

Union which would normalize our trade and commercial relations with the Soviet Union. I would welcome such news under different circumstances.

I think we must now view such important and good news against the background of international morality and violations of international law and of the United Nations Charter posed by the Soviet action in relation to its citizens who wish to emigrate.

I also note that there have been statements indicating that the Soviet Union views its emigration policy as an economic question and I take the U.S.S.R. at its word.

It is my hope that the highest political leadership of the Soviet Union has not yet made a definitive decision to go forward with this emigration tax, and that some lower level bureaucratic bungling such as periodically afflicts all complex societies—including our own—may have resulted in this publication about the new emigration rules at the very time when the White House was announcing the possibility of a major new trade agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

But if this publication does reflect the political will of the Soviet leadership, it is my deep feeling that the individual elements of such a trade agreement could be heading for trouble. Congressional action will be required to implement many phases of the agreement and the President and the Congress, I am sure, will want to review other aspects of Soviet economic policy when they are called upon to pass judgement on trade agreement legislation.

Mr. President, a number of distinguished Senators, such as the Senator from Connecticut, the two Senators from Minnesota, and the Senator from Mis-

souri, the Senator from Indiana, and perhaps other Senators have already spoken out on this question.

I hope very much that the Soviet leadership will listen and that it will open its mind and its ears and its heart to what is being said since it does address itself to a basic feeling for inalienable human rights.

It is one thing to swallow one's feelings when it comes to limiting armaments. No one has raised a word about this issue with respect to this agreement approved today with respect to the limitation of arms. However, it is a very different thing when economic matters are before the Congress since man does not live by bread alone.

So, I hope very much for the best. And I wish to indicate that at a moment when it might count, I must express my deep unhappiness and the appalling feeling that I had when I read this seeming news of a confirmation of what has been dreaded as Soviet policy movement regarding emigration timed to be read throughout the world the very same day as the announcement of what would have been otherwise an optimistic development, namely, the expansion of trade between our two great countries.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York. I am outraged by the way the Soviet Jews have been treated. The Senator raises a valid point. I am glad to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is highly honored that such a great Senator as the Senator from Virginia should find his remarks worthy of the comments he has made.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has already been stated that the business tomorrow will be the conference report on the military procurement bill.

Following that, it is the intention to take up Calendar No. 982, S. 3531, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the planning, design, and construction of outdoor recreational facilities in connection with the 1976 winter Olympic games.

It is quite possible, also, that the treaty which was considered up to final reading today may be voted on tomorrow. So we will have a heavy schedule.

There will be some votes tomorrow, and there will be votes on Saturday as well, because we have a heavy schedule for that day, too.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed; and at 5:20 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, September 15, 1972, at 9 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 14, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Baruch Schectman, Congregation Ner Tamid, Springfield, Pa., offered the following prayer:

The Lord by wisdom founded earth, by understanding He established the heavens.—Proverbs.

Wisdom and understanding are the foundations of the universe. O Heavenly Father, in these Halls, where an abundance of these qualities is required every day, where the deliberations conducted and the decisions made so greatly affect the fate of all Your children, may Your blessings of wisdom and understanding, along with compassion and strength be granted continually to the representatives of the people of these United States; wisdom to investigate the needs of their people, understanding to find the solutions to their problems, compassion to consider the opinions of those who disagree and oppose, and strength to carry out what these qualities teach them they must do.

For this blessing may we be ever grateful. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6503. An act for the relief of Capt. Claire E. Brou;

H.R. 7701. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands located outside the boundaries of Indian reservations in New Mexico;

H.R. 10702. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Fort Belknap Indian Community;

H.R. 13025. An act to amend the act of May 19, 1948, with respect to the use of real property for wildlife conservation purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 698. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to correct the title of the bill, S. 3442.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14896) entitled "An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to assure that adequate funds are available for the conduct of summer food service programs for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers, and for other purposes related to expanding and strengthening the child nutrition programs."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4383) entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a system governing the creation and opera-

tion of advisory committees in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CHILES, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PERCY, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. BROCK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12652) entitled "An act to extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights, to expand the jurisdiction of the Commission to include discrimination because of sex to authorize appropriations for the Commission, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. FONG, and Mr. SCOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 3337. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; and

S. 3917. An act to authorize the construction of the completion of the New Senate Office Building on the east half of square 725 in the District of Columbia, to authorize the acquisition of certain real property in square 724 in the District of Columbia, to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to initiate and conduct a study of alternate designs for a vehicle parking garage with limited commercial facilities to be constructed on square 724 and an architectural design competition to be conducted in connection therewith, and to authorize the acquisition of all publicly or privately owned property contained in square 764 in the District of Columbia as an addition to the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI BARUCH SCHECTMAN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who gave our opening prayer this morning is from my own hometown, Springfield, Pa. He is Rabbi Baruch Schectman of the Delaware County Jewish Community Center.

