the program was forming the prisoners into groups. Since there weren't always enough jobs to go around, they had to take turns working "outside." Competition to get outside, and stay there was intense.

It was made clear that if any one prisoner got into trouble the whole group would be in trouble.

Results: astonishing.

In two years not the slightest trouble has come up. No dishonesty has been found, not even over a few cents. Even more surprising: No one has tried to escape.

Said one prisoner: "I went to jail for the first time at 18. Altogether I've done 17 years, mostly for thefts . . . I've never really had a job before, and it's not bad. I make pretty good money. If I'd known about this before, I'd have started when I was a kid."

One criminologist involved in the experiment explained: "Our team has established human relations with the prisoners. . . . We have found a way of individualizing sentences, against the traditional system. That system has shown itself a failure; punishment for its own sake has little effect."

And all this, in a nation where the official attitude toward offenders is harsh.

At best in the past, the objective has been to put habitual criminals behind bars, and when their sentences have been served, to keep them under almost constant surveillance in workhouses, for minimum periods, but no maximum. Judges often extend the periods for many years.

The "working outside" experiment came at a time when a comprehensive prison-reform bill has passed the Senate but has yet gone through the Chamber of Deputies.

SWEDEN

Of all Western nations, Sweden probably has the most progressive prison system—although it does not have to contend with many of the racial, political, and social upheavals facing a country like the United States.

The Swedish attitude, embodied in law, is that prisons should ease "the offender's adjustment to society." Treatment of the prisoner is aimed at rehabilitation, not punishment.

"Open punishment"—confinement without bars—is preferred in all cases except those involving danger to the public.

The greater number of drug addicts is a factor which has increased the need for more closed forms of treatment," says a 1971 Swedish Government commission report.

Swedish prison officials try to adapt the treatment of each individual to his particular needs. Relations between guards and prisoners tend to be relaxed and, often, in the nature of instructors to pupils.

For most Swedish convicts, life is what they make it. They may work if they so desire, but are not forced to do so. Instead they may choose a mixture of education, special studies, athletics, and "therapeutic" activities guided by prison social workers. The Swedish convict is allowed "furloughs" to visit his family. If he is transferred from one prison to another, he is allowed to travel by himself. (This does not apply to criminals judged to be still dangerous to society.)

EDUCATION CONTINUED

Prisoners who "misuse" their furloughs by extending them are few.

A number of prisoners live in barracks near universities where they continue their studies toward a degree or postprison job.

A few prisoners of exemplary behavior are permitted to move with their wives into special houses near the correctional institution.

Inmates who work at prison shops are paid the going market wage, pay taxes, and receive regular benefits as normal workers do. Some Swedish prisoners go out to work in ordinary factories and shops.

According to Swedish prison expert Torsten Eriksson, it becomes harder and harder "to land in jail in Sweden, with the exception of drunken driving, against which Swedish law is applied with merciless severity."

Most categories of offenders pay their debt to society as probationers and not as prisoners within an institution. The one exception is the growing number of Swedish drug addicts, many of whom are locked up to protect society and themselves.

BRITAIN

Offenders should perform some kind of community service to "pay" for crimes, many British experts believe. The new 1971 criminal-justice bill, now moving through Parliament, introduces a detailed plan.

Courts will be able to require a person aged 17 or over, convicted of an offense punishable by imprisonment, to do between 40 and 240 hours of unpaid work for the community.

The bill also proposes day training centers to try and diagnose an offender's educational, vocational, or social handicaps and to help him tackle them; supervision for some of those who receive suspended sentences; deferring sentences to give offenders a chance to make amends with the prospects of a reduced sentence or even an absolute discharge.

Maximum penalties for some firearms offenses are also increased: Life imprisonment becomes the maximum sentence for possessing a firearm with the intent to endanger life, and for using it to resist arrest.

The effect is to plug the gap left by the abolition of capital punishment.

The bill gives courts power to order a convicted person to pay for personal injury or damage to property. For the first time a wealthy criminal's assets can be tapped to compensate victims.

CONSTRUCTIVE ATMOSPHERE

Grendon Psychiatric Prison, the first of its kind in Britain, was opened in 1962 to treat personality disorders in a prison setting. Techniques may spread to other prisons. The object, government officials say, is to develop "a constructive community atmosphere, under psychiatric supervision." All the staff are involved in the therapy program, in however small a measure.

Grendon's accomplishments so far are mixed. On the one hand it has run a closed prison with special emphasis on prisoners' psychological disturbances, and building an atmosphere of trust. But recidivism rates of its adults and youths are not spectacularly lower than those of other penal institutions.

"Group counseling," says the Home Office in London, "has been found a useful way of helping some young men in borstals [boys' correctional institutions] to face up to their difficulties and to understand more easily the reasons for behavior which is not acceptable to society."

Disagreements exist between professional staff who encourage prisoners to shout as a means of getting their troubles and aggressions out in the open, and prison administrators who insist that control, not crisis, is fundamental in a big institution.

BOYS' WINGS DO BEST

Grendon appears to do its best work in the borstal section, two wings of 30 boys each.

At 8 a.m. everybody—staff and residents—try to get things off their chest—complaints, annoyances, anxieties.

In the afternoon, small groups of boys and prison officials get together and talk things over. Good relationships are built up and many have proved durable.

Many boys come back to see their officers after release. They are encouraged to keep in touch, even to telephoning collect to Grendon from anywhere in the country if they need help. Officers and staff psychotherapists are encouraged to visit the boys at home. Even so, a sadly surprising number of Grendon

borstal boys return to crime after a year outside.

The trend, however, is toward creating a hopeful atmosphere, pinpointing and dealing with the individual's problems, and returning him to a constructive life.

No. 50061, INSIDE MAXIMUM SECURITY—6 DAYS IN STATE PRISON THROUGH THE EYES OF A "MURDERER"—II

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

The aging forger slid over the bench where we were watching television.

"Did you really do it?"

"Do what?"

"You know. The murder."

I looked at him in astonishment. Prisoners don't say things like that to each other. It's the kind of question a clumsy informer asks.

"No," I told him coldly, "I didn't."

It was true. I was in a maximum security penitentiary for murder. But I hadn't killed anyone. No one at the prison—warden, guards, inmates—knew that. All they knew was that one night, two state policemen delivered me in handcuffs as a "transfer" from a distant county jail.

Huntingdon State Correctional Institution is a fortress behind high brick walls and gun towers in the mountains of central Pennsylvania. It was designed to make sure that no man would break out. It had been hard for me to break in. But finally I was here, in crumpled institutional uniform, Prisoner No. 50061, sitting in Cell Block A with my fellow inmates—murderers, rapists, armed robbers, forgers, burglars.

For three months, I had looked at the American prison system as an outsider, observing men behind bars and talking about them the way a tourist visits a zoo. Prison experts agreed that perception of what it means to be imprisoned in America remains dim unless you are on the other side of the bars. They were right. Months of interviewing prisoners, former prisoners, corrections administrators and research scientists, as well as reading dozens of books and reports, had not prepared me for the emotional and intellectual impact of maximum-security incarceration.

On the night of Friday, Dec. 17, two undercover Pennsylvania state policemen delivered me to the state penitentiary.

When they were gone, there was no one inside the prison who knew that I was not really "Benjamin Barsamian," county prisoner awaiting grand jury action for murder.

A trusty, an older prisoner, led me to cell No. 114. The door didn't close behind me with a "clang" as it does on television. It clicked. Firmly.

The cell has no window. It is about seven feet by eight, with a steel cot, small wooden table and chair, a metal shelf on the wall. In one corner near the door there is a porcelain seatless toilet and directly above it a porcelain sink with spring-loaded push-buttons for hot and cold water. Above that a square of shiny metal is riveted to the wall for a mirror.

Two sheets and blankets are on the cot. I make up the bed. The mattress is about an inch thick.

A guard puts a piece of paper on my cell door. "That has your name on it—in case you get lost."

The only light inside the cell is a square fixture above the door, aimed into the cell, casting a pale, yellow light into the eyes.

The corridor lights go dim. A turnkey comes by to double-lock each cell door for the night.

Suddenly I am very tired. I remember that I didn't have dinner. There is nothing to read and nothing in my pockets. It is hard to sleep.

The new sounds fill the mind. Unseen prisoners snore or call out in their sleep. Periodically, someone is heard urinating, followed by the explosive flush. Or there is the percussive bang of the faucet springs in the

sinks. The telephone on the guard's desk rang all night. From time to time there is a quick footstep as a guard shines a five-battery flashlight into the cell for bed checks.

Sleepless, I experience the first surprise of imprisonment: it is difficult mentally to create the outside world. The prison is so drained of normal clues that it is hard to connect, even in the imagination, the reality of inside with the strangely remote reality of outside.

It takes a conscious act of will to recreate the events of that same day.

INFILTRATING A PRISON

The day started with a normal morning at The Washington Post; lunch in a favorite Washington restaurant with a favorite person; driving to Pennsylvania in the late afternoon with the long, yellow light of the setting sun lying gently on the golden stubble of cornfields and the still-green meadows; being stopped by a Pennsylvania state trooper for speeding and being unable to tell him I was late for my imprisonment for murder, and later laughing at myself for driving to the penitentiary in a rented automobile.

In my cell, it is hard to make vivid the memory that only four hours earlier I was in the Pennsylvania State House in Harrisburg, in the office of Attorney General J. Shane Creamer, who made the imprisonment possible and who, with his top assistants, gave me a rapid-fire briefing on my cover story. And the cold two-hour drive from State House to state pen, arguing the pros and cons of capital punishment with the two undercover state policemen.

I worry for a moment if my project has been secret enough. Weeks earlier I was about to enter the Oklahoma State Penitentiary at McAlester when an ex-convict visited me and said, "You'll never get out alive. Too many people know about it and the grapevine down there has picked it up."

A prisoner entering under false pretenses is automatically assumed to be a planted informer, an occupation with high mortality rates.

I also make sure that I remember Creamer's private home phone number, the only thing I might use in a jam to convince a guard that I'm not a real prisoner. A week earlier as we left Creamer's living room he asked Allyn Sielaff, his director of corrections, whether in the event that trouble developed at the prison I couldn't tell a guard I was really a newspaperman and wanted to speak to the attorney general. Sielaff broke into a grin.

"Oh, he could do that, all right. They'd just think he was crazy."

Only when the difficulty of vivid recollection of the outside world recurs day after day do I realize that it is not because of fatigue or tension or a bizarre day. In prison, the outside world quickly becomes unreal.

Around 5:30 in the morning, the turnkey comes by turning the bolts on each door. It does not release the door. Every cell on the tier is automatically locked by a 200-foot-long bar. Only when that moves about four inches, with an almost inaudible rattle, does it release the doors.

"Now men—chow!" I was told last night to ignore that call. The bar moves and after 30 seconds closes the tier again. Five minutes later, at about 7 a.m., there is another shout, "DCCH—chow!" That's it.

Like all entering inmates, I am in DCCH, Diagnostic Classification Center, Huntingdon, the first weeks of prison when there is recording of personal and criminal histories, some testing and assignment to a permanent cell block and permanent prison work in the soap factory, printing plant or clothing mill. The bar moves to the open position and I step out of my cell.

SOME UNFIERCE COMPANIONS

I see my group for the first time, about 25 men with rumpled hair shuffling to line up along the wall. Mostly in their twenties,

mostly with long hair, sideburns and some beards. Three blacks. All looking unfierce.

The guard says, "Let's go," and we walk in loose formation through the Center, the hub of the prison. I fall in next to an older man who nods briefly.

At the dining hall, a large room with about 20 rows of ten tables, each table with four wooden seats attached. All 700 prisoners eat together.

At the entry is a table with a large container of utensils. A uniformed guard wearing transparent plastic gloves picks up one knife, one spoon and one fork and hands them to each prisoner. We shuffle to the cafeteria line, taking metal, walled trays from a rack. Inmate workers hand out the food, sometimes helping it into the tray with hands encased in the surgical looking clear plastic gloves: one fried egg, a cookie, box of dry cereal with milk, grits, coffee.

Each group occupies a single row of tables. The kid next to me asks if I'm new and I asked what it's like here.

"Guards here are pretty good. Used to be a lot of head-knockers here. Real rough. Used to hit you with pipes and clubs. But they got rid of most of them. A few . . . left, though."

SELF-SEGREGATION OF RACES

The dining hall is strictly segregated, self-segregated I'm told. Blacks all together, whites in their own rows.

At a sign from our guard we return our trays to the cafeteria line, rinsing out our steel coffee cups. We carry our utensils to the door where another guard watches as each man deposits one knife, one spoon and one fork. No retention of weapons material.

We walk back to the cell block and are locked into our cells. There is nothing to do. Nothing to read. Razor and toothbrush and other personal effects were sealed up last night.

At lunch I sit next to Mack, a tall Hell's Angel type, unbuttoned shirt showing masses of tattoos long hair in the neck, chin whiskers, a cross tattooed on the left cheekbone.

He speaks with a curious Southern accent. As a black prisoner walks by he says loudly, "There goes a prince." Another black walks by, "There goes the king." He looks at me and laughs. I don't laugh. He scowls.

He eats a spoonful of ice cream from his paper container and then offers me the rest. I decline. He looks at me steadily and says, "Gettin' pretty — bad when a man can't give away some — ice cream just because he took a bite on it." Back at the cell block his cell is directly above mine on the second tier. As we wait in front of our cells for the bar to move, he drops a match on me. I figure I'll have trouble with him. He turns out to be my best friend.

In late afternoon, I am called to the hospital again. Still no pills and no razor. Return to cell block. As Christmas week extra, can watch television.

Mack is on the bench behind me. I remember some last minute advice given me, "Don't turn your back to anyone's cell; they can stab through the bars. And keep your back to the wall." I remain conscious of Mack.

After supper comes the daily exercise in prison democracy: inmates vote on television programs. Between 6:30 and 9 prisoners have a choice of activity. They can watch television at one end of the corridor. They can play pinochle at tables at the other end. They can sit on the concrete floor and talk in the middle. Or they can choose to remain locked in their cells.

If men choose to watch television they can vote as a guard reads out the six choices for each half-hour segment. Men on the other side of the cell block join us, so there was close to 50 per cent black sitting on the benches. Relaxed but separate.

The first vote is on "Hee Haw," an all-white country-and-western program. It's on racial lines, most whites for it, all the blacks against

it. Whites win. Overwhelming vote for "All in the Family." On subsequent nights, "Gun-smoke" is another big favorite. Also Dragnet.

CONVERSATIONS FULL OF DARING

Then begins what was to be repeated day and night, the catechism of prison conversation: daring crimes taking incredible chances, violent fights, big hauls on robberies with the money spent. "So I put the muzzle of that — .38 right against the neck of the — and said "Jess drop your wallet . . ."

Psychological conquest of prison is an important theme. Long sentences are greeted with respect. If a man faces five years he says, "I can handle it." Someone asks how Huntingdon compares with other joints. "Man, I've seen 'em all, and I don't really see that much difference. I can get along in any of them. You just go in, don't — with anyone, pick your own group and stay with them." Or, "The hole? Why in Ohio State I was in the hole for 30 — days for fighting. First day I got out I find the same — and Phoom! I bust his jaw. Back in the hole for 60 days . . ."

A standard story told by a half dozen men on different occasions in various forms is the inmate's version of a profane and defiant speech to the judge who sentenced him.

"Send me up for life if you want, you —. I don't give a — what you do." And I turned my back on the — and walked right out of the — courtroom." Like the sex fantasies of barracks life in the Army, it's almost certain most of the speeches were never made.

In personal conversations without an audience there is less bravado, less violence.

"See that guy over there from B block? He's the greatest escape artist ever."

"Yeah? Just escaped from the street into Huntingdon State Penitentiary?"

Toward the end of the evening, Ollie limps over and sits on the floor. He says he might have to be transferred for an operation. One of the group says, "Don't let them send you to Pittsburgh." Ollie asks what was wrong with the state pen at Pittsburgh.

"Niggers control that. This is our place."

Mack shakes his head.

"Ah'll tell you, wherever the niggers are, they try to take over. Indiana State, the — weren't even a majority and they took it over. You got to fight them or they'll do it every time. They ain't taking this joint over, I'll tell you that."

That afternoon during the movie, the villain is shown fullface on the screen during his most despicable moment. From a black group of prisoners comes the shout, "That's a white man for you!" From a white group: "He's probably a Jew."

Although something like half the prison population is black, I see only one black officer on the staff. Most of the guards seem relaxed, able to small-talk their way around tense moments, avoiding harsh confrontations, establishing an atmosphere of easy relations with most of the prisoners.

Two or three of the guards are noticeable by contrast: rigid personalities, barking orders, speaking in contemptuous tones. It is remarkable how easy it is for a single harsh order to put everyone's teeth on edge. Prison is depressing and demoralizing, the walls and bars and guards and gates and steel and concrete remind one every moment that he is not free, that he is not a whole man because his whole physical being is under someone else's control. Easy-going guards keep that from being an intolerable challenge. A few barked orders in a harsh tone raise the level of felt hostility.

It makes you realize that a couple of guards could bring the place to a crisis in a short time. At Huntingdon, the guards do not seem very sophisticated or educated—many of the prisoners are obviously more so than the staff—but this doesn't seem related much to their effectiveness at preventing

confrontations. Most are skilled at easy relations and relaxed manner. With whites.

There is little or no visible antagonism to blacks among staff, merely an evident lack of communication.

One day one of the blacks in my section is sweeping the catwalks, singing in a high-pitched voice like Ray Charles.

"What the hell are you doing?" the guard, an older man, yells harshly.

A young white inmate sitting on the floor near the guard says, "Oh, he's just that way, you know," and he twirls his finger around his ear, indicating nuttiness. The guard mutters, "They're all like that."

Up on the catwalk, the black continues his zany singing in a thin voice and only if you listen carefully can you hear him singing phrases that included, "honky . . ."

In the exercise yard a few days later the same young black, a Muslim, is not jiving as he argues with a white prisoner:

"Ours is the religion. God is in us. We have the power of God in us. You never see the guards — with any Muslims, do you? You know you haven't. Why you think that is?"

At 9 o'clock, the television set is turned off, its plywood container locked, the floor swept and everyone locked and double-locked in his cell for the night.

HUSBANDS AND WIVES

The second day, a large homosexual inmate is moved into the cell next to me. He is an outstanding athlete, which may explain why he is treated with some deference.

Homosexualism is evident. In the auditorium the queens are obvious, some primping their hair, others walking in tight trousers with swaying hips. Some arm-in-arm and referred to casually as husband and wife.

My neighbor is referred to as "she" and "her" and plays the role of woman openly. The first night he is on the cell block, he borrows a razor blade from me, saying, "My husband will pay you back tomorrow." At supper one night he says to me, "Does my lipstick show?" Back at the cell block he has a quarrel with another homosexual, shouting at him, "You walk around here like you are God's gift to men."

Later my neighbor turns hostile to me. One night he asks, "Are you a Jew?" and when I said I was not, said, "Then why have you got such a crooked nose."

There are jokes about my neighbor, but in anger they center on his blackness, not his sexual role.