Many years ago, long before I came to Congress, I was very happy to see the construction start on the Delaware County Jewish Community Center. Delaware County presently has a population of 604,000. Back in those days it was probably about 300,000. He did a tremendous job of building a building, not only to service a synagogue, but also as a recreation area for the young people of the community.

Rabbi Schectman has been doing a tremendously outstanding job of enlarging his congregation and actually taking care of problem children, going out of his way.

On at least two occasions that I know of, he has taken problem children into his home with the consent of the parents for a period of 2 weeks to a month and has overcome their problems.

I want to thank him for coming down here today, and I want to urge him to

continue the fine work that he has started.

SOVIET POLICY ON EXIT FEES FOR JEWISH EMIGRANTS

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that a bipartisan group of Members will be participating in a special order today to explore the impact of the Soviet policy on exit fees for Jewish emigrants on the proposed expansion of Soviet-American trade.

On September 19, the Supreme Soviet will meet to ratify a schedule of fees, ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000, for each Jewish person with a higher education who wants to go to Israel. I feel it is very important for the Soviet Union to know that their restrictive emigration policy will cause this Congress to extensively scrutinize any proposed Soviet-American trade pacts.

I urge all my colleagues to participate in this demonstration of the Congress concern.

THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues in the House will be happy to know that one of the alltime great Members of Congress, the Honorable Carl Vinson of Georgia, is visiting with us and he is holding court in the Armed Services Committee rooms in true "Admiral" Vinson style. He is outstanding in every sense of the word—we are all proud of him—we all love him and I know we are happy that he is back to spend a little time with his beloved former colleagues at the scene of so many personal triumphs and so many contributions to our Nation's defense.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY DR. DURWARD G. HALL

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, 62 years ago there floated on the air above the Ozark hills the familiar sounds of an infant making his way into the world of the living.

This infant of those many years ago, destined to become known as DURWARD GORHAM HALL, a nationally known physician and surgeon who backslid into politics, sits among us today as one of the most highly respected Members of the House of Representatives.

This will be the last birthday that my close friend and personal physician will observe as a Member of the House for he is voluntarily retiring at the end of this session. He seems to feel that at the age of 62 he has reached the point of no return—quite overlooking the words of wisdom of old that—

King Solomon and King David led merry, merry lives,
They each had many concubines and many, many wives.
Until old age came creeping in, then with many, many qualms
Solomon wrote the proverbs and David wrote the psalms.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that with so many of our colleagues I wish DURWARD GORHAM HALL a happy birthday and both him and his good wife, Bettie, many years of good health and enjoyment in the years of their retirement that lie ahead.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to wish our distinguished friend, Dr. HALL, a happy birthday.

One is brought into the world with a spanking by a physician and makes noise immediately. In the 62 years, up until today, it is my deep conviction that "Doc" HALL has not yet ceased making noise. I know I will miss him on a personal basis—I am not sure I will miss the virtually innumerable walks.

May I ask the gentleman from Iowa, I understand that on occasion he goes fishing with Dr. HALL?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; whenever possible.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Would the gentleman describe to us what happens when one or the other of you is lucky enough to catch a fish?

Mr. GROSS. Then the bugle blows to summon the charge for the capture of another fish. However, the noise usually drives the fish to deeper and more distant waters.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I see.

In order that he can continue being noisy, would you present this bugle on behalf of those who have responded virtually innumerable times to his bugle calls here. I would like the RECORD to show, Mr. Speaker, that that bugle was not purchased with counterpart funds. Thanks to "Doc" HALL's generosity, I was able to save enough of my own funds to invest in this musical instrument for my beloved friend, Dr. HALL.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot thank the gentleman enough for his gift. Hereafter, our mutual friend shall be known as the bulger of the Ozarks.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to pit my talents against the inimitable gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) in trying to describe our pill peddler from the Ozarks, who is really a man of unique qualification as a legislator and a physician. He has played a role in this House that few would undertake but is sorely needed.

Dr. HALL was born 62 years ago today. I already knew how to talk at that time, but I must confess he has caught up with me long since. He has filled pages in the RECORD all in an effort to see that our work was done properly and in the people's interest. We will miss him. We join

in wishing him a happy birthday today and many more in the years to come.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has many talents, and among his talents, at the very top of the list is that of an M.D. He is also a person who gave much as a military man during World War II and has served with experience for many years in the House of Representatives.

I do not know whether he has a talent musically, but he will have the time to perfect that ability during his retirement. We will miss him while he is practicing and hope that he returns often whether he is a proficient bugler or not.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join in the very complimentary remarks made by the gentleman in the well and our leader with respect to our dear friend Dr. HALL.

As the majority leader and one who has been in a position of leadership in this House, I am just interested in knowing who the gentleman's new ally might be. My situation during this Congress has been that I have had to confer with Leader GROSS and if I got concurrence then I had to confer with Leader HALL, or the other way around at times. Sometimes I have thought there was a degree of connivance which could have existed. Happy birthday, Doc.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would hope the gentleman would ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks. I am not sure everyone who is going to say something is necessarily going to be truthful and they ought to have at least time to examine their consciences.

The SPEAKER. The Chair advises the gentleman that this is the first time, I believe, since the present occupant has sat in the chair, that he has stretched the 1-minute rule except for memorial occasions. The fact that this is happening now is only a coincidence.

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

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I first came to the House of Representatives a few years ago it was my distinct pleasure on the first day I arrived to meet the very eminent DURWARD HALL. Later I found out I was living in the same apartment house with him. He took me under his wing and advised me that it was a pleasure to have somebody from New Jersey who wore shoes. He has made some other facetious remarks in my respect, but I want to tell the Members one thing, that when Dr. HALL was born the good Lord broke the

mold, because he is the only man I have ever run across from the Ozarks who has the audacity to sound the clarion call in the apartment house where we live every morning to get everybody out of bed. I shall miss him I am sure not only on the House floor but also in the mornings when he would be blowing that horn. I am hopeful someone will give him one that has a different chime to it so he can get a different call.

Happy birthday, Doc.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I too join my colleagues in paying tribute to the "Bugler of the Ozarks." I recall when I came to Congress the gentleman in the well was the junior Member of a two-man party with Clare Hoffman of Michigan, who has gone to meet his Maker; and now the gentleman in the well is being abandoned by the now junior member of his two-man party. I am looking forward to whomever the gentleman may select to replace the gentleman from Missouri, although that would be a very difficult job. I will say to the gentleman in the well that Dr. HALL well filled the boots of Clare Hoffman. I think the gentleman from Missouri has rendered a tremendous service to his country in the watchdog capacity he has assumed here as a member of the two-man party. He will be missed.

I will say to the good doctor, he being a general practitioner, when he leaves I hope he will return and make House calls.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to be the fate in life of the gentleman in the well to be abandoned.

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

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa I do not believe he is really going to be abandoned. It seemed to me that the insistfulness in the majority leader's voice, when he asked the question as to the successor of the gentleman from Missouri, seemed to be suggesting to the gentleman from Iowa to consider him to replace Dr. HALL as the junior member of this famous two-man party. This should be very carefully considered.

Certainly we are going to miss the distinguished doctor from the Ozarks. He came to the House as a specialist in curing in the disease of profligacy. He is a person who is dedicated to the idea that the disease can be treated and stamped out of this particular Chamber. I think he has done a very fine job of treating the disease, but as yet I have not been able to notice any great upswing in the incidence of the serum which the gentleman from Missouri has always proposed, known as parsimony. There is no doubt but what the good Doctor's career has been a very great success. He has been a true watchdog of the Treasury. Also, he is a fine gentleman, we all

wish him the very best of everything, including many happy returns of the day.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly wish to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, Congressman Dr. HALL, on his birthday. I had the pleasure of living in the same building with Dr. HALL for a number of years. It must have been before he got his bugle. I regret that I have not had the chance to hear him sound off on that bugle.

There is no question that he has performed a very valuable service during his time in the House, and we all owe him a debt of gratitude. We know he is going to leave at the end of this year, and we hope he has a long, prosperous, and very happy retirement.