At 2 a.m. one morning, my neighbor begins singing in a falsetto. Curses come from around the cell block as men wake up. "Shut up!" "For Christ's sake, stop it!" The whites refrain from too open anti-black epithets. But my neighbor shouts back, "White —!" When the other prisoners keep shouting, my neighbor goes to his cell door and rattles it, calling, "Guard! Guard! Come here. Hack! Hack! I need you."

The prison is not on the edge of racial conflict, at least to this eye. But hostility is near the surface.

We take daily showers in a room with two rows of shower heads controlled and observed by a guard behind a plate-glass window. Again there is self-segregation. Blacks shower together at one end, including my neighbor.

EARNING 25 CENTS A DAY

I still have no reading material on the third day. Mack gets some correspondence forms and lends me a ballpoint pen.

Most of the time I still sit in the cell and stare at the standard view: the steel lattice-work on my cell door, silhouetted against the lighted corridor wall beyond. When you close your eyes you still "see" the scene, but in reverse like a photographic negative, the image burned into your retina. Almost all the visible lines are straight

and rectilinear, all the colors subdued, from the tan walls to the guard's grey uniforms. For some reason, my eye keeps going to a pipe entering my cell through the lattice-work and later I realize that it is one of the few curved lines in my scenery. Everything soft or tender or complex has been eliminated. Surfaces are all hard: tile, steel, concrete, brick. So sounds echo, harsh but indistinct.

Even the steel mirror on my wall is a shadow and reflects only a blurred gray image. On the third day, still unshaven, I walk by a clear mirror on the cellblock wall that lets guards look around a corner and I see "another prisoner" appropriately crumpled and grim. It is my own image. Shocking.

One morning at 8, I hear the whistle from the prison soap factory. I envy the inmates their work. Shortly afterward a trusty comes to the cell door.

"Hey, want to work?"

As an unsentenced prisoner, I cannot be forced to work.

"You can make 25 cents a day."

I leap at the opportunity.

I mop the concrete floor of the cell block. As we work around the guard's desk, one young inmate says he's going to California when he gets out.

The kid next to him said, "What'll you do if you can't make it and you're on the West Coast?"

"I'll just pull another armed robbery."

An older guard, tipping back in his chair, said:

"That's where you're wrong. You better not do that in California. Ronald Reagan, he don't — around. He'll just put you in the gas chamber."

I'm called to the hospital to see the prison doctor. He has seen my shaving kit with the medication in it.

"I don't see any problem with giving him the synthroid," he says to no one in particular. "If he takes them all he can't kill himself."

He turns to some sleeping pills and then to me.

"I don't see why anyone needs medication to go to sleep at night. If he gets off his — and does some work he won't have any trouble sleeping."

I decide not to tell him that we're locked in our cells from 17 to 20 hours a day.

A HINT OF THE OUTSIDE WORLD

Even volunteering for work does not prevent the hours of idleness. But the idleness produces less clearness of thought than I expected. It is hard to think of life on the outside with any immediacy. Important places become blurred in memory in an alarmingly short time.

Prison is total. It strains out clues to normal life and in the void every petty detail on the inside becomes important. Relations with other inmates take on a profound quality. Nothing outside the wall seems real any more. It may be no accident that television news is voted down every night.

Yet what fragments of the outside world do intrude become desperately alive. In the early morning hours, if I go to the door of my cell, I can see a small patch of sky through a window in the upper corridor wall. In the predawn hours there is a strange anxiety because the sky is not visible, an uncertain grasp of time and reality. The first light of dawn becomes exciting, the slight of drifting snowflakes intensely moving, the shadow of a bird in flight miraculous.

The first time we are permitted outdoors is an almost explosive experience, an enormous view of blue sky. The yard is an asphalt surface 50 feet by 200, surrounded by the wall.

Another man and I walk the continuous oblong for two hours in bitter cold, but it seems like five minutes. He had been a woodcutter in Pennsylvania and a hunting guide in Montana and is doing 1-to-6. "I can handle

it," he says. "If I do the six I'll only be 30 years old."

The guard on the tower watches us and when we begin taking larger corners into a blind spot, he has to come outside the glassed-in enclosure and stand on the outer parapet huddled into his coat. As we walk we talk about woods, animals in Montana, airplanes, cities, rural life.

When I return to my cell, Mack has deposited, through his genius at mobility and delivery, two eight-month-old Time magazines, one old Argosy, an old TV guide for Pittsburgh. I read them all, cover to cover.

The next day is library call. Practically every prisoner goes and some of them make surprising selections. After meticulous analysis of the October TV listings for Pittsburgh, it is exotic reading Dean Acheson, Simone de Beauvoir and Gore Vidal.

YOU HERE FOR YOUR HEALTH?

Anxiety about my cover, which means my safety, doesn't develop until the fourth day. It is at lunch. At my table is a man from our section who was friendly at first but then cooled off. He is well educated, likes to whistle Mozart and Bach themes, and has lots of reading material which he promised me but never delivered.

He has been increasingly suspicious of me and I have stayed clear of him, especially after I found out that he worked in the front office and has access to an outside telephone. If he called the county jail I was supposed to have come from they would never have heard of me. If he discovered that, the word would get to my friends who would make an unfriendly assumption.

"You here for your health?" he asks as we eat.

He means was I sent here to protect me from threats of other prisoners. I replied that I wasn't.

"What are you charged with?"

"Murder."

"Where?"

"Adams County."

"This is a long way from Adams."

"They think it will be a long wait before I get to the grand jury."

"They usually transfer men to Camp Hill."

I shrug. But I have a feeling time is running out.

I worry about confidences other prisoners had shared with me; they might be remembered if they heard I was under an assumed name. I begin walking away from crucial conversation.

But conversation is hard to avoid. It has special meaning in prison relations, where men are thrown together almost at random and must make crucial decisions about each other.

Prisoners live in fear of each other and in trust at the same time. They have fear because everyone is under total control of the authorities, who can influence whether a man will serve two years or six, or live in a savage cell block or a civilized one, have a pleasant job or distasteful one, avoid punishment or be sent to maddening isolation. The prisoner is forever navigating this jungle. Some do it with weapons for self-defense or for coercion, weapons usually fashioned from scavenged metal. But the more common weapon is information that can win a recommendation for parole or pleasant assignments. So fear of betrayal is constant.

But inmates need each other and need to trust each other. They are united in common hatred of the criminal justice system. They are united in loneliness. Wives, girlfriends, parents, working colleagues, friends, the usual universe by which a man finds his identity and humanness, all are gone. In the void, fellow inmates becomes indispensable.

There is a code of etiquette in prison. You can ask a man what offense he is in for, how long his sentence is, maybe where he comes from and what other prisons he has been in.

After that, it is up to him to volunteer information. The result usually is a great deal of talk, personal history and reactions to people and life. You enjoy the trust of others but at the same time fear it. Everyone is trapped together and each man has the power to harm the others. Trust and betrayal are potential in every relationship.

After I feel the twinge of paranoia, I stay out of the blind spots in the exercise yard, the spots in the corners out of view of the guard in the guntower, two of which I have found in the mental game of "escape" that everyone plays. I stay away from bunched-up lines at the dining hall. All unneeded, no doubt.

THE VALUES OF PRISONERS

In his own way, Mack is a puritan. "There was that m—ing car, free and clear, not a cent owed on it, and I couldn't drive it. I didn't owe a m—ing nickel on it, not a dime. Took me two armed robberies to get it, but I owned it free of debt."

I wonder why my best friends are men whose social values I abhor. They are mostly racists who in their careers hurt innocent people. They are often liars and braggarts, not only in their dealings with the authorities, which was required, or in bull sessions, which is forgiveable, but also in their personal lives. Their talk is full of killing, shooting, pimping, treachery, treachery avenged and the endurance of suffering.

They exist beyond the bravado and toughness that in prison is necessary for self-defense. They have other feelings but they had no vocabulary for them. I marvel that for some unfathomable reason, after years of being bruised by their parents (Mack's mother laughed at him when he was arrested at age 14; thereafter he had four stepmothers and five stepfathers, by their families, after years of chaos and abandonment, years of imprisonment in various degrees of savagery and subjugation, their spirit, is unbroken. They refuse to be beaten. Some are strange and withdrawn. Most are not.

One day, as I watch the population file out of the auditorium, they suddenly strike me as not so different-looking from the students I had seen a few months before at the University of Wisconsin: same cool shuffle, beards, sideburns, the quick quizzical eyes, clothes worn shaggily—prison clothes don't look so different any more—but very cool.

Most of the men are in their low 20s. If the men at Huntington had four more grades of median school achievement and \$3,000 more in parental median income they could be filing out of the auditorium of the state university instead of the state penitentiary. There is much talk about their experience at "Indiana State" and "Ohio State." But they mean state pens. The universities of the poor.

The morning I am supposed to be pulled out of prison I go to work as janitor in the schoolroom. I begin to wonder if they will pull me out today. Maybe there is a big crisis on the outside and everyone will forget.

Just before lunch, I am ordered to the identification office. They are finally going to complete my records, take my mug shot and fingerprints. Time is running out.

I give the man my name, charge, county and hearing judge. He asks my Social Security number. I remember the briefing in the attorney general's office: "You don't remember your Social Security number. Be clear on that. If they have your Social Security number, they can pick up their phone and in 30 seconds know everything they need to know about you."

The fingerprint man is working on me when a clerk walks up. "Hey, one of these guys has to go back to the county today. They're coming for him at 2 o'clock."

Two hours later, after my sixth day, two men in plain clothes issue the prison a "Body Receipt" for prisoner Benjamin Barsamian who, 40 feet beyond and two minutes later,

outside the wall in the unlimited air, ceases to exist.

BUREAUCRATIC OVERLOAD TURNS JUSTICE TO MISERY—III

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

They look like a Norman Rockwell painting of democratic American life—kindergarten kids, some Orientals, some black, some Caucasian, cheeks rosy in the morning cold, skipping and laughing, paired hand-in-hand, with two good-natured teachers guiding them along the sidewalk of Baxter Street.

A few of the children look curiously at the scene across the street. Fourteen men, all blacks, handcuffed in pairs, shivering in their shirtsleeves, jump out of a police van and disappear into a steel doorway of the Manhattan House of Detention, the Tombs.

The first thought prompted by the sight of innocent eyes watching the gray scene is, "Thank God they don't know what it's like inside." The second thought is, "Perhaps they should. Some of them, some time in their lives, will be held in a jail."

Of all places of restraint, jails are the worst. They are detention centers where men, women and children get their introduction to the criminal justice system, where they are held after their arrest, where they stay awaiting trial unless they have bail money, or where they serve short sentences for minor crimes. Most are designed for only short stay; prisons are for sentenced people.

But for people too poor to make bail: an overloaded and creeping bureaucracy of justice keeps them in compacted misery for weeks, months or years, the majority of them not yet convicted of anything.

The Tombs is famous: 12 floors of cages, the scene of a spectacular series of prisoner rebellions in 1970 against overcrowding, racial abuse, vermin, court delays. It is now more than a year after the rebellions were put down with promises of reform.

I enter the public door.

Minutes later, the chairman of the City's Board of Corrections, William Van Den Heuvel, arrives, an old Kennedy hand in the Kennedy manner, big, shell-rimmed glasses, full of bounce. We are admitted and start taking elevators to various floors.

Each floor has a double tier of cells with adjoining small concrete and steel enclosures where prisoners spend the day playing solitaire or dominoes. As guards let us inside, Van Den Heuvel is surrounded by men, like a feudal lord beseeched by beggars inside the castle wall.

"Mr. Van Den Heuvel, please help me. They've lost my papers and I've been here four months. . . ."

"Mr. Van Den Heuvel, I'm afraid I'm gonna go out of my mind. They transferred me from Rikers a week ago but they didn't bring my medication and these headaches I can't stand. . . ."

"Please help me. I'm an addict. I been on heroin 17 years. I got on a methadone program on the outside and got off heroin. But I got arrested and brought to the Tombs. I'm on methadone now but they tell me that when I get out tomorrow I can't get back on the street program because I missed a treatment and they got a waiting list that takes 30 days. I'm afraid I'll go back on heroin. . . ."

"Please help me"—his hands reached through the bars of his cell—"I'm locked up because I'm a homicide case. But the sink here leaks and there's water on the floor all the time. My feet are wet. Can't you do something. . . ."

One whole floor holds homosexuals. On another floor a dozen young blacks do calisthenics in military formation. Our escort, Capt. Paul Feltman, 17 years a guard, says, "Look at 'em Panthers. Black Panthers. Killers."

An older white man with a painted smile

cries out from a locked cell. "Hey, come here. I'm here by mistake. I'm a native New Yorker. I know my way around. I've been to Harvard. I've been to Harvard twice. I know my way around. They made a mistake. Hey, hey, listen . . ."

I ask Van Den Heuvel what they do with psychotic prisoners. "If the psychiatrist says a man is psychotic, the man goes to Bellevue. Bellevue will hold him only while he's acute, meaning physically unmanageable. Then they send him back."

Why isn't he sent to a mental hospital?

"No way. They're full, too."

He guesses that 15 per cent of the prisoners are mentally ill. That would be about 220 men. There is one full-time psychiatrist.

EPIDEMIC OF SUICIDE ATTEMPTS

There have been 11 suicides and over 100 attempts in the last year. In the last few months, there has been an epidemic of men breaking the toilets in their cells and attempting suicide with the pieces. It takes the city nine months to replace a toilet.

Memory of the riots is still strong among prisoners. One shouts at us, "Hey, newspaperman. Ask them about the roaches and the rats. Ask them!"

Capt. Feltman yells at the prisoner, "Show me a rat! Go ahead, show one to me. Those aren't rats, they're mice. Don't you know the difference between a rat and a mouse?"

The day the riots began, the Tombs with a rated capacity of 902 men, had 1,416 prisoners, 57 per cent overcrowded, the day I visited, 13 months later, the rated capacity was 873 because of damaged cells, and there were 1,463 prisoners, 68 per cent overcrowded.

After the riots, the city somehow found \$2 million in emergency funds. It added 24 tons of steel on each floor to increase protection of the staff.

Outside, the school kids were long gone. Over the door of the Tombs-court complex is the inscription:

"Justice Is the Firm and Continuous Desire to Render to Every Man His Due."

And under that a bronze plaque notes that this building was erected on the site of the underground railroad that helped free black men from slavery.

New York City is not alone in the misery of its jails. Last year a group of inmates in Baltimore City Jail petitioned the city court for relief from the following claimed treatment:

Officers in the jail regularly forced some retarded inmates to perform sexual acts on the officers; other retarded inmates were chained to the bars of their cells and beaten with keys; inmates in Sections N and O, while confined and peaceable in their cells, were Maced by guards because inmates had protested their treatment; when an inmate told a guard he was suffering from narcotics withdrawal the guard Maced him; inmates had been warned not to talk or write about conditions in the jail.

Riots over overcrowding and all that means—dirt, disease, homosexual rape, hysteria, exposure to psychotics—bring promises of relief.

In Wayne County Jail in Detroit, conditions did not lead to riots. Instead, there were 33 suicide attempts in two months.

Bad as city jails are, rural jails have their own special morbidity. Forrest County Jail, in Hattiesburg, Miss., isn't the worst but it isn't the best. The building may collapse. The cells are filthy, full of vermin, dirty rags and paper. The brick walls are so porous that some prisoners escaped by scraping away the mortar between bricks with a spoon.

In one year, the jail held 2,657 drunks, 688 people accused of felonies and 52 believed insane and awaiting commitment proceedings. It has held 12-year-old runaways and lost children in the same jail. Trials are held

only every three or four months and it is not unusual for a person to wait in jail nine months before anyone decides if he is guilty.

Until this year, the sheriff in charge of Forrest County Jail got no salary. Instead, he got \$4 for every arrest he made, 10 cents a mile for transporting the prisoner from place of arrest to the jail, \$2 for logging the prisoner into the jail, and \$2 for every prisoner held each day in the jail. There was no public money for food and other maintenance of the prisoners, so it came out of the sheriff's fees.

The state of Mississippi, as of this year, ended the fee system for sheriffs. But the practice continues in hundreds of counties across the country, rewarding sheriffs economically for making maximum arrests and jailings, and punishing him economically if he feeds and maintains the prisoners decently.

Forrest County is better than most in one respect. Its grand jury has regularly condemned the jail for years. Typical was their finding in 1968: "The grand jury is of the unanimous opinion that both the city jail of Hattiesburg and the county jails of Forrest County are unfit for human habitation."

Both are still being used.

No one knows how many jails, lockups and county camps there are in the United States. There is no way for inspecting them or imposing civilized standards on them.

The U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has counted those that are authorized to hold persons two days or more, and there are 4,037 with 161,000 men, women and children in them on a given day (5 percent women and 5 percent children).

LEAA says 86 percent have no exercise or recreation for inmates; 90 percent have no educational facilities; 50 percent have no medical care; and 1.4 percent have no flush toilets.

There are over 100,000 cells in these jails and more than 5,000 of them are over 100 years old. About 25 percent of these cells are over 50 years old.

More people than ever are headed for such places. The President's Crime Commission in 1967 said that 40 percent of all male children now living in the United States would be arrested for a nontraffic offense some time in their lifetime. Most of those will spend some time—hours or days or weeks or months—in a local jail.

THE PLANNING OF PRISONS

Unlike jails, prisons are built with the knowledge that they will hold inmates under sentence, usually for more than a year and sometimes for life. These institutions, usually for adult males, are not accidental in their design and operations but are elaborately planned and constructed and operated by large bureaucracies of fulltime careerists.

It is depressing to consider what some men will plan and operate. It took a lawsuit in Virginia to expose the following treatment in the State penitentiary:

An inmate who attempted suicide had his neck taped to his cell bars for 14 hours and then was left naked in his cell for 17 days; a black prisoner screamed for help in solitary confinement for one week before dying unattended of sickle cell anemia; one inmate was locked in his cell without being let out for 743 days.

Federal Judge Robert R. Merhige ordered drastic changes in the Virginia prison system to eliminate atrocities by protecting prisoners' rights. The head of the State prison system said these rights are "not practical in the prison situation."

The State of Alabama, proud of refusing all Federal aid, built a new maximum security

prison, the Holman unit, in Atmore, Alabama.

Holman was originally planned for 500 men; it now holds 800. There is not one classroom, no gymnasium, no auditorium, no hospital, no teachers, no psychologist, no social workers. There are very few guards—about 18 to a shift—and they are paid \$3,900 a year. The prison is heavily monitored by television and watched by a guard at a station with 30 monitor screens.

The prison is organized with some open dormitories, some multiple-occupancy cells and special cells for punitive segregation. Unfortunately, the television monitors show only shadows at night and men in dormitories make tents of blankets that the television can't see through. Homosexuals roam the dormitories freely and there are fights, stabbings, homosexual rapes and homosexual prostitution.

Rather than risk assignment to dormitories or to work details under brutal conditions, men sometimes prefer punitive segregation which is not exactly luxurious: the punitive cells have four men to a 5 1/2-by-7 1/2-foot cell with nothing in it but a single blanket and a five-inch-wide hole in the floor for a toilet. On one day, there were 145 men in segregation.

To avoid assignment to dormitories or segregation or work details with guards who are especially brutal, prisoners often cut their own Achilles tendons, an act that occurs about once a week.