Mr. GARMATZ. I, too, wish to join my colleagues in wishing Dr. HALL a very happy birthday today. I hope that he enjoys many, many more, and I hope also that he enjoys the best of everything.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members caring to do so may extend their remarks on the life, works, and bugling of the gentleman from the Ozarks.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Dr. DURWARD HALL, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 364]

Abourezk	Erlenborn	Purcell
Ashley	Evans, Colo.	Quie
Baker	Evins, Tenn.	Rarick
Barting	Fulton	Rees
Bell	Gallagher	Reid
Bevill	Goldwater	Robison, N.Y.
Blanton	Griffiths	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hagan	Rosenthal
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	Runnels
Brotzman	Hawkins	Ryan
Byrnes, Wis.	Hillis	Scherle
Caffery	Keith	Scheuer
Carey, N.Y.	Koch	Skubitz
Carney	McDonald,	Springer
Celler	Mich.	Talcott
Clark	McMillan	Teague, Calif.
Clay	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Colmer	Mass.	Tierman
Curlin	Mayne	Vander Jagt
Delaney	Meeds	Waldie
Dellenback	Melcher	Wampler
Dowdy	Mills, Ark.	Wilson, Bob
Dwyer	Nichols	Yatron
Eckhardt	Pelly	
Edmondson	Pickle	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H.R. 16654), making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1400), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MICHEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the defense appropriations bill.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 16593) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 16593, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 7 on page 1 of the bill.

If there be no amendments to be proposed, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere); \$7,488,461,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am told by defense officials across the board that the committee has cut too deeply into personnel funds. The committee has made estimates of short falls in strength and has cut appropriations accordingly. The services insist the cuts are too severe

and they will cause serious funding problems. The committee attitude seems to be to let the matter go to the Senate for adjustment. I do not think this proper. The time is short for reconsideration but we should make certain of our facts and make corrections if they are needed.

Each of the services disagree sharply with the reductions saying they will have significant adverse impact on force manning, training programs and service capability.

The Air Force requests that 5,246 of the man-year cut be restored. This would require a funding restoration of \$51,956,000.

The Navy wants \$108,720,000 to restore 8,832 man-years.

The Army requests the restoration of \$21.2 million in funds and 2,642 man-years for personnel. This is less than half of the cuts in short fall personnel imposed by the committee.

The committee has acted in good faith in making reductions but the committee is not infallible. A half billion dollar cut in personnel has been made. It appears that it may be too severe.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman has set forth the problem I believe very clearly and succinctly. The problem is simply that we, apparently, in the computations have made an error in the number of personnel and the grades of personnel who may be in the military during this next fiscal year. I believe also we may not have realized or not taken into consideration the fact that much of the fiscal year is already gone and more of the fiscal year will have elapsed before the bill is in its final form and the Department of Defense will know exactly the pattern it will have to set fiscally in military personnel for the next year.

The figures I have, which I am sure the gentleman from Florida will agree with, are that the Air Force has been shorted some 5,246 man-years, and in a total amount of \$51,956,000; the Army has been shorted some 2,642 man-years, and that total is \$21.2 million; and the Navy has been shorted, 8,832 man-years, with a total in financial involvement of \$108,720,000; which adds up to a total of somewhere near \$190 million.

I might state also that the total cut in this bill in military personnel is something near \$576 million under the budget, so if the \$190 million were restored there would still be a cut in spending for military personnel of some \$386 million below the budget.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, my question to the distinguished chairman is simply this: If the services are able to provide conclusive evidence of hardship in numbers of personnel under the proposed committee cuts, can it now be stated that the committee is prepared to make reasonable restorations in conference to insure a satisfactory force level for personnel within the services?

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. I would respond by say-

ing to my distinguished colleague and friend that I assume, as in former years, that the Defense Department will appeal practically all of the reductions made by the committee. The Defense Department wants the figures as set forth in the budget.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I certainly believe that the House conferees should, and will consider sympathetically any requests which may come to the conferees of the House, and will do whatever is reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances.

I am not concerned that the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations will knowingly do an injustice to the services. We have provided in the bill \$23.1 billion for personnel. If we have cut too deeply in some areas, I think the committee must and will consider taking any action that is reasonably necessary under the circumstances to prevent cutting the muscle of the Defense Department.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the gentleman's response.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HEBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want one thing clearly understood, because it is rather fuzzy in my mind at this moment.

The authorizing legislative committee is charged with the responsibility for fixing the authorized strength of the various services. In discharging its responsibility there it cut back the strength this year to a number. Does this appropriation cut that strength back further?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. As I understand it, the authorizing committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana reduced the personnel end strength to a degree that their total would be 43,000 less than had been budgeted for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The Committee on Appropriations recommends in this bill a reduction of some 12,000 additional personnel, not from the combat forces but from headquarters personnel and other such areas. These things are treated in the committee report.

I think it would be impractical at this point to try to make any substantial change in the bill. I would hope that any action that may be necessary can be taken in a conference with the other body or in consideration of the supplemental bill to come up early next year in connection with military personnel.

Mr. HEBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I say to the distinguished

gentleman from Texas he has not definitely answered the question I asked. He has sort of, in a roundabout way, indicated if an injustice has been done in a further reduction, he will do something about it, but my question was the action of the Committee on Appropriations does cut down further the authorized strength, does it not?

Mr. MAHON. It does cut further the authorized strength.

Mr. HEBERT. That is the point I want to make.

Certainly the authorizing legislative committee in this instance felt it had cut to the bone and it feels such action as this cuts deeper into the muscle instead of cutting away fat.

If the gentleman from Texas, in response to the gentleman from Florida, will give his assurance that it shall be given sympathetic consideration in the conference, that will satisfy me at this time, because I understand the gentleman's position. I can sympathize with him and support him in trying to legislate on the floor.

Mr. MAHON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. Of course, the matter will have the most sympathetic and careful attention.

Let me say further, if the gentleman will yield further, that the services themselves have agreed to a lower average strength figure than the authorizing committees which dealt with end strength would enable the military services to obtain.

Mr. SIKES. The services have protested the cuts but they have agreed to accept about half of the cut made by the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. They have agreed to a figure below the authorized figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MAHON, Mr. SIKES was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SIKES. I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. In that connection, while the gentleman from Texas says that the services have agreed, yet within the last 48 hours the Chief of Naval Operations has not agreed as far as I am concerned, because he has complained to me about the cuts and he says it will cut 25,000 bodies.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. Yes. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The Chief of Naval Operations has not agreed to the action by the House, but he agreed to a figure below the figure in the authorizing bill.

Mr. HEBERT. But did he agree to a figure as low as the figure fixed by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MAHON. He opposes the additional reduction contained in the appropriation.

Mr. HEBERT. That is what I want to get understood. He does not agree to the figure set by the Committee on Appropriations. However, if the gentleman from Texas says he will give some sym-

thetic consideration in the conference to it, of course, I have no objection.

Mr. SIKES. It is my understanding from personal conversations with the heads of the services that they have agreed that while they will not be happy about it—they will attempt to live with about half of the cut that is required under the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, to achieve that balance, to get half of the military personnel back, who will have to be dropped as the result of the action of the Committee on Appropriations, it will be necessary either to adopt an amendment at this time or to adjust the matter with the Senate in conference.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I have amendments prepared to assure these funds, but I think that in view of the colloquy with the chairman of the full committee and other members of the committee and the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, it would be better to let the matter go to the other body.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Florida be extended 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the gentleman from Florida has yielded to me.

I have listened to the colloquy; I have read the committee report; I have talked with various individuals from the Department, and it seems to me that one must come to the conclusion that the figure for personnel in the bill before us is too low. I personally would not hesitate to seek remedial action on the floor of the House, but I will defer to the judgment of those who are on the subcommittee. I know them all, because I have served with most of them for a number of years on the subcommittee.

But, you cannot maintain the year-end strength that has been projected with the kind of money that is in this bill. It is just impossible. Therefore, I strongly hope and trust that the other body will take action to correct what was done by the Committee on Appropriations in this area and to the degree that I can, I shall urge those in the other body to take this kind of action to correct a mistake that has been made.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the colloquy that has transpired I think it is very wise that the committee wait until we get into conference and try to work it out with the Senate.

We will have more facts at our disposal and be able to act much more intelligently than we can on it at this time. I assure you that on this matter, we will give it every consideration.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Appropriations Committee and its talented chairman, Congressman GEORGE MAHON, for displaying great wisdom in its consideration of the defense appropriations bill. It has taken something similar to the wisdom of Solomon to trim the fat from the budget request while not affecting the muscle.

The American taxpayers, already hard hit by some unnecessary Government spending, have been saved \$4.3 billion as a result of the committee's action. At the same time our Nation can be assured of continuing military strength, because the committee has approved the highest military budget since World War II—\$1.8 billion above last year's budget.