The prison is shoddily built, leaks in the rain and leaks between floors. One official who works there says, "It must have been designed by a psychotic." The present warden was not associated with its design or construction.

Asked how he survived at Holman, one inmate said:

"One, you shoot dope. Two, you find yourself a boy and make out sexually. Three, you burn yourself out reading. Four, you just sleep."

THE RULE OF SILENCE

The deliberate debasement of human beings is not limited to Alabama state prisons.

The enlightened state of Wisconsin forbids prisoners in its maximum security penitentiary at Waupun to speak in their cells in the evening. In a special cell block, inmates may not speak at all and one inmate said he had spent 11 years without speaking except when spoken to by a guard.

Portsmouth County Jail in Virginia is a handsome, new high-rise structure overlooking the beautiful Elizabeth River and Norfolk harbor. It has a peculiar architectural feature: outside each barred window is a concrete slab held eight inches from the exterior wall. Its purpose is to prevent prisoners from seeing the view.

The most carefully designed prison system in the country is the Federal Bureau of Prisons. It has often been run with enlightened, humane administrators in Washington who recognize the prisoners are human beings who will return to mingle with their fellow citizens.

But Congress is the real boss of the federal prisons. In the past this has resulted, at best, in near neglect. There has been a Senate committee on prisons since 1924. Its annual appropriation of \$5,000 was usually turned back minus the cost of a few senatorial trips to a federal penitentiary for what the senators informally called "cockroach counts."

Many politicians, including some of the most fervent rhetoricians against crime in the street, have been shaping prison systems in ways that make it harder to protect society from crime.

A major problem in American prisons is their isolation in rural places, usually without public transportation. Families of prisoners cannot visit; marriages of inmates break up and normal ties are lost. The prison cannot find rural staff members who have rapport with the inmates, who are overwhelmingly urban and after a majority black. The prison has difficulty getting professionals—teachers, psychologists, psychiatrists, vocational trainers, social workers—to move to remote country locations. And if a prison decides to educate its prisoners or teach them marketable skills before their release, there are few local schools or factories where this can be done.

Nevertheless, prisons continue to be built in precisely the wrong places. The usual reason given is that land is cheaper and the isolation is better for security. Land is usually cheaper but that is not always a large factor, prisons are full of expensive hardware and cost as much as \$22,000 a bed to construct. And most rural prisons have had periodic escapes, while there has never been an escape from the most urban of all institutions, the Tombs, in the heart of Manhattan.

The real reason prisons are located in the country is that legislatures used to be controlled by rural politicians who placed the prisons there as profitable industries and opportunities for patronage.

Federal prisons have not escaped. Convenience for visitors is a difficult problem for any federal prison, since it holds inmates from all parts of the country, (though location near a big city would simplify travel). But federal prisons, like state and local ones, also suffer from rural locations in obtaining professional staff from the surrounding countryside and providing access to work, study and volunteer contacts for its programs.

The newest penitentiary in the federal system is the maximum security prison at Marion, Ill.

The prison was planned in 1958 and opened as a maximum security unit in 1969. It is eight miles from the town of Marion, which has a population of 11,000. The nearest city of any size is Evansville, Ind., 75 miles away. The nearest metropolis is St. Louis, 100 miles away.

The formal reason for putting it there was the availability of a federal wildlife preserve and security, since it replaced Alcatraz. The real reason is that the late Sen. Everett Dirksen, in addition to being Senate minority leader, was ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over federal penitentiaries. And he wished a federal facility in the southern tip of Illinois, where his strength lay and which at that time was suffering from economic depression.

For the first time, the past year has seen interest by some committees and individual members of Congress in the basic problems of prisons, prisoners and criminal justice. A few have gone into prisons for the first time to talk to inmates.

Their nearest stop is Lewisburg federal penitentiary, impossible to reach by public transportation, spacious, improbable Gothic arches and handcarved stone in the dining room, carefully but bureaucratically run (visiting rules: one kiss at the start, one kiss at the end), not without the pathology of most prisons (an officer told one militant prisoner, "Why don't you get yourself a boy and settle down") but better than most.

Not all prisons in America are grim dungeons with iron idleness. Here and there, the system has produced amenities that begin to resemble outside life. At California Men's Colony East, at Los Padres, a medium security prison, one inmate was disciplined for breaking a window when he hit a golf ball too hard on the prison's miniature golf course.

But this does not eliminate the morbidity

or the punishment. A survey of 871 inmates showed that most thought that from 30 to 50 per cent of the men would become involved in homosexuality before they left the prison.

At Leesburg, N.J., and Vienna, Ill., state prisons are designed to avoid the concrete-and-steel cage atmosphere.

There are many Americans, including many legislators, who feel that softening the harshness of male prisons will diminish the punishment and therefore encourage crime. A major theme of congressional appropriation hearings for prisons is the fear that inmates will be placed in "country clubs." It overlooks the fundamental punishment of any prison: to be deprived of liberty.

A HUMAN WASTELAND IN THE NAME OF JUSTICE

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

If today is average, 8,000 American men, women and children for the first time in their lives will enter locked cages in the name of justice.

If theirs is an average experience they will, in addition to any genuine justice received, be forced into programs of psychological destruction; if they serve sentences most of them will not be by decision of judges acting under the Constitution but by casual bureaucrats acting under no rules whatever; they will undergo a significant probability of forced homosexuality, and they will emerge from this experience a greater threat to society than when they went in.

"Justice" in the United States today is so bad that conservative reformers talk openly of salvaging law-breakers by "diversion from the criminal justice system wherever possible" (The American Bar Association Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services).

It so efficiently educates children into crime that one official could say, "It would be better if young people who commit crimes got away with them because we just make them worse" (Milton Luger, Director of the New York State Division of Youth).

American convicts serve a majority of their sentences at the mercy of parole boards whose decisions on which prisoners to release are so irrational that it can be statistically proved that society would be better protected if some passerby pulled names of convicts at random out of a hat.

Coerced homosexuality is merely one of the psychological distortions built into the prison system. It appears to be prevalent among 80 per cent of all women prisoners, from 20 to 50 per cent of male prisoners, and an unknown but significant proportion of juveniles.

Ninety-seven per cent of all prisoners are eventually released back into society, where from 40 to 70 per cent of them commit new crimes.

Human prisoners in the United States are more carelessly handled than animals in our zoos, which have more space and get more "humane" care. Eighty per cent of all prison guards in the country are paid less than \$8,000; all keepers of animals in the National Zoo in Washington are paid between \$8,400 and \$9,100.

Almost everyone seems to agree that our prisons are terrible.

President Nixon: "No institution within our society has a record which presents such a conclusive case of failure as does our prison system."

John Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States: "The state of America's prisons comes close to a national shame. No civilized society should allow it to continue."

Norman Carlson, director of the U.S. Bu-

reau of Prisons: "Anyone not a criminal will be when he gets out of jail."

But the change is glacial. In most places there is no change at all.

The system is hardly a true system, but a disjointed collection of buildings and jurisdictions. The smallest is the federal, generally accepted as the more carefully designed, if bureaucratic.

On any given day the prisoner population in federal prisons is about 20,000, or less than 10 per cent of all sentenced prisoners in the country.

The states have 200 facilities, ranging from the big state penitentiaries to an assortment of reformatories, forestry camps and juvenile halls, ranging from some of the most humane in the country to some of the worst. They held over 200,000 prisoners each day.

There are 4,037 jails and uncounted city and town lockups where the range in conditions runs from fairly good to filthy and dangerous. Technically, "jail" is a place where a person is held awaiting trial, "prison" where he serves a sentence.

The county jails hold about 161,000 persons a day, 5 per cent of them juveniles (usually mixed with adults) and 5 per cent women. Including jails, the total incarcerated population is about 1 million. If one includes town "drunk tanks," 3 million Americans pass through cells each year.

Who are the Americans who find themselves behind bars?

They are overwhelmingly the poor, black and the young. A profound sense of being cheated runs through them. They may have been cheated by the environment they grew up in, by chaotic families, poor neighborhoods, ineffective schools, depressing career opportunities. But this is not the usual reason the average prisoner feels cheated. He feels that he has been unfairly rated by the criminal justice system. He is right.

A TINY MINORITY OF LAWBREAKERS

The President's Crime Commission in 1967 showed that from 3 to 10 times more crime is committed than is ever reported to police. They cite a survey showing that in a sample of 1,700 persons of all social levels, 91 per cent admitted committing acts for which they might have been imprisoned but were never caught. So most law-breakers are never caught.

If they are, the affluent tend to avoid imprisonment. The concentration in prison of the poor, the black and the young reflects, among other things, a social selection by which we decide whom to put behind bars.

Once found guilty, the fate of a sentenced man is subject to the wildest accidents of fate. Robert Apablaza sold a matchbox of marijuana and happened to find himself in a particular courtroom in New Orleans where he was sentenced to 50 years in prison; hundreds of others have done the same thing elsewhere and not gone to prison.

So every prisoner knows other offenders who received substantially better treatment than he did. He knows, and statistics prove, that justice is not evenhanded.

Once committed to prison, he is still governed by chance. The building he is in may be a 100-year-old fortress with four men in a narrow, dark and damp cell, or he may be in a clean one, one man to a cell. More than a quarter of all prisoners are in prisons 70 years or older.

If he is in Delaware, the state will spend \$13.71 a day on his food and custody; if he is in Arkansas, \$1.55 a day. If he is in Pennsylvania he will get meat and three vegetables almost every meal; if in South Carolina, meat once a week and other times greens and beans.

In some prisons he will be raped homosexually unless he is strong and has a weapon; in others he will be left alone. In some the guards will abuse him and turn him over to psychopathic or racketeering fellow inmates, and censor his mail to make sure he gets no word of it to the outside. In other prisons he will be treated humanely and can appeal punishments to an impartial board, including inmates, and communicate with the free world.

The people on whom such uncertain justice is visited are men, women and children who already have been unlucky. At least half have been involved in drugs or alcohol. They are generally of normal intelligence (the median for federal prisoners is 104 I.Q.: for a typical Midwest state, 99.78) but they test out between 7th and 8th grade achievement.

In a typical state 25 per cent are in for burglary, 22 per cent for larceny, 12 per cent for assault, 5 per cent for drugs, 5 per cent for auto theft, 4 per cent for homicide, and 2 per cent for some sex offense.

THE PROTECTION OF SOCIETY

The President's Crime Commission showed that in 1965 there were 2,780,000 serious crimes reported to police and 727,000 arrests made and of these 63,000 people imprisoned. Thus just for reported crime, which is a minority, only 2 per cent of criminals went to prison. If they were all released they would not materially increase the law-breaking population.

If they were released the prisoners conceivably could affect the crime rate in another way: by encouraging otherwise inhibited people to commit crimes because they felt they would not be punished.

But nobody knows this or can even guess intelligently.

For all the public clamor about crime and punishment, this field remains a wasteland of research, the most remarkable void of reliable analysis of any major institution in American prison programs where, in the words of one administrator, "we are sorting marbles in the dark." The American prison system is a monument to mindless procedures in the midst of a society that prides itself on being scientific and measuring everything in sight.

The result is that the lives of millions of prisoners, the billions of dollars spent on them (about \$1.5 billion this year), the safety of citizens from crime and the loss of \$20 billion to victims of crime, continue to be governed by archaic conventional wisdoms. The only thing we are fairly certain of is that most of these conventional wisdoms are wrong.

It is one of the conventional wisdoms that the current rise in crime is strongly influenced by excessive leniency by prosecutors and courts. Another is that harsh punishment will reduce crime. J. Edgar Hoover told a recent Senate committee, "The difficulty is with district attorneys who make deals and judges who are too soft. Some are bleeding hearts."

According to the FBI, from 1960 to 1965 the crime rate per 100,000 rose 35 per cent. Beginning in 1964, federal courts and most state judges began giving out longer sentences. From 1964 to 1970, federal sentences became 38 per cent longer and time served was even more because the federal parole board began reducing paroles. California's sentences have risen 50 per cent.

But from 1965 to 1970 the national crime rate—during the harsher period—rose 45 per cent.

Robert Martinson studied every report on treatment of prisoners since 1945 and analyzed the 231 studies. He concluded:

... There is very little evidence in these studies that any prevailing mode of correctional treatment has a decisive effect in reducing recidivism of convicted offenders." "Recidivism" refers to crimes committed by released prisoners.

James Robison of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and Gerald Smith, of the University of Utah, made one of the most rigorous analyses of various treatment of American prisons and concluded:

"It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the act of incarcerating a person at all will impair whatever potential he has for a crime-free future adjustment and that, regardless of which 'treatments' are administered while he is in prison, the longer he is kept there the more he will deteriorate and the more likely is it that he will recidivate."

A CONFLICT OF MOTIVES

A fundamental reason for confusion is that unlike some countries, the United States has never decided what it wants its prisons to do. There are several motives for criminal punishment:

1. Hurting the prisoner so that he will feel free of guilt, having paid for his act;
2. Using the criminal as a scapegoat for others in society who feel the same criminal impulses within themselves and by punishing the criminal purge themselves;
3. The need of some to feel morally superior by sustaining outcasts in a despised and degraded condition;
4. Keeping the criminal out of circulation;
5. Revenge imposed by the state to prevent the victim or his family from taking private revenge, as in family feuds;
6. Revenge in the name of all society so that the public will not impose its own version of justice, as in lynch mobs;
7. Deterrence of the criminal who, by being hurt, will decide that committing the crime is not worth it;
8. Deterrence of others who, seeing the criminal suffer, will not imitate his crime; and
9. Reforming the criminal so that he will learn to live in peace with society.

Criminal punishment may accomplish a number of these objectives simultaneously. But some are contradictory and cannot be done together. It is not possible to cause a man to respect to those who treat him with deliberate cruelty. Scapegoating does not eliminate the illicit impulse; where punishment of the individual is violent and cruel, it promotes violence and cruelty in society at large.

The confusion in goals for prison has its roots in a curious phenomenon: the most damaging practices in criminal justice were started as humanitarian reforms.

The prison itself is an American invention created out of genuine compassion.

For centuries, people were incarcerated only until the local lord or king could impose punishment. Punishment would then be death by hanging, drowning, stoning, burning at the stake, or beheading, usually with a large crowd observing to deter them from imitation.

A PLACE FOR PENITENCE

In the 1780s, the Quakers of Philadelphia taking soup to the jails, were appalled by conditions. They organized to pass laws substituting sentences of incarceration in permanent, well-designed prisons as a substitute for death, mutilation or flogging.

They designed the new prisons for solitude and meditation on the prevailing theory that men do wicked things because the devil has invaded them and only through contemplation of their sins could they become penitent and innocent again. The new institutions for penitence were called penitentiaries. The prisoners were forbidden to speak and saw no one, sometimes not even their jailers.

Europeans studying the new country reported on the new institution and adopted it, though some, like DeTocqueville and Dickens, observed that penitentiaries often produced insanity.

In the late 1800s, it was observed that country people on their farms had been law-abiding but after they moved to the impoverished industrial cities they became criminals. It was thought that there might be some connection between environment and crime, that prisons might be a way to counteract bad environment.

The impact of Freud and psychology complicated the view of human behavior, adding to the physical environment the emotional history of the individual. If prison was an opportunity to change the environment, it might also be a place to give the prisoner a more accurate view and control of himself.

But the conflicts have never been resolved between punishment and "treatment," between the purpose of protecting society by keeping the criminal locked up and the goal of protecting society by trying to condition him for peaceful return to the community.

THE USEFULNESS OF "INDUSTRIES"

Only this continuing confusion could explain the survival of irrationalities like "prison industries" and the decisions of parole boards.

Most work inside federal prisons, for example, is done for an independent corporation called Federal Prison Industries, Inc. It has a board of directors mostly of executives of private corporations who serve without pay. It maintains 52 shops and factories at 22 federal institutions where it employs about 25 per cent of all federal prisoners.

Historically, at the insistence of private business and labor unions (George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO also is on the board of FPI), they do not make goods that will compete with privately made goods, which means that they usually do not develop skills that will let the ex-convict compete in private industry after he gets out.

The chief customer is the federal government. Pay rates are from 19 to 47 cents a day.

FPI in 1970 had earnings of \$9.9 million on \$58 million in sales, or 17 per cent profit on sales, the highest of any industry in the United States (average for all U.S. industry is 4.5 per cent on sales, the highest being the mining industry at 11 per cent).

FPI has proudly announced that it declared a dividend every year since 1946 and that these dividends total \$82 million. To whom was this dividend on captive labor issued? The American taxpayer—the general treasury of the United States.

Federal prison officials agree that a major reason for repeated crime by ex-convicts is their lack of skill in the jobs that are needed in free life—medical and dental technicians and other categories that will hire all the qualified help they can get. They also admit

that they lack the money to train significant numbers of convicts in these marketable skills. Yet they have regularly turned back large profits made by prisoner labor.

THE EFFECTS OF PAROLE

Even prison industries cannot match the performance of parole boards for lack of success and lack of accountability. Parole is another humanitarian reform that was perverted. It was supposed to give the prisoner incentive to improve himself to earn a release earlier than his full term. It was supposed to shorten time spent behind bars. It has lengthened it.

Most prisoners are eligible to apply for parole after one-third of their sentences have been served. Judges and legislatures know that, so they have increased sentences on the assumption that most prisoners will be released in something like one-third their time. The prisoners have not been released at that rate. Consequently, American prisoners serve the longest sentences in the Western world.

But that is not the worst characteristic of American parole boards. Their purpose is to release the prisoner as soon as possible consistent with his own good and protecting society from repetition of crime. The boards are in the position of predicting human behavior, a difficult task for even the most perceptive and wise individuals.

Most parole boards are appointed by governors and include his cronies or former secretaries.

Parole boards regularly release the worst risks, as measured by the best data.

Take the case of Jack Crowell (not his real name, but a real person). He is a stocky, 41-year-old Navy veteran doing 10 years for voluntary manslaughter in a Southern state. He had such a good record in the state penitentiary that toward the end of his sentence he was permitted to join the state's work release program.

Under work release he left prison to live in an unlocked dormitory in a city. He got up each morning, drove his boss's truck to work site where he became a master plumber, supervising an assistant. At the end of the day he returned to the dormitory. He earned \$140 a week and had saved \$1800. He applied for a parole. The prison system recommended him. He was turned down.

Typically they didn't tell him why except that he wasn't "ready." They did parole some men direct from the state prison who had never had a chance to show that they could hold a good job and handle freedom.

WHO ARE THE WORST RISKS?

Crowell's is a typical case. One can guess what happened. He was in for manslaughter. Parole boards do not like to parole killers and sex offenders because it makes for bad public relations. They fear the headlines if such men repeat crimes while on parole. But contrary to conventional wisdom, murderers and sex offenders are the most likely not to repeat a crime.

In 1969 parole boards reporting to the Uniform Parole Reports released 25,563 prisoners before they completed their full sentences. Almost one-third of them were burglars who in their first year had their usual rate of repeated crime of 31 per cent. There were 2,870 armed robbers released and in the first year 27 per cent went back to prison. The board released 2,417 forgers, 36 per cent of whom were re-imprisoned, and they released 2,299 larcenists, of whom 30 per cent went back for various violation. Murders and rap-

ists released had failure rates of 11 to 17 per cent.