There are some who will criticize the committee for not approving everything the President requested. However, the Appropriations Committee must evaluate proposed spending programs in light of the serious budgetary deficits with which the Nation is faced. It appears that the 1972 actual deficit will be \$28.9 billion and the President's own 1973 deficit projection is \$36.8 billion. The committee must stand firm and call for a ceiling on Federal spending. At the same time, only unessential requests which will not hinder our national defense have been trimmed. For example, \$92 million was requested to hire civilians to perform KP duties. The committee felt this was an unnecessary request and disallowed it.

On the other hand, some will be critical of the committee's action feeling that more should have been cut from the President's request. To those I suggest that Congress is given specific responsibilities to provide for the common defense of our Nation. While reasonable men may disagree on the merits of various weapons systems, the committee has attempted to exercise prudent economy in defense spending. The sums recommended for appropriations are sufficient to maintain adequate military strength. The administration has frequently criticized Congress for adding some budget items and for cutting others. However, this is the precise constitutional function of Congress. What other body in America is more representative of the American people and thus has more of a right to reorder our priorities than the House of Representatives?

I encourage my colleagues to support the committee bill. We have spent many long weeks in very technical discussions in preparing it.

I also hope that my colleagues will not create undue delay through floor attempts to place a terminal date certain on the war. There are at least three reasons why I hope the action will not occur. First, the administration has reduced troops to a minimal low level at the present time and is concurrently engaged in intense delicate negotiations.

Any congressional interference, at this point, would be unwise. Second, a prolonged floor fight on such an amendment at the present time would seriously jeopardize the appropriations bill itself. Finally, this House has already defeated similar motions so many times this term that a further attempt would be an exercise in futility. It would serve no useful purpose and might seriously delay passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when voices from both sides of the political spectrum are urging either unreasonable defense cuts or unnecessary defense spending, I encourage prompt floor support for the reasonable and perfectly adequate defense appropriations legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to intercede at this time, but yesterday it was pointed out that this was an excellent and extensive report, and I concur that it is.

I have read it in detail. I have served along with the Chairman BOB MOLLOHAN, of the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the Legislative Committee on Armed Services on the problem of our defense communications for the past two Congresses. We recognize that currently our greatest single national defense need is secure voice communications.

Mr. Chairman, I would call the committee's attention, and especially the members of the parent committee on appropriations handling the bill today, to pages 123 and 124 of their report, entitled, the Defense Communications Agency, the very object of our legislative inquiry for the past 2 years.

I am particularly upset with the findings concerning the System Engineering Facility, known as the SEF over in Reston, Va., which will allow the defense communications system to complete its mission and carry out its problems and challenges in the next few years. But my particular concern or first priority concerning this report, is that portion that deals with the new computerized test-bed and/or simulation center in the SEF, and the statement that it should be terminated. I take exception to this because I am now convinced it is essential to our plan of the future DCA, and its mission.

The report continues that the installation of an Autodin or Autovon switch would be used as GFE—Government furnished equipment—this is of no value because it provides no capability for analyzing anything except the old systems which we have in being.

Now, I agree thoroughly that in the beginning of our investigation I too was lerry of the project and, indeed, asked the question of why this could not be done in Bell's simulation or test facilities on a contract basis. The difference, I will say to the Members, between test-bed facilities and simulation in a Systems Engineering Facility for Communications is that test facilities can test what we have in hand, and simulation facilities enables us—with the use of computers—to forecast what we can do with new oncoming or following-on systems or suggestions—including needed technical breakthroughs.

It has been agreed by everyone from the Commander in Chief himself including the Secretary of Defense, on down, that our greatest lack at the present time is in secure voice communications to carry the function and decision of command, to the troops in the field, or the seamen, airmen, marines, et cetera.

It is intolerable to think that we should terminate this system, as illegitimate as it might have been in concept, as erroneous as they may have been in certain points of acquisition, after we have gone over these plans and under the guidance of the legislative committee have assembled albeit slowly the best possible qualified people—including the Bell system—for simulation facilities we know we need. We ought not to tear it down at this particular time.

And I would ask the Members of the Committee, in the same spirit that they have just discussed personnel requirements, and expected service reclaims, if they are not prepared to reread the legislative record of that report at least to the point where we can continue this vital and essential defense work, if we are to get the function of command to the voice of our troops or users?

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) for yielding. Certainly the gentleman from Missouri has made a very important statement.

The matter appears at pages 123 to 124 of the committee report, and in the last paragraph dealing with this subject, on page 124, these words are stated:

The Committee directs that the Government-owned equipment planned for installation in the SEF be installed, and if that equipment is not installed the operation of the facility be terminated.