These are the failure rates for various offenders as compiled by the most authoritative group, the Uniform Parole Reports of the National Probation and Parole Institutes of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency:

	Percent
Negligent manslaughter	11
Willful homicide	12
Statutory rape	15
Forcible rape	17
All other sex offenses	17
Aggravated assault	22
Armed robbery	27
Unarmed robbery	30
Larceny	30
Burglary	31
Forgery	36

(These are failure rates for the first year on parole; the rate increases as the group is out longer but the rank order does not change significantly over the years.)

It appears reasonable for parole boards to be more cautious in releasing violent men. Even if burglars repeat their crimes, theft of property is less harmful to society than killing and raping. But here, too, the data do not support the parole boards: murderers and rapists on their second offense do not commit as many added murders and rapes as do other kinds of criminals. Of 30 cases of willful homicide that sent 1969 parolees back to prison in their first year of freedom, 24 were committed by people not originally in for willful homicide. Six released murderers went back to prison for another killing, but nine burglars went back for murders.

The 511 forcible rapists on parole, to take another example, committed four new forcible rapes; burglars during their paroles committed eight. All men whose original conviction was for property crimes while on parole committed 12 forcible rapes.

The rate of new homicides and rapes by all categories of released prisoners is about the same, approximately one-half of 1 per cent. Since murderers and rapists represent a small proportion of all released prisoners, about 12 per cent for all such categories, their one-half of 1 per cent represents less of a threat to society than do the violent new episodes by other kinds of criminals.

Because they regularly release the worst risks, parole boards would do better picking parolees at random.

Parole boards are not solely to blame. Whatever other notions are in their heads when they make their decisions, they are seriously influenced by public opinion. The police and the general public are outraged at the violent crimes of released prisoners; they don't know that 97 per cent of all prisoners are released anyway and that the longer criminals stay in prison, the more crimes they commit afterwards.

THE TORTURE OF UNCERTAINTY

In prison after prison, the uncertainty of the sentence was mentioned as the most excruciating part of prison. "Give me a fixed sentence anytime," is common.

Or, "I behaved myself, the warden recommended me, I had a job on the outside, my family said they had a place for me and they turned me down. I ask them why and they say, 'You're not ready.'

"I ask them what that means and they don't say. What am I supposed to do? Give me five, give me ten but let me know how

much time I have to do and don't keep me hanging all the time."

Society takes elaborate pains to assure that lawyers and judges are qualified to exercise their power over the freedom of their fellow citizens and that no person is deprived of his liberty without due process of law, including a review of grave decisions. Yet the gravest of decision—a majority of the time a citizen may spend imprisoned—is determined most of the time by untrained persons acting without adequate information in opposition to the best data and without accountability.

During the last few years, the federal parole board has reduced paroles by 20 per cent.

In Louisiana they stopped giving all convicted armed robbers parole, after which armed robberies in the state rose 57 per cent.

It is tragic for the protection of society and the future success of prisoners that carefully selected boards do not use the best available data to decide the issue of liberty or imprisonment. It unnecessarily exposes society to more crime, it stunts the potential for change within convicted criminals and it suffuses American prisons with frustration and bitterness.

THE LEAST STUDIED INSTITUTION

What remains after the available data on criminality are sifted is the remarkable absence of other good data on American prisons and their effectiveness. Prisons would seem to be ideal laboratories for social scientists—controlled populations in a variety of conditions, available to be measured and compared. But they remain the least scientifically studied of any major American institution.

George Saleeby, associate director of the California Youth Authority, was asked why it is that a society apprehensive about crime, and a country anxious about criminals, did not insist on rigorous study and analysis.

"Wait a minute," Saleeby said. "Wait a minute. Who said society was concerned? Who said they give a damn? They want some people put away and then they want to forget about them."

Why don't prison administrators themselves look carefully at their own results? George Beto, director of Texas prisons, says:

"I know of no institution unless it be organized Christianity which has shown a greater reluctance to measure the effectiveness of its varied programs than has corrections."

The answer seems to be that what happens to prisoners inside American prisons has very little to do with the prisoners themselves or what will happen to them after they are released into the free world. The state of prisons seems mainly determined by the values of the American citizen who considers himself law-abiding.

John Irwin served five years in Soledad Prison for armed robbery. He is now a college professor at San Francisco State College, specializing penal studies. He says:

"The radicals talk of abolishing punishment, but they really want to start punishing a new population of 'capitalist pigs.' The liberals want punishment but call it 'treatment.' The conservatives are the only ones honest about it, but they want such disproportionate amounts that it's crazy."

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that what goes on inside American prisons tells more about the character of people outside the walls than it does about the inmates inside.

THE WAR, THE PRESIDENT, AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY: EDITORIAL FROM DUBOIS, PA.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to bring to the attention of our colleagues, an editorial from the January 27, issue of the Courier-Express of DuBois, Pa., entitled "Hanoi Prolongs Vietnam War, Not the President."

The editorial was written by Mr. Herb Martin, managing editor of the newspaper and a registered Democrat of the area. His perceptive comments regarding this administration's efforts to bring the war in Southeast Asia to a close are worth close study by those who have been quick to criticize President Nixon's policies with respect thereto. Since I could be accused of gross partisanship were I to say the things about the Democratic Party that Mr. Martin does, I will allow the editor to speak for himself.

The article follows:

HANOI PROLONGS VIETNAM WAR, NOT THE PRESIDENT

(By Herb Martin)

As a registered voter in the Democratic Party of 25 years standing and as a newsman of 30 years seniority I have two bones to pick with fellow colleagues who have continually sided with Hanoi, North Vietnam and Viet Cong leaders in this nerve-wracking matter of getting a peace settlement in the Vietnam conflict that has been bugging us Americans for a decade.

Soon after the President of these United States revealed to the nation Tuesday night the proposals offered a very stubborn enemy to end U.S. participation, the national Democratic leaders and national news media wasted no time tearing apart the noble effort by our government. This certainly must have delighted Hanoi and NV-VC officials who for too long a time have been riding the coattails of self-styled spokesmen in this country who have completely exonerated the Communists for prolonging the war and place the entire blame on the present administration. This is hogwash.

The latest terms offered by the United States are certainly fair and in keeping with expressed desires of the enemy. The withdrawal date has been set . . . within six months of an agreement between the two sides. That means if Hanoi is sincere in closing out the fighting they will have achieved their objective of withdrawal of all U.S. and Allied forces from South Vietnam as early as this summer. Add to this a cease-fire throughout Indochina, new presidential election in South Vietnam, exchange of prisoners, U.S. aid to help reconstruct North and South Vietnam, international supervision and conferences involving neutral parties.

Hanoi would probably have agreed to some of the past proposals if it had not been for those in this country who insist on stirring up a hornets nest on any kind of settlement. Until this kind of useless talk (especially by senators and news commentators) subsides, Hanoi will remain pat knowing there is diversion in U.S. ranks over peace initiatives.

I, for one, feel President Nixon has done an admirable job in winding down a mess he inherited from Democratic regimes that got us into (Kennedy) and escalated (Johnson) this war. How any Democrat can fault Mr. Nixon about the war takes a lot of gall. If anyone is playing politics with the war it is the Democrats and not Mr. Nixon.

He has not deceived us by conducting secret negotiations. The newsmen use the term loosely because they are pouting over the fact they weren't able to scoop the President in advance.

I'm ashamed of the Democratic Party because they have occupied leadership of this country almost every time we have gone to war. Then, the Republicans have to come along and bail us out.

I fail to understand the reasoning of the young people who are flocking to the Democratic Party as registered voters because they are against war. It doesn't make sense to join a party that has been responsible for most of the wars in which the U.S. has engaged. Make no mistake, of the two major political parties the Democrats have a far poorer war record.

Maybe the young people, by joining the Democratic Party, can change the war stigma image that has plagued us long-time Democrats for years.

Giving credit where it is due, President Nixon gets one solid Democratic vote from this reporter come November because he has kept his promise to the American people to do everything within reason (and even beyond that) to end the war. Hanoi has blocked a settlement, not the President of the United States.

Why don't the critics start hammering at Hanoi, North Vietnam and the VC for their bold refusal to accept the one-sided terms in their favor? How much more do they want?

No longer can this nation bear the brunt of accusations either at home or abroad. We have taken our share, the finger now points directly to the enemy. The full responsibility for continuing the war henceforth lies completely in the laps of those Communistic dictators across the Pacific Ocean.

The numerous Democratic entries in the presidential nomination race ought to soon realize the issue of peace proposals has been thoroughly covered by the President's address, and they would be wise to concentrate their campaigns on other problems.

THE SEAT ACROSS THE AISLE: A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE WILLIAM ANDREWS

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, we all miss our respected colleague, the late Congressman from Alabama, George William Andrews, but my sorrow has deepened these past few days when I no longer see that familiar face in the seat to my left, just across the aisle.

The testimony to the good works of Congressman Andrews has been fully laid before the House by many of our colleagues; there is little I can add to the

revelations of that marvelously productive public record unless it is to say that we all hope to leave something of value behind as did George when the Good Lord calls. He left behind a record and a memory that few shall match.

My friendship with George Andrews spanned all of my congressional career. Our responsibilities, our interests, our congressional assignments were different, yet entirely the same. Though we came from differing backgrounds, had different ideas, thoughts, and dreams about our beloved country and its problems, we agreed most of the time about the action to be taken to meet such problems by our commonly loved House of Representatives. We were united in a common understanding about the necessity of this country's continual national strength. We were united in believing that fiscal policies had to be strictly controlled.

The man who occupied that seat just across the aisle from me so many years was my senior, slightly, in both years and in service in the House. A fact he never let me forget. However, we both served in the U.S. Navy during World War II and I never let him forget my exalted rank therein, compared to his, at war's end. We were, George and I, the closest of friendly colleagues.

My day-to-day personal contact with George Andrews was a source of inspiration; not the least of which was his never ending store of good stories. I make it a point to stress this personal relationship inasmuch as many have dealt with George as one of the public's great servants. George was more than a distinguished and respected colleague, more than a dedicated American patriot—George was a close friend and I shall miss him in that seat across the aisle.

ATTORNEY CHARLES S. RHYNE, CHIEF PROPONENT OF WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW, NOMINATED FOR NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize Attorney Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D.C., who has been one of the principal proponents of world peace through law.

I have made this recommendation at the request of a number of Chicago attorneys who have praised very highly Mr. Rhyne's tireless effort to bring about better understanding among nations through the majesty of law.

I have taken this action today since Members of Congress have the privilege of nominating candidates for Nobel Peace Prize awards.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting Mr. Rhyne's name because it is my honest

belief that the road to peace can be found in a world order predicated upon law.

My letter to the Nobel Peace Prize Committee follows:

LETTER TO NOBEL PEACE PRIZE COMMITTEE
NOBEL PEACE PRIZE COMMITTEE,
*The Stortinget,
Oslo, Norway.*

GENTLEMEN: I am extremely pleased to place in nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize, Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Rhyne helped to organize the International Bar Association and Inter-American Bar Association. He was Chairman of the U.N. Committee, International and Comparative Law Section, of the American Bar Association. As President of the American Bar Association, he announced the World Peace Through Law program as the Association's major effort during this Presidency and visited some 30 nations to urge cooperation by judges and lawyers in such a program. In 1958, he conceived and carried out LAW DAY U.S.A. to focus public attention on law processes as the road to peace.

In 1958, he was the subject of a Time Magazine cover story devoted to his thesis that more law means more peace. From 1954 to 1961, by appointment of President Eisenhower, he served as a member of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

Mr. Rhyne has had a long and distinguished career as a member of the Bar. His activities before the United States Supreme Court, on behalf of local units of government in the United States, have done much to contribute to an orderly, peaceful, uniform and continuing improvement of local government.

His contributions to the development of aeronautical law rank him as one of the legal pioneers in that most important area of international communication and understanding.

Mr. Rhyne early understood that when technological progress made virtually every citizen of the world a commuter among countries, each, of necessity, had to be made aware of his broadened responsibilities toward maintaining a tranquil society. Over the past 20 years, Mr. Rhyne has devoted his energies toward that purpose, and his efforts, through the American Bar Association, the World Peace Through Law Center, and the World Association of Judges have brought him international recognition.

Mr. Rhyne is truly a fitting nominee as the person who shall have most or best promoted the fraternity of nations through law and a world order predicated upon law.

By every standard established by Dr. Nobel, Charles S. Rhyne merits your most serious consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include with my remarks today a list of Mr. Rhyne's accomplishments and a biography prepared by the National Cyclopaedia.

The documents follow:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1939: Published book: *Civil Aeronautics Act Annotated* (1939) and articles on international law and aviation.

1939-44: Officer and Chairman of Junior Bar Section, American Bar Association (ABA), published special Spanish and French

editions of magazine entitled "Young Lawyer". He sought joint efforts of young lawyers world-wide in cooperation with Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association.

1944-49: Secretary, Vice-Chairman and Chairman of ABA's International and Comparative Law Section where he focused its program upon law, the UN and peace.

1950: Published International Law "A Field American Lawyers Should Know Better," 36 American Bar Association Journal 376, and other articles on the same subject.

1945-46: Helped organize International Bar Association and Inter-American Bar Association as one of ABA's official representatives.

1946-57: Chairman of UN Committee, International and Comparative Law Section, ABA.

1946-1959: Served as member of International Bar Association Council and as Vice-President (1957-58) and attended its conferences 1946-1967.

1946-1957: Led ABA action to remove self-judging (Connally) reservation from U.S. acceptance of World Court jurisdiction.

1957: As President of ABA he announced World Peace Through Law program as Association's major effort during his Presidency and visited some 30 nations to urge cooperation by judges and lawyers in such a program.

1957-58: Conceived and carried out Law Day U.S.A. to focus public attention on law processes as the road to peace.

1958: He was subject of A Time Magazine cover story (May 8) devoted to his thesis that more law means more peace.

1954-1961: By appointment of President Eisenhower he served as a member, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

1958-1963: He attended conferences in New Delhi, Lagos and other places sponsored by the International Commission of Jurists.

1945-1971: He served as a member, Vice-President and participant in Inter-American Bar Association's work.

1943-1953: He served as Professor of Law at George Washington University Law School.

1950-1972: A member and attender of meetings of Union International des Avocats.

1950-1972: A member and attender of conferences of the International Law Association.

1957-1972: An Honorary Member of foreign Bar Associations, including Mexico and Canada.

1957-1971: He has received 8 Honorary Degrees from Universities based upon his work to advance peace through law.

1958-1971: He received the Grotius Peace Award, the Gold Medal of the American Bar Association and many other awards for his work on law for peace.

1957-58: He conceived the idea of a worldwide effort to strengthen law processes into a peace process and appointed Governor Thomas E. Dewey of New York as Chairman to head a Committee to determine whether this was a feasible idea and if it were determined to be feasible to outline a program for its accomplishment.

1958: In creating Law Day U.S.A. he persuaded President Eisenhower (for whom he once served as a legal consultant) to proclaim this Day as one all Americans should celebrate.

1959: Dewey Committee reported idea was feasible if lawyers of the world would join in a great mutual effort and he (Mr. Rhyne) was appointed Chairman of an ABA Special Committee to carry out Dewey formulated program.

1957-1972: He contacted and secured support of lawyers of over 100 nations for the

proposal of a vast joint world-wide program to build peace out of law.

1959: He secured financing for the program from the Agency for International Development, Ford Foundation and other sources.

1959-1960: He organized and directed 4 USA regional conferences on how to achieve peace through law. These were held in Boston, San Francisco, Dallas and Charlotte.

1960-1962: He organized and directed 4 continental conferences on how to achieve peace through law. These were held in San Jose, Costa Rica for Americas; Rome for Europe; Tokyo for Asia; Lagos for Africa. Out of these conferences attended by 1000 law leaders from 109 nations, came: a proposed work program to achieve these objectives; a consensus on objectives; and a statement of general principles of law which should be adhered to by civilized nations.

1963: He argued and won before the U.S. Supreme Court the famous international law case involving the "law of the flag" principle in *Sociedad Nacional de Marineros de Honduras* (377 U.S. 10).

1963: First World Peace Through Law Conference (Athens), (1250 Delegates from 112 nations).

Objectives and general principles of the World Peace Through Law Program.

Global work program to achieve objectives formulated and adopted.

World Peace Through Law Center created with temporary headquarters in Washington, D.C.

108 Committees created to develop work program.

1965: Second World Conference (Washington), (3,500 Delegates from 120 nations).

First World Law Day celebrated (September 13, 1965).

Work program up-dated and expanded. Center Secretariat created in Geneva as world clearinghouse of law information.

Proposal for creation of World Association of Judges approved (colorful procession of 300 high court judges in their robes at inaugural session).

Originals of historic law documents of world exhibited, including:

England's Magna Carta; U.S.A. Constitution; U.S.A. Declaration of Independence; France's Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen; and many others.

Volume "Law and Judicial Systems of Nations" published.

1966: World Association of Judges created.

1967: Third World Conference on World Peace Through Law Center (Geneva), (3,500 Delegates from 121 nations).

Seabed Treaty proposed.

First computer and the law exhibit.

First meeting of World Association of Judges.

Second World Law Day celebrated (July 10, 1967).

1968: Third World Law Day celebrated—devoted to Human Rights.

1969: First World Law Directory published containing computerized listing of names and addresses of judges and lawyers of 130 nations.

1969: Fourth World Conference on World Peace Through Law (Bangkok) (1500 Delegates from 111 nations).

Airplane Hi-Jacking Convention proposed.

Exhibit on law for development of developing nations.

Fourth World Law Day celebrated, theme: "Law and Development of Nations" (September 8).

1970-71: Served by appointment of President Nixon on United Nations Commission.

1970: Environment Convention proposed to control air, water and land pollution.

1970: Airplane Hi-Jacking Convention drafted and published.

1970: Weather Control Convention drafted and published.

1970: Fifth World Law Day celebrated, theme: "International Education Year" (September 25).

1971: Published Towards A Feasible International Criminal Court.

1971: Fifth World Conference on World Peace Through Law (Belgrade), (4000 Delegates from 114 nations).

First international "Demonstration Trial" (space ship falling on Yugoslavian Parliament).

Environment-Pollution Convention considered and approved.

Seabed Convention revised and approved.

Airplane Hi-Jacking Convention revised and approved.

Weather control Convention revised and approved.

Sixth World Law Day celebrated, theme: "Law, Peace, Environment" (July 21).

1971: Authored and published "International Law: The Substance, Process, Procedures and Institutions for World Peace With Justice," chronicling the vast growth in International Law.

1971: Served by appointment of President Nixon as his personal representative (Ambassador rank) to the 20th Anniversary meeting of the Council of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

1973: Sixth World Conference on World Peace Through Law Scheduled for 1973.

[From the National Cyclopaedia of American Biography]

BIOGRAPHY

RHYNE, Charles Sylvanus, lawyer, was born in Charlotte, N.C., June 23, 1912, son of Sydneyham Sylvanus and Mary (Wilson) Rhyne. His father was a farmer. Charles S. Rhyne received his preliminary education at the public schools of Charlotte and attended Duke University during 1928-29 and 1932-35, subsequently receiving his LL.B. at George Washington University in 1937.

After leaving Duke in 1929 he worked on a ranch as a cowboy, at a hotel, and for a building contractor in Denver, Colo., before returning to the university in 1932. After studying law for a year at Duke, in 1935 he moved to Washington, D.C., where he was a clerk with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration until October of that year. During this period he enrolled at George Washington University, and while still attending law school became a law clerk in the Washington firm of Dow, Lohnes & Albertson. Admitted to the Bar of the District of Columbia in 1937, he set up the private law practice in Washington which he has since maintained, practicing under the name of Charles S. Rhyne until 1956, when he became senior partner of the firm of Rhyne, Mullin, Connor & Rhyne.

Mr. Rhyne has specialized in administrative, municipal and aeronautical law. He has appeared as counsel in thirty-four cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, of which the most notable are: *Ewing v. Mytinger & Casselberry, Inc.* (339 U.S. 594), involving the constitutionality of multiple seizures of food and drug products by the Federal government; *Ramspeck v. Federal Trial Examiners Conference* (345 U.S. 128), involving validity of regulations allowing federal agencies to control case assignments and salaries of trial examiners; and *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Wisconsin* (347 U.S. 672), involving federal jurisdiction over producers of natural gas who sell their product in interstate commerce. The last-named brought on the famous "Gas Bill" which President Eisenhower vetoed after its adoption by the Congress.

From 1948 to 1953 he was professorial

lecturer on aviation law at George Washington University, and he has been general counsel for the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers since 1937. He has also served as general counsel to the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries during 1953-54. His published works include "Civil Aeronautics Act Annotated" (1939), "Airports and the Courts" (1944), "Labor Union and Municipal Employee Law" (1946), "Aviation Accident Law" (1947), "Comic Books—Municipal Control of Sale and Distribution—A Preliminary Study" (1948), "Municipal Control of Noise" (1948), "Airport Lease and Concession Agreements" (1948), "Cases on Aviation Law" (1950), "The Law of Municipal Contracts" (1952), and "Municipal Contracts" (1952), and "Municipal Law" (1957).

He edited the thirteen volumes of Municipalities and Law in Action during 1938-52 and co-edited its successor, the NIMLO Municipal Law Review during 1952-58. He has also edited the Municipal Law Journal since 1940, Municipal Law Court Decisions since 1942, and Municipal Ordinance Review since 1953. Mr. Rhyne has been a member of the advisory board of the Journal of Air Law and Commerce since 1953.

He became a member of the American Bar Association in 1938, and he has served that organization in such capacities as: national chairman, junior bar conference, 1944-45; member of the house of delegates, 1944-57, assembly delegate, 1944-46, and state delegate, 1946-57; chairman, section on international and comparative law, 1948-49; chairman, aeronautical law committee, 1946-48 and 1951-54; general chairman, Blue and Gray Regional Convention, 1953; member of the scope and correlation of work committee, 1952-57; chairman, committee on draft, 1950-54; chairman, rules and calendar committee, 1954-56; and chairman, house of delegates, 1956-57.

In February, 1957, he became the first chairman of the house of delegates to be elevated to the presidency of the American Bar Association during his term of office, and he also has the distinction of being the first president to take office on foreign soil, this event taking place at the association's convention in that year in London, England.

At the time of the London convention he was chairman of a committee which erected a Memorial Monument to Magna Carta at Runnymede, where King John sealed the Great Charter of Liberties in 1215. During his presidency (1957-58) of the American Bar Association he developed and sponsored the idea of Law Day—U.S.A. to be celebrated annually, beginning in 1959, on May 1. Thereby, he hoped to recapture America's interest in and respect for the law, to contrast the significance of Law Day with that of May Day in Communist countries, and to further understanding of the importance of a world judiciary in achieving and maintaining peace, as opposed to the recourse to armed force.

Mr. Rhyne was awarded honorary LL.D. degrees by Duke University and Loyola University (Los Angeles) and the honorary D.C.L. by George Washington University, and he is also a recipient of the Grotius Award in international law. Aside from his membership in the American Bar Association, he belongs to the American Judicature Society, American Law Institute, American Society of International Law, International Bar Association, Canadian Bar Association (honorary), Federal Communications Bar Association, Federal Power Bar Association, Federal Bar Association, Bar Association of the District of Columbia (pres. 1955-56), Omicron Delta Kappa, Delta Theta Phi, Order of the Coif, National Aeronautical Association, Duke University Alumni Association, the Scribes,

Washington Board of Trade, and the Metropolitan, University, National Press, Baristers, Congressional, and Aero clubs of Washington.

In religion he is a Presbyterian. Mr. Rhyne was married in Denver, Colo., Sept. 16, 1932, to Sue Margaret, daughter of Lewis Cotton of Silver Creek, Neb., a cabinet maker, and has two children, Mary Margaret and William Sylvanus.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, for February 2 through February 9, 1972, on account of official district business.

Mr. ASPINALL, from 12 noon February 3, 1972, until noon February 8, 1972, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 60 minutes, February 2, 1972, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. ESCH, on February 2, 1972, for 1 hour.

Mr. ASHBROOK, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL, today, for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. FLOOD, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. RODINO, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, today, for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ARCHER to include pertinent material and tables with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on S. 2010.

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

Mr. MINSHALL in three instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. KEATING in two instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. KING in five instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. MIZELL in five instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. FREY in four instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. SIKES in five instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. MOLLOHAN in five instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in 10 instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in 10 instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in three instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.

Mr. BEGICH in five instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. HÉBERT in two instances.

Mr. DANIELSON.

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1794. An act to authorize pilot field-research programs for the suppression of agricultural and forest pests by integrated control methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, February 2, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

January 7, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Christine S. Gallagher	Chief clerk	\$16,004.82
Lacey C. Sharp	General counsel	16,004.82
Hyde H. Murray	Associate counsel	17,985.17
Louis T. Easley	Staff consultant	12,982.74
Betty M. Prezioso	Secretary to general counsel	8,558.16
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	8,558.16
Martha S. Hannah	Subcommittee clerk	8,558.16
Marjorie B. Johnson	Secretary to associate counsel	8,558.16
Peggy L. Pecore	Calendar clerk	8,558.16
George L. Misselbeck	Printing editor	9,547.50
Fowler C. West	Staff consultant	12,499.88
Mildred Baxley	Staff assistant	8,558.16
Mary Perry Shaw	do	6,360.36
Doris Lucile Farmarco	do	6,360.36
Bert Allan Watson	do	5,256.18
Doris R. Swischer	do	5,897.70
Bertha W. Maginniss	do	4,818.17
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		45,793.38
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		45,370.19
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		91,163.57
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		158,836.43
W. R. POAGE, Chairman.		

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul M. Wilson	Clerk and staff director	\$17,671.62
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	17,497.74
Robert M. Moyer	do	17,497.74
G. Homer Skarin	do	17,497.74
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	17,497.74
Samuel R. Preston	do	17,497.74
Hunter L. Spillan	do	16,875.44
Henry A. Neil, Jr.	do	16,832.52
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	16,457.52
Keith F. Mainland	Staff assistant to chairman	15,921.46
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	15,921.46
Earl C. Silsby	do	15,921.46
Peter J. Murphy, Jr.	do	15,331.97
William G. Boling	do	12,831.17
John M. Garrity	do	12,582.08
Robert B. Foster	do	12,582.08
Milton B. Meredith	do	11,812.54
Thomas J. Kingfield	do	10,352.74
Donald E. Richburg	do	10,352.74
Robert C. Nicholas III	do	10,227.74
George A. Urian	do	9,894.39
Dempsey B. Mizelle	do	9,894.39
Charles W. Snodgrass	do	9,600.00
Thayer A. Wood	do	8,057.70
John G. Plashal	do	6,718.20
Gary C. Michalak	do	6,615.76
Byron S. Nielson	do	6,194.46
Paul E. Thomson	do	5,554.18
J. David Wilson	do	2,715.55
Samuel W. Crosby	Special assistant	8,400.00
Lawrence C. Miller	Editor	12,831.17
Paul V. Farmer	Assistant editor	8,854.88
Francis W. Sady	Administrative assistant	7,355.21

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Cornelius R. Anderson	Director, surveys and investigations staff	\$15,900.00
Leroy R. Kirkpatrick	1st assistant director, surveys and investigations staff	14,800.02
Willie C. Law	2d assistant director, surveys and investigations staff	13,549.98
Mary Alice Sauer	Administrative assistant	7,320.90
Frances May	Clerk-stenographer	6,360.36
Janet Lou Dameron	do	4,831.02
Beatrice T. Dew	do	1,429.17
Agency for International Development: Peter G. Peterson	Investigator	1,388.14
Central Intelligence Agency: Hill, D.W.	Clerical assistant	5,296.14
Defense Contract Audit Agency: Herron, M. A.	Investigator	4,619.63
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Baber, J. R.	do	10,771.20
Bennett, C. L.	do	13,178.88
Bosko, A. P.	do	11,373.12
Brummitt, D. A.	do	11,583.60
Carroll, G. C.	do	12,359.68
Carson, D. W.	do	13,178.88
Cauffman, R. E.	do	5,567.76
Fenstermacher, H. E., Jr.	do	12,894.40
Franklin, R. M.	do	12,314.88
Funkhouser, P. K.	do	10,553.92
Goedtel, J. G.	do	12,576.96
Groover, L. C., Jr.	do	11,061.20
Ivy, C. M.	do	12,576.96
Jenkins, D. L.	do	5,083.44

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leffler, R. P.	Investigator	\$10,967.60
Graeble, A. H.	do	4,403.76
McGahen, H. B.	do	12,883.20
Magee, E. H.	do	13,140.80
Maher, M. F.	do	12,883.20
Malyniak, J., Jr.	do	11,975.04
Mansfield, J. P.	do	12,359.68
Michalski, J. E.	do	12,576.96
Morris, E. J.	do	11,975.04
O'Connor, J. J.	do	8,472.00
Schaum, E. V.	do	5,489.36
Schmidt, D. A.	do	14,139.84
Shannon, A. J.	do	12,961.60
Szoka, C. E.	do	12,281.28
Theisen, L. J.	do	5,352.48
Welch, W. H., Jr.	do	13,178.88
Wetzel, R. G.	do	9,412.80
Wood, H. B.	do	13,178.88
Health benefits		
Life insurance fund		1,244.26
Retirement fund		21,731.36
General Services Administration:		
Jones, H. H.	Investigator	7,769.04
Kelly, C. A.	do	2,024.33
Health, Education and Welfare, Department of: Haaser, T. C.	do	6,473.83
Interior, Department of: Thomson, P. E.	Clerical assistant	1,855.92
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Driver, C.	Investigator	6,861.30
Stepka, F.	do	13,088.50
Naval Audit Service:		
Wytte, D.	do	2,410.56
Treasury, Department of: Miconi, A. S.	Clerical assistant	3,882.34
United States Army Audit Agency: Lyons, F. T.	Investigator	3,240.46
Travel expenses		119,271.59
Miscellaneous expenses		1,189.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$1,219,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	622,425.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	596,574.28

GEORGE MAHON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

January 6, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Blandford	Chief counsel	\$18,000.00
Frank M. Slatinshek	Assistant chief counsel	18,000.00
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member	17,950.00
William H. Cook	Counsel	17,950.00
John J. Ford	Professional staff member	16,000.00
Ralph Marshall	do	14,500.00
George Norris	Counsel	13,925.00
James F. Shumate	do	13,925.00
William H. Hogan, Jr.	do	11,500.00
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	12,500.00
Bernice Kalinowski	Secretary	9,125.00
L. Louise Ellis	do	9,125.00
Edna E. Johnson	do	9,125.00
Dorothy R. Britton	do	9,125.00
Doris S. Svendsen	Secretary (to Dec. 1)	7,604.15
Innis E. McDonald	Secretary	6,850.00
Brenda J. Gore	do	5,700.00
Ann R. Willett	do	5,700.00
Emma M. Brown	do	5,700.00
Nancy Sue Jones	do	4,750.00
James A. Deakins	Clerical staff assistant	6,900.00
Issiah Hardy	Messenger	4,950.00
Staff, Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee (pursuant to H. Res. 201 and H. Res. 202, 92d Cong.):		
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	17,950.00

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Staff, Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee (pursuant to H. Res. 201 and H. Res. 202, 92d Cong.)—Continued		
John F. Lally	Assistant counsel	\$14,500.00
Richard A. Ransom	Professional staff member	13,300.00
H. Hollister Cantus	do	9,250.00
William B. Short, Jr.	Clerical staff assistant	7,500.00
Sanford T. Saunders	Security officer	6,900.00
Ross C. Beck	Secretary	6,850.00
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	6,000.00
Joyce C. Bova	Secretary	4,774.98
Diane C. Bowman	do	4,662.52
Sally A. Moore	do	4,750.00
L. Mendel Rivers, Jr.	Clerical staff assistant (Sept. 9 through, Nov. 20)	720.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		97,335.79
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		102,419.25
Total amount expended from Jan 3 to Dec. 31, 1971		199,755.04
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1972		100,244.96

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Paul Nelson	Clerk and staff director	\$18,000.00
Orman S. Fink	Minority professional staff member	18,000.00
Curtis A. Prins	Chief investigator	16,391.04
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member	17,463.00
Benet D. Gellman	Counsel	18,000.00
Joseph C. Lewis	Professional staff member	18,000.00
Graham T. Northup	Professional staff member	18,000.00
Mary W. Leyton	Secretary to minority	10,754.58
Donald G. Vaughn	Administrative assistant	9,297.84
Total salaries standing committee		143,906.46

Investigative staff (H. Res. 226, 92d Cong.)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rose Marie Allen	Assistant clerk	5,597.21
Richard C. Barnes	Professional staff member	10,000.02
David O'Connell Couch	Counsel	2,833.34
Jane N. D'Arista	Professional staff member	3,665.58
Dolores K. Dougherty	Research associate	8,756.16
Susan E. Driggers	Secretary	1,547.70
Allen R. Ferguson	Economist	1,500.00
Carole A. Fowkes	Secretary	123.79
Helen Hitz	Administrative assistant	9,289.20
Linda L. Hoff	Secretary	5,204.28
Mary Ann Holmes	do	1,850.01
Joseph J. Jasinski	Professional staff member	15,400.02
Mary-Helen Kesecker	Secretary	4,496.76
Mary E. Kirk	Assistant clerk	5,204.28
Michael Ross Lemov	Counsel	2,101.93
Kelsay Ray Meek	Professional staff member	13,750.02

CXVIII—133—Part 2

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Subcommittee Investigative staff (H. Res. 226, 92d Cong.):		
Terrence Boyle	Minority counsel	\$11,132.52
L. Marie Chaillet	Minority secretary	5,766.48
W. Jean Clarkson	Secretary	5,808.06
Patricia Eley	Assistant clerk	5,065.86
David Glick	Counsel	18,000.00
George Gross	do	18,000.00
Emily Hightower	Secretary	7,500.00
Casey Ireland	Minority staff member	18,000.00
Margaret Leary	Secretary	9,220.32
Benjamin B. McKeever	Assistant counsel	12,499.98
Gerald R. McMurray	Research associate	16,219.38
Catherine Smith	Minority secretary	4,771.08
Doris Young	Assistant clerk	8,522.58
Total salaries, Housing	Subcommittee	140,506.26

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 226—Housing Subcommittee)		\$390,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		148,879.05
Amount expended from July 1, to December 31, 1971		166,872.30
Total amount expended from January 3, to December 31, 1971		315,751.35
Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1971		74,248.65

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

December 31, 1971.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as

amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to January 1, 1972, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	\$14,115.54
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director	12,161.10
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	10,875.24
James T. Clark	Clerk	14,977.38
Othello Steinbauer	Secretary	8,756.16
Betty C. Alexander	do	8,095.44
Peggy L. Thornton	Secretary (retired Aug. 30, 1971)	2,698.48
John E. Hogan	Minority clerk	12,718.56
Marcellus C. Garner	Clerk-typist (resigned Oct. 1, 1971)	1,329.42
Deborah J. Blanton	Clerk-typist (summer intern June 1 to Aug. 10, 1971)	541.67
Patrick E. Kelly	Assistant counsel	7,500.00
Whitney Turley	Investigator	9,065.34
Camille Butler	Secretary (resigned Sept. 30, 1971)	2,636.73
Terry Hill	Clerk-public relations	5,500.02
Paul Y. Little	Special consultant	10,000.02
Margaret G. Hoffman	Legislative assistant	6,000.00
Rebecca D. Moore	Research assistant	6,000.00
Irene V. Howard	Legislative assistant	4,694.42
Peter Lektrich	Analyst (resigned Nov. 30, 1971)	1,333.34
Lelia Martin	Clerk (from Nov. 11, 1971)	1,000.00
Wanda M. Worsham	Secretary (Oct. 11, 1971)	878.91
Browardine R. Brohill	Clerk assistant	5,500.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$220,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

27,961.56

Amount expended from — to —

75,884.69

Total amount expended from — to —

103,806.25

Balance unexpended as of —

116,193.75

JOHN L. McMILLAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—STANDING COMMITTEE

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald M. Baker	Chief clerk and associate counsel	\$18,000.00
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant	12,300.00
Louise Maxienne Dargans	Research director	18,000.00
William F. Gaul	Associate general counsel	18,000.00
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr.	General counsel	18,000.00
Benjamin F. Reeves	Assistant to chairman and assistant clerk	18,000.00
Austin P. Sullivan, Jr.	Legislative specialist	16,500.00
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant	12,373.02
Marian R. Wyman	Special assistant to chairman	15,936.00
Minority staff:		
Robert C. Andringa	Minority staff director	5,166.66
Michael J. Bernstein	Minority counsel for labor	18,000.00
Crawford C. Heerlein	Minority clerk	10,601.32
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel for education	18,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (contingent fund)

\$196,467.72

Amount of expenditures previously reported

198,877.00

Total amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1971

198,877.00

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971 (contingent fund)