I have discussed that wording with members of the staff and with other members of the committee, and what our committee meant to say was that it was not our belief that at the present time new equipment should be bought. The whole idea of the SEF was sold to the subcommittee of which I am a member, on the basis that there was equipment on hand which could be used for this particular purpose. If that is not the situation, then certainly the Department of Defense should come to the subcommittee and explain to us why they need new equipment, and what new equipment they need.

You will also note on page 124 that there were funds used which were earmarked for personnel and there was no request for reprogramming. We think there should have been.

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

(Mr. HALL, at the request of Mr. RHODES, was granted 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. RHODES. The committee disagreed with the Department of Defense on the propriety and necessity in this instance of not asking permission to reprogram these funds. We felt the original representation, under which the committee agreed, somewhat reluctantly, to the establishment of the systems engineering facility was not honored. Instead

of using regular equipment which was on hand, and which had been promised, they departed from that procedure and intend to purchase equipment which is far beyond anything that we had contemplated. All we do here is ask them to please play square with the committee, tell us where they are going and how much money it is going to cost.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

As I said at the beginning, there may have been some errors, honestly, so far as coordination by the executive branch and DCA specifically to the operating (appropriations) committee; or on the part of the legislative committee, possibly made because we went to see, changed our minds, became enthused and although issuing a second and more complete report—forgot to coordinate.

Our committee, chaired by Congressman MOLLOHAN of West Virginia, has spent a lot of time even interviewing personnel, and their records; and the difference is, if we use this old Government-furnished equipment, we will have a test bed and that will only test what we already have on hand.

A decision was made, and I say again perhaps it was not coordinated properly, to put equipment into the simulation facility other than the Autodin or Autovon switches which the Committee on Appropriations herewith orders to be used, except as explained as to intent by the gentleman from Arizona.

Then there is a second priority, Mr. Chairman, the reduction of \$696,000 in the \$2.7 million SEF budget is directed, in the bill and according to the report of the committee.

If possible, I think this amount should be restored. I am certainly not known as a "big spender" in Congress. The reason I think this so important is because, if not, the DCA should be allowed to apportion the reduction throughout the agency.

A cut of this magnitude in SEF alone would drastically affect their performance. A competent system engineering facility is necessary in order for the future defense communications system to meet the vital command and control requirement.

I want to say with every fervor of energy in my body or with all the Shakespearean drama that my friend from Pennsylvania could muster, if he were in the well; that it is intolerable and completely nonunderstandable to claim that the greatest defect of our armed services, the greatest cause of ambush in South Vietnam has been the lack of secure voice control communications on the one hand, and then to eliminate a communications system simulation facility on the other.

I hope all of you will agree this can and will be restored in any manner whatsoever. We will continue careful guidance. We will share all of our information and, indeed, there is a second report which is in script already in the Committee on Armed Services which will be very valuable to the Committee on Appropriations. This, I consider our legislative duty.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat for emphasis portions of my observations.

The language of the report will severely impact on the ability of the Defense Communications Agency to improve our defense command, control, and communications.

As many of you know, Mr. MOLLOHAN and I, together with the members of the Subcommittee to Investigate Communications, have examined very critically the whole area of defense communications during the past 2½ years and will publish our second comprehensive report on this field in the near future. We have participated in extensive hearings, visited field activities, and explored in-depth problems of the defense community.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago before undertaking this extensive investigation I would have agreed with some of the language included in the present report of the House Committee on Appropriations. Today, based on our extensive activities, I must conclude the guidance included therein is counterproductive and will severely arrest effort to improve defense command, control, and communications which we so badly need.

As I pointed out in the fiscal year 1972 budget hearings before the House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee No. 1, the Director of the Defense Communications Agency has made a believer out of the subcommittee as to the necessity of having a test-bed facility and a system engineering operation. In addition, we feel that this type of activity is essential in order to develop an operable secure voice and data transmission system. As you know this is one of the critical problems of our national defense. I reiterated my position in March of 1972 before the same committee:

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, I must say this test-bed facility out there, although we looked askance at it originally, and thought we were delaying it, has reached such proportion that our communications priority needs have gotten so high that the Subcommittee on Communications has in its last report reversed itself and concurred in the need for such a facility other than those available in civilian or commercial life, and we are just as anxious for the success of this facility as the general or the Defense Department is at this time."