395,344.72

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigating staff:		
John J. Absher	Assistant clerk	\$380.00
Andrew M. Agree	Assistant clerk (from Aug. 1 to Sept. 30)	950.00
Louise A. Amidon	Assistant clerk (from Aug. 1 to Aug. 31)	400.00
Carole J. Ansheles	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Aug. 31 and Dec. 20 to Dec. 31)	1,124.17
Goldie A. Baldwin	Legislative assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	7,800.00
Arthur Balytry	Assistant clerk (from Aug. 9 to Sept. 22)	880.00
Dean Gregory Barker	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to July 31 and Oct. 1 to Oct. 4)	538.33
William H. Cable	Legislative assistant (from July 1 to Sept. 30); counsel (from Oct. 1 to Dec. 31)	9,150.0
Elizabeth A. Cornett	Administrative assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	8,755.98
Lelia T. Cornwell	do	7,800.00
Stephen J. Dryden	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to July 31)	475.00
Harry M. Feder	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to July 5)	79.17
Eydie Gaskins	Administrative assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	7,800.00
Katherine Clark Gibbons	Research assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	7,200.00
Scott L. Gordon	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to July 31)	475.00
Ernest B. Hillenmeyer, III	do	475.00
Karin Marie Kendrick	Junior researcher (from Sept. 13 to Dec. 31)	1,950.01
S. G. Lippman	Special counsel (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	2,671.02
Mattie L. Maynard	Research assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	600.00
Shirley R. Mills	Secretary (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	7,800.00
David E. Pinkard	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Aug. 15)	712.50
David B. Putnam	Staff assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	4,857.00
Peter Schott	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	3,522.00
David S. Shaw	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to July 31)	475.00
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	6,526.02
William H. Skofield	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to July 31)	475.00
Brian E. Sullam	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Aug. 15, and Sept. 14 to Dec. 31)	2,139.17
Jeanne E. Thomson	Legislative assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	9,547.50
John E. Warren	Junior researcher (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	4,860.00
Minority:		
Robert C. Andringa	Minority legislative associate (from July 1 to Oct. 11, and minority staff director from Oct. 12 to Oct. 31)	8,740.35
Louise W. Finke	Secretary (from July 1 to Oct. 11)	7,192.98
Anita M. Gerhardt	Minority research assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	6,115.98
Sophia Jo Jolivette	Secretary (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	4,000.02
Martin L. LaVor	Minority legislative associate (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	13,674.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John C. Miller	Minority associate counsel for labor (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	\$14,500.02	Bruce D. Moir	Research assistant (from July 1, to Aug. 13)	\$388.19
Silvia J. Rodriguez	Secretary (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	4,771.02	Peter E. Newbould	Assistant clerk (from July 1, to July 31, and Sept. 1, to Sept. 15)	487.50
Dorothy L. Strunk	do	6,115.98	Bradley Gene Peters	Assistant clerk (from July 1, to July 31)	375.00
Dennis J. Taylor	Minority associate counsel (from July 1 to Dec. 31)	9,678.88	Daniel H. Pollitt	Special counsel (from July 1, to Dec. 31)	4,666.98
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:			Anne W. Risdon	Assistant clerk (from July 1, to Aug. 31, and Dec. 1, to Dec. 31)	1,166.66
\$655,000.00			Carroll Underwood	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 1, to Nov. 30)	200.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported			Kathleen M. Sullivan	Assistant clerk (from Sept. 1, to Dec. 31)	2,333.32
179,779.46			Mark Leslie Tower	Assistant clerk (from July 1, to July 31)	375.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1971, to Dec. 31, 1971			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
192,639.31			SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 1		
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to Dec. 31, 1971			January 15, 1972.		
372,418.77			To the Clerk of the House:		
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
\$282,581.23			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3			GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3		
January 15, 1972.			January 15, 1972.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 2			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 15, 1972.			January 15, 1972.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			January 5, 1972.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1972.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
To the Clerk of the House:			To the Clerk of the House:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:			The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)			CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		
January 5, 1					

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3 (TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS)—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Barbara Gerson	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 1 to Dec. 31).	\$500.00
Eric Honick	Staff assistant (from Dec. 1 to Dec. 31).	750.00
S. G. Lippman	Special counsel (from Nov. 1 to Dec. 31).	737.00
Julie D. McAteer	Staff assistant (from Nov. 22 to Dec. 31).	780.00
W. Kenneth Miller	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 1 to Dec. 31).	600.00
John M. Smokevitch	Minority counsel (from Dec. 15 to Dec. 31).	888.89
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		None
Amount expended from July 1, 1971, to Dec. 31, 1971		7,987.43
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to Dec. 31, 1971		7,987.43
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		92,012.57

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 4

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Gerber	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	\$6,510.50
John F. Jennings	Counsel (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	12,486.44
Alexandra J. Kisla	Clerk (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	7,945.19
Carol E. Koterski	Research assistant (from Aug. 1 to Aug. 31).	500.00
Toni E. Painter	Secretary (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	2,422.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		28,038.76
Amount expended from July 1, 1971, to Dec. 31, 1971		34,056.50
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1971, to Dec. 31, 1971		62,095.26
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		22,904.74

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 5

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Loretta A. Brown	Clerk (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	\$7,281.00
Daniel H. Krivit	Counsel (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	13,312.98

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Catherine Ladnier	Research assistant (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	\$3,933.35
Catherine R. Romano	Secretary (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	4,505.52
Charles R. Zappala	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Aug. 31).	1,083.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		29,511.69
Amount expended from July 1, 1971		31,276.75
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1971		60,788.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		24,211.56

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 6

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Margaret Sue Brown	Special assistant (from Nov. 15 to Dec. 31).	\$1,788.89
Jack G. Duncan	Counsel (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	11,954.67
David A. Lloyd-Jones	Research assistant (from July 1 to Nov. 30).	5,150.40
Christine Marie Orth	Assistant Clerk (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	3,791.67
Ann Nicholson Owens	Staff assistant (from Oct. 18 to Dec. 31).	1,662.77
Gladys Marie Walker	Clerk (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	4,291.65
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		31,075.16
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		34,224.77
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1971		65,299.93
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		19,700.07

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR, NO. 7

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Curtis C. Aller	Associate director (from July 1 to Sept. 22).	\$8,200.00
Arthur R. Baltrym	Legislative assistant (from Sept. 23 to Dec. 31).	1,960.00
Alfred Carl Franklin	Counsel (from Sept. 9 to Dec. 31).	6,222.24
Gloria Gleichner	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 12 to Oct. 13).	50.00
James B. Harrison	Staff director (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	13,150.02

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joan Marie King	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 1 to Dec. 31).	\$400.00
Diane Melillo	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 1 to Oct. 31).	100.00
Colleen Mitchell	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 12 to Oct. 16).	125.00
Phoebe Ann Pollitt	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Aug. 8).	411.67
Barbara Anne Radike	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 1 to Oct. 12).	40.00
Martha D. Risdon	Assistant clerk (from Dec. 27 to Dec. 31).	72.22
Elinora H. Teets	Clerk (from July 1 to Dec. 31).	6,000.00
Margaret F. ter Horst	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Aug. 20).	541.67
Susan Weisberg	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 12 to Oct. 18).	140.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,413.92
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	39,056.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1971	54,470.88
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	30,529.12

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

January 10, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Roy J. Bullock	Staff administrator	\$18,000.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff Consultant	18,000.00
Franklin J. Schupp	do	17,932.92
Harry C. Cromer	do	17,671.62
Marian A. Czarnecki	do	17,671.62
Melvin O. Benson	do	14,876.16
Everett E. Bierman	do	14,157.36
John J. Brady, Jr.	do	13,000.02
John H. Sullivan	do	13,000.02
John Chapman Chester	do	13,000.02
Robert K. Boyer	do	10,000.00
Peter Anthony	do	12,000.00
Abbruzzese	do	
George R. Berdes	Subcommittee staff consultant (effective Sept. 8).	7,847.21
Robert B. Boettcher	Subcommittee staff consultant	11,250.00
Goler T. Butcher	do	12,499.98
Robert Michael Finley	do	10,350.00
Clifford P. Hackett	do	12,499.98
Charles S. Levy	do	10,000.02
Henry M. Lloyd	Subcommittee staff consultant (effective Dec. 1).	2,083.33
Michael H. Van Dusen	Subcommittee staff consultant	10,000.02
Charles P. Witter	Subcommittee staff consultant (terminated Nov. 30).	8,333.35
Clara June Nigh	Senior staff assistant (terminated Sept. 30).	6,578.07
Helen C. Mattas	Senior staff assistant (succeeded to title Oct. 1).	11,704.80
Louise O'Brien	Staff assistant	10,445.28
Dora B. McCracken	do	8,629.38
Jean S. Brown	do	6,823.08
Paula L. Peak	do	8,629.38
Ray Sparks	do	9,013.68
Thelma H. Shirkey	do	4,858.00
Arlene M. Altwater	do	4,833.35
Shirley A. Furnier	do	6,499.98
Bernadette M. Kuwirk	Staff assistant (effective July 28).	4,462.50
Audrey Lee Clement	Staff assistant (effective Sept. 21).	2,916.67
Catherine Ann Donnel	Staff assistant (effective Oct. 18, terminated Dec. 10).	1,604.17

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donna Gail Wynn	Staff assistant (effective Dec. 22)	\$212.00
Kenneth W. Cowell	Clerical assistant (terminated Oct. 31)	3,220.68
Charles W. Snyder	Clerical assistant (effective Nov. 29)	853.33
Albert Kremposky	Special assistant (terminated Aug. 31)	933.34
Emma Willis Hill	Special assistant (terminated Aug. 13, 1971)	668.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$425,580.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	111,349.73
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	198,974.44

Total amount expended From Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 310,324.17
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971 115,225.83

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Expenses—July 1 through Dec. 31, 1971:		
Full committee		\$4,009.23
Special investigative staff		29,821.59
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee		74,694.09
Government Activities Subcommittee		47,721.96
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee		54,483.75
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee		65,245.82
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee		44,179.84
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee		57,746.06
Special Studies Subcommittee		51,732.26
Total		429,634.60

Salaries: Full committee, July 1 through Dec. 31, 1971:		
Herbert Roback	Staff director	18,000.00
Christine Ray Davis	Staff administrator	18,000.00
James A. Lanigan	General counsel	18,000.00
Miles Q. Romney	Associate general counsel	16,021.98
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto	Staff member	8,756.16
Ann E. McLachlan	do	8,487.00
Catherine S. Cash	do	6,955.20
Marilyn F. Jarvis	do	7,527.66
Annie M. Abbott	do	6,919.92
John Philip Carlson	Minority counsel	18,000.00
William H. Copen	Minority professional staffer	14,358.12
Clara Katherine Armstrong	Minority research assistant	7,801.62
Expenses, July 1 through Dec. 31, 1971:		
Full Committee, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman: Expenses (total)		4,099.23

Special investigative staff, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman:		
Warren B. Buhler	Minority staff member	9,000.00
Thomas H. Saunders	do	8,611.56
Shirley A. Davenport	Minority secretary (to Dec. 12)	3,824.98
John L. Dodson	Clerical Staff (to Nov. 30)	4,279.25
Ralph T. Doty	Clerical staff	3,674.28
Mabel C. Baker	Staff member (to July 15)	431.52
Total		29,821.59

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman:		
Elmer W. Henderson	Counsel	\$16,219.38
Douglas G. Dahlin	Staff attorney	11,680.38
John Paul Ridgely	Investigator	10,413.54
Joseph C. Luman	Defense analyst	11,021.27
Catherine L. Koeblein	Research assistant	8,015.28
Veronica B. Johnson	Clerk	7,810.62
Mary Etta Haga	Clerk-stenographer	4,999.98
Gloria Ann Rubin	do	4,351.08
Expenses		182.56
Total		74,694.09

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, Chairman:		
Ernest C. Baynard	Subcommittee staff director	15,528.66
C. Don Stephens	Research analyst	10,397.70
Paul A. Mutino	Counsel	9,250.02
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer	6,955.20
Mary G. Jones	Secretary	4,249.98
Expenses		1,340.40
Total		47,721.96

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, Chairman:		
James R. Naughton	Counsel	15,528.66
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member	15,528.66
Gilbert S. Goldhammer	Consultant	10,122.66
Pamela R. Horsmon	Clerk-stenographer	4,999.98
Margaret M. Goldhammer	Secretary	4,196.82
Expenses		4,106.97
Total		54,483.75

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Henry S. Reuss, Chairman:		
Phineas Indritz	Counsel	15,528.66
David B. Finnegan	Assistant counsel	12,726.84
Michael B. Gross	Legal assistant (to Dec. 3)	5,967.15
Clem L. Zinger	Professional staff member (from Aug. 2)	5,790.54
Josephine Scheiber	Research analyst	7,997.52
Ruth M. Wallick	Stenographer	5,875.38
Veronica K. Nicolas	Stenographer (from Sept. 20)	2,384.88
Jean E. M. Landsberg	Stenographer (from July 19 to Aug. 31)	991.73
Expenses		7,983.12
Total		65,245.82

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. John S. Monagan, Chairman:		
Richard L. Still	Subcommittee staff director	13,750.02
Charles A. Intriago	Assistant counsel	10,342.14
Jeremiah S. Buckley	do	6,250.00
Frances M. Turk	Clerk	4,999.98
Jane G. Cameron	Secretary	4,000.02
Expenses		4,837.66
Total		44,179.84
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. William S. Moorhead, Chairman:		
William G. Phillips	Subcommittee staff director	15,528.66
Norman G. Cornish	Deputy subcommittee staff director	15,528.66
Harold F. Whittington	Professional staff member	7,762.41
Martha Myers Doty	Clerk	4,500.00
Mary Elizabeth Milek	Secretary	3,750.00
William R. Maloni	Professional staff member (to Aug. 31)	3,459.42
Expenses		7,216.91
Total		57,746.06
Special Studies Subcommittee, Hon. Wm. J. Randall, Chairman:		
Erskine Stewart	Acting subcommittee staff director	9,895.08

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jacob N. Wasserman	Counsel	\$14,282.82
James L. Gyory	Investigator	6,001.37
Wilene O. Moore	Clerk	3,962.30
Elynor H. Humber	Secretary (from Nov. 1)	1,416.66
Jane F. Johnson	Secretary (to Oct. 20)	2,597.21
Herschel F. Clesner	Counsel (to Sept. 30)	7,112.13
Expenses		6,464.69
Total		51,732.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 303, 92d Cong.)	\$1,032,600.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported Jan. 3 to June 30, 1971	406,158.14
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	429,634.60
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1971	835,792.74
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	196,807.26
CHET HOLIFIELD, Chairman.	

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

January 14, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. Walker	Staff director	\$18,000.00
Frank B. Ryan	Director, information systems	18,000.00
Louis I. Freed	Assistant clerk	16,249.98
Robert D. Gray	Chief auditor	15,901.80
David S. Wolman	Personnel analyst	15,738.66
Melvin M. Miller	Minority clerk	15,738.66
John G. Blair	Assistant to the staff director	13,000.02
Ralph W. Murphy	Assistant clerk (minority)	10,000.02
Louis Silverman	Assistant clerk	9,616.44
Mary Stolle	do	6,438.90
Evelyn Hange Wilson	do	6,062.50
Judith Leonard Vargas	do	3,988.26
Thomas S. Foster, Sr.	Election's clerk	9,007.08
Thomas A. Tangretti	Electrical and mechanical office equipment clerk	8,325.00
Thomas W. Latham	Account's clerk	8,125.02
Curtis Wilkie	Printing clerk	3,525.00
John L. Boos	Library and memoirs' clerk	7,666.66
Douglas Lea	Printing clerk	5,096.67
Gurney S. Jaynes	Assistant clerk	6,250.02
Judith K. Holes	do	6,124.98
Robert A. Burk	do	6,000.00
Barbara D. Lewis	do	5,500.02
Velma T. Youngblood	do	5,083.32
Colette K. Bohatch	do	3,083.33
John Paul Tolson	do	3,083.33
Corbin Miller, Jr.	do	1,000.00
Marlene F. Whiteko	do	1,500.00
Thomas J. Hart	do	2,627.10
Pamela M. Bussen	do	2,803.17
Steven L. Glauberman	do	650.00
Charles R. Kaiser	do	430.00
Dianne Sue Gajot	do	304.76
Frank Sullivan, Jr.	do	1,214.14
Charles T. Moffit	do	4,250.01
Saundra M. Straw	do	1,625.01
Johanna Lucas	do	1,600.00
Lynne E. Patridge	do	1,500.00
Vincent A. Paka	Printing clerk	1,066.67

INFORMATION SYSTEMS—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(July 1 through October 31, 1971)

Charles N. Arrowsmith	Information systems specialist	6,333.32
Joseph L. Burns	Facility manager information systems	8,023.60
Betty Lamb	Administrative assistant, information systems	4,166.68
Betty J. Sharp	Assistant clerk	1,333.34

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—Continued

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$400,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	78,693.88
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	135,543.95
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31	214,237.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	185,762.17

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEMS (FORMERLY OPERATED BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE)

January 14, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from Nov. 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph L. Burns	Facility manager	\$4,416.67
Daniel J. Lasser	Manager, application development	1,597.23
Stuart M. Robinson	Information systems specialist	1,433.34
Phillip B. Ladd	do	1,628.83
Charles N. Arrowsmith	do	3,166.66
Earl D. Watterson	do	2,638.88
William R. Hill	Senior member technical staff	1,295.00
Michael Tomanio	Member technical staff	1,200.00
David L. Brazeal	do	1,143.58
Kent Huff	do	1,143.58
Betty Lamb	Administrative assistant	2,083.34
Benjamin R. Candler	Member technical staff	1,005.17
Kathryn A. Smith	do	1,005.17
Noah M. St. Clair	do	1,065.17
Timothy E. Gunter	do	858.00
Melvina R. Mallone	do	858.00
Robert Mumma	do	700.00
Betty Gill	Member operations staff	671.17
Betty J. Sharp	Secretary	1,333.34
Irene S. Morris	Member operations staff	649.67
Antionette P. Gauthier	do	600.00
Curtis L. Merrick	Senior member technical staff	534.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$1,500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
1971 amount expended from November 1971, to Dec. 31	56,134.53
1971 total amount expended from November 1971, to Dec. 31	56,134.53

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

January 12, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sidney L. McFarland	Staff director and chief clerk	\$18,000.00
Lewis A. Sigler	Counsel and consultant on Indian affairs	17,500.02
William L. Shafer	Consultant on mines and public lands	17,254.32

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles Leppert, Jr.	Minority counsel	\$16,000.02	Margie D. Biggerstaff	Secretary	\$5,046.78
Lee McElvain	Assistant counsel and consultant on national parks and recreation	14,500.02	Charles Bonneville	Investigator	7,953.00
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on irrigation and reclamation	15,499.98	Daniel Butler	Assistant documents clerk	4,996.68
Robert M. Gants	Assistant minority counsel	10,500.00	S. Janice Coil	Secretary	5,731.86
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk	10,000.02	Ruth Ann Crocetto	Information analyst	3,813.72
Patricia A. Murray	Clerk (minority)	10,000.02	Susan K. Daniels	do	4,411.08
Patricia B. Freeman	Clerk	9,000.00	Florence P. Doyle	Secretary	4,788.18
Susan W. Gardner	do	7,500.00	Elizabeth Edinger	Editor	7,748.34
Kathleen V. Sandy	do	7,500.00	Daniel Ferry	Assistant counsel	9,280.62
Salaries paid pursuant to H. Res. 285-92d Cong.:			Andrea Foy	Information classifier	3,250.02
Charles Conklin	Special counsel on public lands and environmental matters	16,000.02	Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	8,915.40
William G. Thomas	Consultant on Territorial and insular affairs	14,500.02	Sheila Harrison	Clerk-typist	3,250.02
Miriam Waddell	Clerk	7,000.02	William H. Hecht	Executive staff assistant investigator (terminated Nov. 30, 1971)	12,291.65
Inez Jarvis	do	7,500.00	Isobel Hurwitz	Information classifier	3,563.70
Nancy Lois Larson	do	6,750.00	L. William Ivory, Jr.	Assistant documents clerk	3,093.00
Marsha Lane	do	6,750.00	Doris R. Jaek	Information analyst	5,057.22
Marston L. Becker	Printing clerk	8,500.02	Mildred James	Clerk-typist	3,546.72
Edward Gaddis	Messenger	4,999.98	Joan Keller	Secretary	5,146.02
Bertha Drotos (from Nov. 1)	Clerk (minority)	1,666.66	John F. Lewis	Coordinating editor	13,780.98
Edward L. Weidenfeld (from Dec. 1)	Special counsel on energy matters	2,416.67	Virginia Masino	Receptionist	4,248.24
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$478,000.00	Anita Maggio	Clerk	3,250.02
Amount of expenditures previously reported		80,586.16	David E. Muffley, Jr.	Documents clerk	4,882.44
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1971		107,328.06	Maureen P. Ontrich	Information analyst	4,445.34
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to Dec. 31, 1971		188,514.22	Alma T. Pfaff	Research analyst	5,525.77
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		289,485.78	Peggy Pixley	Editorial clerk	5,057.22
WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Chairman.			Robert Poos	Research analyst	9,280.62
1 Includes payment of \$6,000 to Edward L. Weidenfeld, special counsel on energy matters, pursuant to contracts approved October 20, 1971, and November 5, 1971.			Stuart Pott	Investigator	6,456.36
			David Riggs	Information classifier (resigned Aug. 15)	600.00
			Audrey Rollins	Secretary	4,513.92
			Stephen H. Romines	Assistant Counsel (resigned Sept. 30)	4,640.31
			Karen Sue Russell	Information classifier	3,563.70
			Richard A. Shaw	Investigator	8,774.22
			Albert H. Solomon, Jr.	do	10,000.02
			Jeanne L. Spencer	Clerk-stenographer	4,249.98
			John N. Stratton	Investigator	7,953.00
			Barbara C. Sweeny	Clerk-stenographer	4,376.82
			Joseph Thach, Jr.	Research analyst	7,999.98
			Francis M. Watson, Jr.	Research specialist (appointment Dec. 15)	917.33
Investigative Committee (minority):					
George C. Armstrong			George C. Armstrong	Investigator	7,249.98
James L. Gallagher			James L. Gallagher	Research analyst	8,220.00
Richard Norusis			Richard Norusis	Investigator (appointed Oct. 9)	3,530.57
William T. Poole			William T. Poole	Research analyst	6,883.20
Herbert Romerstein			Herbert Romerstein	Chief investigator (terminated investigative Sept. 30)	4,261.29
Linda Spirit			Linda Spirit	Secretary	4,848.41
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$570,000.00			
Amount of expenditures previously reported		244,393.27			
Amount expended from July 7 to Dec. 31, 1971		297,535.78			
Total amount expected from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		541,929.05			
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		28,070.95			
RICHARD ICHORD, Chairman.					
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE					
January 3, 1972.					
To the Clerk of the House:					
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:					
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing Committee (majority):					
Donald G. Sanders (P)	Chief counsel	\$17,315.15	DeWitt White (P)	Legal counsel	6,019.36
Richard L. Schultz (P)	Associate chief counsel	13,663.86	Herbert Romerstein	Chief investigator (to standing Oct. 1)	7,250.01
William H. Hecht (P)	Executive staff assistant (to standing Dec. 1)	2,458.33	Ruth I. Mathews (C)	Clerk	12,000.00
Alfred M. Nittle (P)	Legislative counsel	14,842.26	Victoria Appell	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 1)	693.33
Glenn E. Davis (P)	Editorial director (terminated Nov. 30)	12,884.05	Barbara B. Bagwell	Information classifier (appointed Sept. 20)	1,823.62
Robert M. Horner (C)	Chief investigator	12,336.00	Martha M. Beck	Information classifier (resigned July 23)	441.02
William G. Shaw (C)	Research director	12,625.80	Patricia A. Belback	Stenographer	4,249.98
V. Bernice King (C)	Financial secretary	8,453.04			
Mary M. Valente (C)	Administrative secretary	9,134.22			
Anniel Cunningham (C)	Chief files and reference section	8,567.10			
Standing Committee (minority):					
DeWitt White (P)	Legal counsel	6,019.36			
Herbert Romerstein	Chief investigator (to standing Oct. 1)	7,250.01			
Ruth I. Mathews (C)	Clerk	12,000.00			
Investigative Committee (majority):					
Victoria Appell	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 1)	693.33			
Barbara B. Bagwell	Information classifier (appointed Sept. 20)	1,823.62			
Martha M. Beck	Information classifier (resigned July 23)	441.02			
Patricia A. Belback	Stenographer	4,249.98			

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
James M. Menger	Professional staff member.	\$18,000.00
William J. Dixon	do	18,000.00
Robert F. Guthrie	do	18,000.00
Kurt Borchardt	do	18,000.00
Charles B. Curtis	do	17,500.00
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 170 and 290:		
A. Bennett Schram	Staff assistant (minority).	10,000.00
Henry Thomas Greene	do	10,000.00
Helen M. Dubino	do	14,598.80
Darlene G. McMullen	Clerical assistant (minority).	4,033.97
Barbara L. Bullard	do	6,211.94
Linda (Firkin) Lantz	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Aug. 8)	3,676.70
Diane R. Tretter	Clerical assistant (through July 31)	779.46
Dennis C. Shumaker	Clerical assistant	3,716.52
Judith (Messer) Wood	do	4,750.00
Diane G. Kirchenbauer	do	5,750.00
Violet M. McCarthy	do	5,888.99
Anne P. Lebbon	do	4,450.00
Joseph T. Kelley	Messenger (through Aug. 31)	1,000.00
Randell R. Eley	Intern (through Aug. 31)	1,000.00
Robert P. Sweeney	Staff assistant (through Aug. 31)	1,833.34
Walter J. Graham, Jr.	Staff assistant	12,872.50
Stephen E. Lawton	do	12,872.50
Michael A. Taylor	Staff assistant (through July 31)	2,145.42
Michael R. Lemov	Staff assistant (from Aug. 1)	10,833.35
Special Subcommittee on Investigations:		
Michael J. Parker	Attorney	11,000.00
James R. Connor	Staff assistant	13,065.32
Daniel J. Manelli	Acting chief counsel	16,000.00
William T. Druhan	Staff assistant	14,090.43
Benjamin M. Smethurst	Special assistant	14,090.43
James F. Broder	do	13,427.55
Michael F. Barrett, Jr.	Attorney	12,712.89
Michael J. Duff	Staff assistant (through Oct. 12)	3,400.00
Albert J. McGrath	Special assistant (from Aug. 9)	5,601.09
Mark J. Raabe	Attorney	12,943.48
Russell D. Mosher	Staff assistant	5,238.84
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	7,422.00
Elizabeth A. Eastman	do	6,630.90
Judith B. Fisher	Clerical assistant (from Oct. 18)	2,230.56
Sylvia Sue Dodge	Clerical assistant (through Sept. 15)	2,333.33
Special securities study group:		
William Hall Painter	Special counsel	17,500.00
Robert L. Stern	Special consultant	11,763.91
Harvey A. Rowen	Staff attorney	9,375.00
Barboura C. Flues	Clerical assistant	5,500.00
Judith Ann Quinn	Clerical assistant (from July 19)	3,824.98
Annette Marie Bouchard	Clerical assistant (from Dec. 2)	725.00
William L. Cary	Special counsel (through July 31)	3,000.00
Christopher Vasillo-pulos	Staff assistant (through Aug. 9)	1,086.11
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$989,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		288,325.76
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1971		362,786.26
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1971		651,002.02
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		337,997.98

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it

during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	\$18,000.00
Benjamin L. Zelenko	General counsel	17,750.22
Kenneth L. Harkins	Chief counsel, anti-trust (through Sept. 8)	6,705.64
Herbert Fuchs	Counsel	17,463.00
Garner J. Cline	do	15,528.66
William F. Shattuck	do	15,528.66
Donald G. Benn	Associate counsel	15,000.00
R. Frederick Jett	Counsel	14,157.36
Jerome M. Zeifman	do	15,000.00
Frances Christy	Clerical staff	9,921.24
Jane C. Caldwell	do	9,099.78
Gertrude Clara Burak	do	8,095.44
Carrie Lou Allen	do	7,659.78
Lorraine W. Beland	do	7,659.78
Roberta E. Eisenberg	do	7,659.78
Joanne E. Bell	do	3,843.46
Pearl L. Chelman	do	4,999.98
Odia R. Chiles	Summer intern	600.00
Daniel L. Cohen	Assistant counsel	6,583.32
George A. Dalley	do	9,250.02
Howard C. Egli	Assistant counsel (from Oct. 1)	5,000.01
Arthur P. Endres, Jr.	Assistant counsel	7,000.02
James B. Farr	Messenger-clerk	3,275.02
Matthew Frank	Summer intern	430.00
Mary Shea Gaffney	Clerical staff	4,675.83
Samuel A. Garrison, III	Associate counsel	9,499.98
David J. Goldman	Summer intern (through Aug. 31)	600.00
Alma B. Haardt	Clerical staff	6,369.06
Alice E. Hamlin	Clerical staff (Oct. 10)	2,166.67
Herbert E. Hoffman	Special counsel for Federal criminal law reform	17,250.00
Alice M. Jackson	Clerical (from Sept. 27)	2,219.43
Florence C. Johnson	Clerical staff	4,770.00
Alfred S. Joseph, III	Assistant counsel	9,250.02
Judith Kahn	Clerical staff	3,709.98
Michael Kelenomick	do	6,718.20
Florence T. McGrady	do	6,718.20
Thomas E. Mooney	Assistant counsel	10,500.00
Roger A. Pauley	Associate counsel (through July 31)	2,500.00
Franklin G. Polk	Associate counsel	15,000.00
Ruth T. Pratt	Clerical staff	5,500.02
Mary G. Sourine	do	6,600.00
Keith A. Takata	Summer intern (through Aug. 31)	600.00
Annelie Tischbein	Clerical staff	4,750.02
Louis S. Vance	Messenger-clerk	4,179.66
Nancy L. Viener	Clerical (through Aug. 16)	332.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$350,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		106,978.89
Amount expended July 1, through Dec. 31, 1971		193,014.29
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, through Dec. 31, 1971		299,993.18
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1972		50,068.82

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1971	\$26,756.14
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1972	160,000.00
	186,756.14
Expenditure July 1-Dec. 31, 1971	53,804.58
Balance December 31, 1971	132,951.56
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1971	92,052.24
Expenditure July 1-Dec. 31, 1971	14,077.72
Balance Dec. 31, 1971	77,974.52
C. Revisions of the laws, 1972:	
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1972	39,980.00
Expenditure July 1-Dec. 31, 1971	17,419.50
Balance Dec. 31, 1971	22,560.50
EMANUEL CELLER, Chairman.	

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

December 31, 1971.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ralph E. Casey	Chief counsel	\$18,000.00
Ned P. Everett	Counsel	15,088.02
Ernest J. Corrado	do	13,500.00
Leonard L. Sutter	do	12,250.00
Robert J. McElroy	Chief clerk	12,045.61
William B. Winfield	Clerk	11,867.77
Frances P. Still	do	9,168.66
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	8,774.20
Albert J. Dennis	Investigator	8,127.91
Richard N. Sharoof	Minority counsel	13,015.77
William C. Rountree	do	9,000.00
Virginia L. Noah	Secretary (minority)	8,308.98
Francis D. Heyward	Counsel	13,000.00
Alfred Ronald Santo	do	8,000.00
Frank M. Potter, Jr.	do	9,000.00
Donald A. Watt	Editor	9,581.97
Lucy L. Summers	Secretary	6,159.58
Jane C. Wojcik	do	7,386.73
Pauline M. Dickerson	do	7,775.03
Eleanor P. Mohler	do	5,307.95
Betty Ann Nevitt	do	5,000.00
Norman W. Barnes	Investigator	5,065.85
Ronald W. C. Watt	Assistant clerk	3,375.00
Ruth I. Hoffman	do	5,000.00
Ellen Sudow	Research assistant	1,000.00
Mark Gersh	do	1,000.00
Elizabeth D. Heater	Staff assistant	3,249.99
James L. Larocca	Clerk, Subcommittee on Panama Canal	3,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$291,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	88,942.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	105,423.84
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to Dec. 31, 1971	194,366.60
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	97,133.40

EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

January 18, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Martini, John H.	Chief counsel	\$18,000.00
Gaughan, Vincent M.	Staff director and special counsel	17,500.02
Bray, Bun Benton	Associate staff director	17,749.98
Smiroldo, Victor C.	Counsel	17,749.98
Irvine, William A.	Assistant staff director	17,749.98
Kazy, Theodore J.	Senior staff assistant	17,749.98
Fortune, Francis C.	Coordinator	14,299.98
Lockhart, Robert E.	Assistant counsel	13,066.67
Thornton, Elsie E.	Chief clerk	12,250.74
Wells, Barbara M.	Secretary	8,749.98
Simons, Blanche M.	do	8,299.98
Investigative staff (pursuant to H. Res. 217 and 279 of the 92d Cong., 1st sess.):		
Artz, David J.	Intern (Aug. 1-31)	283.33
Barton, Richard A.	Staff assistant	11,100.00
Bates, Kathryn E.	Secretary	6,255.00
Bethke, Barbara Faye	Secretary (from Oct. 1)	1,500.00
Bebick, Joan E.	Secretary (July 1)	28.33

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—Con.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigative staff, (pursuant to H. Res. 217 and 279 of the 92d Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued		
Blackmore, Ruby	Staff assistant (to July 31).	\$500.00
Marina	Secretary	5,875.02
Borger, Deanne L.	do	4,953.42
Brown, Lorraine L.	Intern (November and December).	500.00
Camhi, Stanley A.	Secretary (from Nov. 1).	5,005.02
Ciaravella, Jo Ann	Secretary	7,099.98
Coultrap, Ray H.	Staff assistant	14,100.00
Devlin, Ralph J.	do	1,200.00
Diamond, Elaine L.	Secretary (from Nov. 1).	4,950.00
Eisen, Estelle F.	Secretary (July 19 to Nov. 7).	2,361.67
Fenstermacher, Frederic	Intern (to Aug. 9).	422.50
Ferdon, Julie	Intern (to Aug. 31).	600.00
Findley, Thomas W.	Staff assistant	2,499.99
Fussell, Glenda J.	Secretary	3,600.00
Gabusi, John B.	Staff assistant	12,510.00
Gould, George B.	do	12,512.52
Griffith, Thomas B.	Intern (to Aug. 31).	600.00
Harding, Delois	Secretary	4,950.00
Hitchcock, John E.	Intern (to Aug. 9).	422.50
Howard, Alton M.	Printing editor	9,600.00
Jacovitz, Richard H.	Intern (November and December).	500.00
Kennedy, Thomas R.	Staff assistant	12,220.02
Meyer, Robert J.	Intern (to Aug. 22).	693.33
Miller, Michael D.	Intern (to Aug. 29).	786.67
Moore, Robert M.	Intern (to Sept. 6).	898.33
Myers, Lois G.	Secretary	6,400.02
Napier, Margaret G.	do	5,400.00
Neuman, Robert A.	Staff assistant	7,504.98
Pendleton, Maria R.	Document clerk	8,250.00
Peters, Dorothy L.	Secretary	7,099.98
Raymond, Anthony J.	Staff assistant	11,749.98
Snipes, Justine P.	Secretary	7,131.36
Steeper, Scott Charles	Intern (July 1-31).	291.67
Spencer, Walter A.	Intern (to Aug. 9).	422.50
Thayer, Ted J.	Research assistant (from Sept. 1).	4,666.68
Ward, Sara L.	Secretary	7,975.02
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		
		\$553,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		
		203,375.45
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1971		
		212,384.48
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1971		
		415,759.93
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		
		117,240.07

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

December 31, 1971.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	\$18,000.00
Lester Edelman	Counsel	16,000.02
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Lloyd A. Rivard	Engineer consultant	16,000.02
Carl H. Schwartz Jr.	Consultant—projects and programs	7,374.00
James L. Oberstar	Administrator	16,006.02
Dorothy A. Beam	Executive staff assistant	11,023.98
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	9,194.52
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	7,684.98
Erla S. Youmans	Minority executive staff assistant	9,250.02
Gordon E. Wood	Minority professional staff	10,407.48
Investigating staff:		
Richard C. Peet	Assistant minority counsel	15,460.86
Robert F. Spence	Subcommittee clerk	8,629.38
Joseph A. Italiano Jr.	Editorial assistant	9,349.98

COMMITTEE ON RULES

January 15, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurie C. Battle	Staff director and counsel (P.)	\$18,000.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert D. Hynes, Jr.	Minority counsel (P.)	\$17,419.50
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant counsel and research analyst (P.)	10,830.38
Winifred L. Watts	Administrative assistant (P.)	8,266.10
Jonna Lynne Cullen	Staff assistant (C.)	7,447.52
Margaret Anne Bundick	Secretary (C.)	4,975.00
Total		66,938.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	268.23
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	456.60
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	724.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	4,275.17

WILLIAM M. COLMER, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

January 13, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Chas. F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel	\$18,000.00
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel	17,906.52
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	17,906.52
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	17,193.42
James E. Wilson, Jr.	Technical consultant	16,416.84
Carl Swartz	Minority staff	11,250.00
Joseph Del Riego	Minority staff (from Oct. 11)	4,888.88
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	7,184.16
Emily Dodson	do	6,884.70
Carol F. Rodgers	do	6,718.20
June C. Stafford	do	6,718.20
Kieran U. Cashman	do	5,558.88
Theresa M. Gallo	Secretary, minority (from Aug. 2)	3,725.00

Investigative staff (H. Res. 247):		
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	16,416.84
Harold A. Gould	Technical consultant	16,416.84
Philip P. Dickinson	do	14,232.66
W. H. Boone	do	17,906.52
William G. Wells, Jr.	Staff consultant	13,663.86
K. Guild Nichols, Jr.	Science consultant	4,640.31
J. Thomas Ratchford	Science consultant	14,893.14
John D. Holmfield	Science policy consultant (from Oct. 9)	5,466.67
Frank J. Giroux	Printing clerk	8,756.16
Elizabeth S. Jernan	Scientific research assistant	8,077.62
Martha N. Rees	Secretary	6,430.14
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	7,104.90
Patricia J. Schwartz	Secretary	4,953.42
Barbara J. Jackson	do	4,771.08
A. Patrick Nucciarone	Assistant publications clerk	933.00
Colleen P. Dunphy	Clerk-typist (to Sept. 17)	898.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$380,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	162,304.44
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	167,281.04
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1971	329,585.48
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	50,414.52

GEORGE P. MILLER, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

January 7, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946,

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT—Con.

Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Swanner	Staff director	\$18,000.00
Bennett Wolfe	Assistant staff director	15,028.58
Robert G. Allott	Senior staff member	17,002.14
Mariann R. Mackenzie	Secretary	10,000.02
Tempie W. Whittington	Assistant clerk	4,999.98
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 236; Mar. 23, 1971)		\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		380.25
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		184.40
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		564.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		24,435.35

MELVIN PRICE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

January 10, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	\$18,000.00
Donald C. Knapp	Counsel	18,000.00
John R. Holden	Professional staff (minority)	15,494.76
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aide	15,494.76
George W. Fisher	Clerk	17,463.00
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk	10,843.02
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	7,483.62
Mervie Ann Colby	do	7,272.24
Marjorie J. Kidd	do	6,955.20
Arthur M. Gottschalk	Professional aide (minority)	10,500.00
Patricia J. Wilton	Clerk-stenographer (minority)	5,481.06
Investigative staff:		
Philip E. Howard	Investigator	15,393.06
Rita W. Schwall	Clerk-stenographer (minority)	5,224.98
Audrey A. Powelson	Clerk-stenographer	5,481.06
Candis L. Graves	do	4,488.24
Helen Lee Fletcher	Clerk-stenographer (to July 31)	544.36
Vance L. Gilliam	Records clerk	4,333.92
Michael J. Wootton	Intern (minority) (to Nov. 30)	2,916.65
Courtenay E. Baskin	Clerk-stenographer (to Aug. 31)	1,166.66
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		52,829.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		56,265.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1971		109,094.57
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		40,905.43

OLIN E. TEAGUE Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

January 6, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971,

inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Martin, Jr.	Chief counsel (P)	\$18,000.00
Richard C. Wilbur	Minority counsel (P)	18,000.00
John Patrick Baker	Assistant chief counsel (P)	17,091.12
Robert B. Hill	Professional staff (P)	11,805.00
William Kane	do	15,738.66
James W. Kelley	do	16,487.46
Harold T. Lamar	do	16,487.46
A. L. Singleton, Jr.	do	14,569.74
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	7,395.00
Virginia Butler	do	8,790.00
William C. Byrd	do	5,962.50
Marie Crane	do	7,000.00
Mary Clare Fitzgerald	do	5,244.24
William Fullerton	do	16,487.46
Maxine Ganger	Staff assistant (C) (Oct. 18 to Oct. 31)	375.56
Charles Hawkins	Staff assistant (C)	17,091.12
Mary Jackson	Staff assistant (C) (to Oct. 14)	2,888.88
Grace Kagan	Staff assistant (C)	8,790.00
June Kendall	do	10,244.48
Elizabeth Lieblich	do	3,650.00
Mary M. Matthews	Staff assistant (C) (to Sept. 6)	2,109.52
Jean Ratliff	Staff assistant (C)	5,127.48
Gloria Shaver	do	8,542.98
Eileen Sonnett	do	7,395.00
Patricia Carol Stern	Staff assistant (C) (from Oct. 1)	2,124.99
Danna Thomas	Staff assistant (C) (from Aug. 1)	3,854.15
Judith VanDerSchaaf	Staff assistant (C)	5,130.00
Carole Vazis	do	6,099.12
Kaye Anne Weinstein	Staff assistant (C) (from Nov. 15)	1,426.99
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	7,395.00
Walter B. Little	do	7,395.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		3,019.37
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		7,489.37
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		10,508.74
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		64,491.26

WILBUR D. MILLS, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

January 6, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Stephen B. Abrams	Press assistant (to Aug. 31, 1971)	\$1,769.36
Stuart R. Allen	Chief investigator (to Nov. 30, 1971)	11,046.00
Mildred Irene Appleby	Secretary (from Aug. 19, 1971)	3,050.65
Ronald Barbatoe	Assistant counsel (to Oct. 31, 1971)	6,187.08
Livio A. Beccaccio	Investigator (from July 26, 1971)	8,611.13
Leroy C. Bedell, Jr.	Investigator	8,500.02
Michael William Blommer	Associate chief counsel	13,249.98
Mary R. Lingle Boysen	Secretary to the associate counsel (from Nov. 8)	1,722.50
Marian Carty	Secretary to the chairman	6,104.04
Frederick B. Collison	Investigator	7,025.64
Martha A. Cook	Secretary (from Sept. 20, 1971)	2,525.00
Joseph Mark Cribben	Associate chief investigator (to July 12)	824.86
James P. Donovan	Investigator (from July 1, 1971)	10,000.00
Eisworth D. Dory	Investigator	8,500.00
Miriam E. Douglass	Secretary (from Dec. 7, 1971)	666.66
Mary Faye Downey	Secretary	4,249.98
Lina Mabel Duran	do	5,934.75
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$43,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		13,215.79
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		15,142.23
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		14,641.98

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE RESTAURANT

January 3, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Campbell	Staff director	\$9,547.50
Judy A. Crowe	Secretary (resigned Sept. 30)	1,879.50
Patricia S. Putnins	Secretary (hired Oct. 1)	1,879.50
Total		13,306.50
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$675,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		188,764.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		259,711.18
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1971		448,475.73
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971		226,524.27

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

January 5, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Con.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Emilia E. Parrish	Secretary	\$6,019.62
James F. Qualls, Jr.	Staff assistant	900.00
William A. Keel, Jr.	Research analyst	18,000.00
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	9,482.52
Donna M. Watson	Secretary	4,484.52
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	16,118.36
William V. Clark	Staff assistant	1,333.34
Leslie R. Pennington	Printing editor	9,394.38
Thomas G. Powers	Counsel	5,250.02
Ralph W. Emerson	Investigator	4,000.00
Justinus Gould	Counsel	15,927.54
Donald B. Roe	do	9,394.38
Mary Eileen Owens	Secretary	3,141.68
Howard Greenberg	Staff director	18,000.00
Linda W. Kinkead	Secretary	6,133.80
Norma Gilbert	do	2,125.00
Millard V. Oakley	General counsel	3,000.00
John Rayburn	Counsel	10,416.68
T. J. Oden	do	1,931.07
Christine Santoro	Secretary	3,929.40
Dorothy M. Jordan	do	3,666.68
Linda Louise Spakes	do	4,166.68
Mary Biddle Dick	Secretary, minority	3,499.98
Margaret L. Carpenter	do	468.75
Willa C. Rawls	do	4,104.87
Bernadette O. Romanesk	do	5,205.19
James R. Phalen	Assistant minority counsel	10,500.00
John M. Finn	Minority counsel	11,500.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$530,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	206,596.99
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1971	211,122.40
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1971	417,719.39
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	112,280.61

JOE EVINS, Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

January 7, 1972.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Eugene F. Peters	Executive director	\$18,000
Raymond L. Gooch	Counsel	13,673.63
Nicholas A. Masters	Staff director	8,000.01
Francis J. Butler	Clerk	3,750.00
Cynthia K. Watkins	Executive secretary	5,250.00
Donald G. Tacheron	Director of research	16,000.02
Vilma Berarducci	Clerk	1,666.67
James J. Hennelly	do	442.00
George Meader	Counsel	11,172.00
Mary E. Bernard	Clerk	3,369.43
James F. McAllister	Administrative officer	2,483.33
Robert J. Kelley	do	2,355.55
James S. Machowski	Clerk	58.33
Lynn Gayle Zeltner	do	54.17
Gerard C. Snow	do	166.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$425,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from July to Dec. 1971	90,070.13
Total amount expended from July to Dec. 1971	90,070.13
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1971	334,929.87

JACK BROOKS, Chairman.

January 10, 1972.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name,

profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1971, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren	Staff director and counsel	\$15,528.66
Charles S. Brewton	General counsel	15,257.46
George T. Ault	Professional staff member	10,572.24
Cary H. Copeland	Assistant staff director	10,462.70
Mattie I. Echols	Secretary	5,472.42
Helen O. McDaniel	Clerk assistant	1,500.00
Joel V. Lumer	Staff assistant	1,250.00
John R. Hall	do	1,033.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1526. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that several appropriations to the Department of Defense and other departments and agencies have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations in order to permit payment of pay increases granted by law, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1527. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of the company as of December 31, 1971, pursuant to 37 Stat. 979; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1528. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting the 13th annual report of the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1529. A letter from the Director, Office of Telecommunications Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 to increase and extend for 1 year the authorization for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1530. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the disposition of applications for conditional entry to the United States from Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Italy, and Lebanon, during the 6 months ended December 31, 1971, under the provisions of section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1531. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1532. A letter from the Commission, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1533. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report, on an agency-by-agency basis, of positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 during 1971, together with summaries of actions taken (1) under the numerical limitations of U.S.C. 5108(a), (2) outside such numerical limitations, and (3) regarding hearing examiner positions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1534. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a report of positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 in the Department of Defense during 1971, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1535. A letter from the State and Federal Co-chairs, Ozarks Regional Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission for 1971; to the Committee on Public Works.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

January 10, 1972.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurence N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	\$19,999.98
Lincoln Arnold	Deputy chief of staff	18,000.00
Dennis P. Bedell	Assistant chief of staff	16,960.02
Arthur Fefferman	Chief economist	18,000.00
Nicholas A. Tomasulo	Legislation counsel	16,819.98
Herbert L. Chabot	Assistant legislation counsel	14,050.02
Robert R. Smyers	Refund counsel	16,811.52
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	16,177.02
John Germanis	do	13,249.98
Meade Emory	Legislation attorney	14,050.02
Albert Buckberg	Economist	13,999.98
Michael D. Bird	do	13,999.98
Harrison B. McCawley	Refund attorney	12,373.02
Bernard M. Shapiro	Legislation attorney	11,925.00
Joseph P. Spellman	do	10,827.00
Harold Dubroff	do	10,500.00
Donald C. Evans, Jr.	Statistical clerk	10,445.52
Anastasia Connaughton	do	10,445.52
Joseph E. Fink	Accountant	10,000.02
James E. Wheeler	Economist	9,250.02
Leon W. Klud	Refund attorney	8,638.98
Carl E. Bates	Secretary	8,050.02
Joanne McDermott	do	6,349.98
Linda Savage	Secretary (refund)	6,199.98
Blanche Nagro	Secretary	5,906.52
Mary W. Gattie	do	5,700.00
Jamie L. Daley	do	5,250.00
June Matthews	do	5,149.98
Amelia Del Carmen	do	5,149.98
Marcia B. Rowzie	do	5,149.98
Sharon Malcom	Secretary (refund)	4,099.98
Wanda D. Fraser	Secretary (through Nov. 13)	3,509.74
Jacqueline Miller	Secretary (through Sept. 7)	1,861.10
Jacqueline S. Pfeiffer	Secretary (as of Oct. 11)	2,376.79
Katherine Keller	Secretary (through Aug. 31)	816.66
Lorene Heriot	Secretary (as of Nov. 8)	1,437.49

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$756,720.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1 to July 1, 1971)

348,950.52

Amount expended from July 1, 1971 to Jan. 1, 1972

360,316.91

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1971

709,267.43

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1972

398,403.09

RUSSELL B. LONG, Chairman.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1536. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the financial statements of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal year 1971, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 851 (H. Doc. 92-242); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1537. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that the Department of the Air Force system for buying spare parts for initial support of new military aircraft needs substantial improvements; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1538. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on management improvements needed in the review and evaluation of applications to construct and operate nuclear powerplants, Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce 92d Congress, first session (Rept. No. 92-803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 790. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7987. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution (Rept. No. 92-804). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 791. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10243. A bill to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-805). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 792. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12089. A bill to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse (Rept. No. 92-806). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12769. A bill to assist local educational agencies to provide quality education programs in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12770. A bill to provide financial assistance for State and local small, community-based correctional facilities; for the creation of innovative programs of vocational training, job placement, and on-the-job counseling; to develop specialized curriculums, the training of educational personnel, and the funding of research and demonstration projects, to provide financial assistance to encourage the States to adopt special probation services to establish a Federal Corrections Institute; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12771. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed, and restore on behalf of certain veterans educational assistance benefits which had previously terminated; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12772. A bill to adjust the basic compensation of the police helicopter pilots of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 12773. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 12774. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FAUNTRY (for himself and Mr. STUCKEY):

H.R. 12775. A bill to authorize programs in the District of Columbia to combat and control the disease known as sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12776. A bill to provide for the prevention of sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 12777. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize the insurance of loans to defray mortgage payments on homes owned by persons who are temporarily unemployed or whose income has been drastically reduced as the result of adverse economic conditions prevailing in an industry or area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GODE, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. ROE, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 12778. A bill to amend section 1905 of title 44 of the United States Code relating to depository libraries; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 12779. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which deductions on account of an individual's outside earnings will cease to be made from benefits based on such individual's wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 12780. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 12781. A bill to provide for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the improvement and operation of museums; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12782. A bill to modify the restrictions contained in section 170 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code in the case of certain contributions of literary, musical, or artistic composition, or similar property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 12783. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to allow the counting of time spent in enlisted service as a cadet or midshipman at a service academy toward length of service as an officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEMP, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WAGGONER, and Mr. JONES of Tennessee):

H.R. 12784. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12785. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to certain islands in the State of Massachusetts to determine whether such islands should be made a part of the Cape Cod National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12786. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN (for himself and Mr. ROBISON of New York):

H.R. 12787. A bill to establish an Emergency Medical Services Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist communities in providing professional emergency medical care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 12788. A bill governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 12789. A bill to provide for the control of sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 12790. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for voluntary agreements between ministers and their employers to treat ministers as employed persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 12791. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations to fully fund bilingual education programs under title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 12792. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish procedures providing members of the Armed Forces redress of grievances arising from acts of brutality or other cruelties, and acts which abridge or deny rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States, suffered by them while serving in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12793. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12794. A bill to provide for a procedure to investigate and render decisions and recommendations with respect to grievances and appeals of employees of the Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 12795. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the rate base of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidiaries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 12796. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12797. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 12798. A bill to provide for the establishment of feed grain bases for farms acquired from the United States for the production of feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 12799. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to authorize an insurance program and death and disability benefits for public safety officers; to provide civil remedies for victims of racketeering activity; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 12800. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations requiring certain modes of public transportation in interstate commerce to reserve some seating capacity for passengers who do not smoke; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. KEITH, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PODELL, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. FISH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. REES, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GROVER, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. RYAN, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. McDONALD of Michigan):

H.R. 12801. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint students at State maritime academies and colleges as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DOW, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. STRATTTON):

H.R. 12802. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint students at State maritime academies and colleges as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. KEITH, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PODELL, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. FISH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. REES, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GROVER, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. RYAN, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. McDONALD of Michigan):

H.R. 12803. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act in order to provide for the deferment thereunder of students appointed to maritime academies and colleges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DOW, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KYROS, and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 12804. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act in order to provide for the deferment thereunder of students appointed to maritime academies and colleges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12805. A bill to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to delegate to any common carrier by railroad, or any employee thereof, certain functions relating to the enforcement of certain Federal laws affecting railroads and property moving by railroad in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12806. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to permit Postal Service employees to engage more fully in political activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

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; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 12808. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by authorizing general support grants to defray the ordinary operating costs of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast stations and by establishing the long-range financing of public broadcast programming through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in a manner consistent with the original intent of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12809. A bill to retain November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 12810. A bill to amend section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to additional mileage for the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. GAYDOS):

H.R. 12811. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL (by request) (for himself and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H.R. 12812. A bill to amend section 208(f) of the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 to provide that the amounts in the airport and airway trust fund shall be available to meet obligations of the United States incurred in accordance with the priorities established under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 12813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 12814. A bill to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-378; 85 Stat. 794) to expand the Youth Conservation Corps pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 12815. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. High Court of Settlement which shall have jurisdiction over certain labor disputes in industries and other enterprises affecting interstate commerce and the public interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12816. A bill to provide for improvements in the administration of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 12817. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly pro-

cedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 12818. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold, and to accept gold as compensation under the terms of a contract; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. GARMATZ, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 12819. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the income of individuals for certain amounts of tuition paid with respect to dependents enrolled in private elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 12820. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to permit the waiver of matching requirements in special and unusual circumstances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 12821. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to conditionally suspend the application of certain penal provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 12822. A bill to approve and authorize amnesty or mitigation of punishment for certain persons who have illegally manifested their disapproval of U.S. participation in the Vietnam war; and to provide for restoration of civil and political rights that have been lost or impaired by reason of such illegal acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12823. A bill to retrocede a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 12824. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 12825. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HOLFIELD and Mr. HOSMER) (by request):

H.R. 12826. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 12827. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of certain Federal courts with respect to public schools and to confer such jurisdictions upon certain other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BARING, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DORN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. Saylor, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 12828. A bill to amend chapters 31, 34, and 35 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of vocational rehabilita-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and persons; to provide for advance educational assistance payments to certain veterans; to make improvements in the educational assistance programs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THONE (for himself, Mr. CA-
BELL, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr.
DOWNING, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HOGAN,
Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. McCLORY, Mr.
THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. VANDER
JAGT, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 12829. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 12830. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to include diabetes among the diseases specifically required to be covered by regional medical programs thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DER-
WINSKI, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORSYTHE,
Mr. FRASER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. LAND-
GREBE, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. ROE, Mr.
ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. TIERNAN,
Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 12831. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 12832. A bill to provide for a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a proposed Ohio River National Parkway in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.J. Res. 1040. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of signifi-

cantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LINK, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McCLORE, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MOSHER):

H.J. Res. 1041. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAILBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SLACK, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WARE, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YATES):

H.J. Res. 1042. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 1043. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give to local school authorities the right to determine the extent to which students are provided transportation to their schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.J. Res. 1044. Joint resolution to suspend for 80 days the continuation of any strike or lockout arising out of the labor dispute between the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1045. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period April 19 through April 22, 1972, as "School Bus Safety Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.J. Res. 1046. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting deficit spending by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPEL:

H.J. Res. 1047. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period April 19 through April 22, 1972, as "School Bus Safety Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

February 1, 1972

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 514. Concurrent resolution to relieve the suppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 515. Concurrent resolution urging review of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 793. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 243; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 794. Resolution calling upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry; 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. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12833. A bill for the relief of James R. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 12834. A bill for the relief of Marion Davis and Maxine Davis, husband and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12835. A bill for relief of Arnold J. Follett and his wife, Elsie M. Follett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 12836. A bill for the relief of Harold Gilbertson, Raymond Nelson, Lawrence Powell, Marvin Holland, Erling Ellison, Haakon Pederson, Marvel Blix, all of Cathlamet, Wash., and Charles F. Gann, of Westport, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12837. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Mario Petrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

183. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, Oklahoma City, Okla., relative to maintenance of a strong domestic oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

184. Also petition of the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, Santurce, P. R., relative to the centennial of the birth of Santiago Iglesias Pantin, founder of the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS DETAILS THE POSITIVE ACTIONS BEING TAKEN AGAINST DRUG USE AND ABUSE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Monday I attended a ceremony marking the 25th anniversary of Listen magazine, a youth-oriented publication devoted to better living. Featured speaker at the luncheon was Senator FRANK E. Moss,

who gave an excellent presentation of the positive actions being taken against drug use and abuse.

The able legislator from Utah said:

The need for assistance is great for young people. Far too often they turn toward drugs, cigarettes, or alcohol to provide that something extra in their lives. Listen has shown them the other side of the story.

Listen magazine contains articles on drug usage, told in language that young people can understand and appreciate. But it is not merely a recitation of drug experiences; the authors also produce first-person narratives on why they choose to avoid drugs.

It is this positive approach that is often overlooked by writers. Along with the warnings and preachments, we must tell our young people that there are safer, healthier and much better ways to find self-fulfillment, and show them by example.

The monthly publication, with its emphasis on wholesome living, presents up-to-date facts on drug problems, alcoholism, smoking and health. It has the largest circulation of any magazine of its type, 180,000 copies each issue, according to editor Francis A. Soper. It is the only one of its type officially approved by the commissioner of education