I am convinced that the new computer simulation center at the system engineering facility—SEF—should be installed because it is essential to the planning of the future defense communications system. Installation of an Autodin or Autovon switch would be of no value because it provides no capability for analyzing new and proposed system concepts. This type of facility is not available in any commercial or Government laboratory. To carry out the direction indicated in the House Appropriations Committee report would be wasteful in money and counterproductive to the purposes of the System Engineering Facility. The alternative proposal to close the SEF is inexplicable and intolerable. Without talented system engineering, we can never have an operable defense communication system.

In addition, a reduction of \$696,000 in the \$2.7 million SEF budget is directed. On page 230, reference is made to HASC

action suggested. In fact in our final report we do not recommend a reduction. If possible, this amount should be restored. If not, DCA should be allowed to apportion the reduction throughout the Agency. A cut of this magnitude in the SEF would drastically affect their performance. A competent system engineering facility is necessary in order for future DCS to meet vital command and control requirements.

The Defense Communications Agency has created a systems engineering facility of outstandingly competent scientific personnel whose efforts are directed toward the future design of the defense communications system. Their education profile matches that of Bell Laboratories. They require a modern computer simulation facility to do their work. An appropriate computer has been purchased based on competitive bids, and will be installed in November. The activities of the Defense Communications Agency to create this systems engineering facility with its attendant hybrid simulation computer must be permitted to proceed.

In a second and important aspect the report restricts the growth of the joint technical support activity, a key element in the Worldwide Military Command and Control System ADP program. This element must be effective if the benefits of the program in terms of effectiveness and dollar costs are to be achieved. Accordingly, the modest increase in civilian personnel for that activity should be permitted.

Finally, and directly related to improve the effectiveness of our command and control system is the matter of direct expenditure for software conversion programs for the new ADP system. The \$1.9 million reduction proposed by the Appropriations Committee will increase the Defense Communications Agency overall software conversion cost over the next 2 years by \$1.1 million. This is not economy, but rather waste and we should not permit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT AND MISSILES,
NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft missiles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public or private plants; \$3,682,140,000, and in addition, \$40,000,000 which shall be derived by transfer from "Procurement of Aircraft and Missiles, Navy, 1971/1973", to remain available for obligation until June 30, 1975.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct some inquiries to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense particularly with reference to the procurement by the Navy of LC-130 Operation Deepfreeze airlift aircraft. On page 166 of the re-

port I note the committee recommends that the request of \$31.5 million to procure LC-130 aircraft in support of the general United States effort in Antarctica be denied.

As the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas knows, the National Science Foundation was given responsibility for coordinating the Antarctic program, Operation Deepfreeze. Last year the budgetary responsibility for the annual logistic operating costs in Antarctica were transferred from the Department of Defense to the National Science Foundation. At that time the President decided, for several reasons, that the Department of Defense should continue to budget for major capital equipment, and specifically the procurement of airlift aircraft.

The President has now recommended that five new aircraft be procured in the 1973 Defense budget for this program. I think all of us in this Congress recognize the importance of the Antarctic program. Antarctica dominates one-fifth of the area of the world, including all the southern oceans. This continent has a major influence on world weather and climate. It is the world's largest area in protein production. It contains potentially valuable mineral and petroleum products. At the present time it is a neutral continent.

The President of the United States has promulgated four vital policy objectives with reference to Antarctica. These objectives are to maintain the viability of the present Antarctic treaty, to foster extension of cooperative scientific research, to insure peaceful and equitable use of the natural resources, and to protect the U.S. rights in the area.

The Department of Defense has a role and a responsibility in support of our general national effort and presence in this vast neutral area.

The scientific and political leadership of the United States stems from the singular ability of the United States personnel to move about and concentrate resources at will, a capability which offsets the influence of strategically located Soviet stations. This United States capability is totally dependent on the availability of long-range ski-equipped aircraft.

There are now only (3) aircraft available to support the Antarctic program. This is down from nine as late as 1967. They are more than 10 years old, and you may draw your own conclusions for their continuing adequacy and safety in the Antarctic environment. Even if this Congress were to approve the purchase of new aircraft in this bill, the scientists and the airport personnel would still have to rely on those three old aircraft for at least 2 more years.

I hope when this bill is considered by the other body and action is taken to insert the \$31.5 million, that there can be some agreement by the House with reference to this particular item.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the impact of the failure to procure replacement aircraft will severely curtail the level of the U.S. effort in Antarctica.

It could place in jeopardy the lives and the safety of the personnel who are

operating in that area, and those who man the stations. There will also be a dramatic change in the U.S. posture in Antarctica, including abandonment of inland stations at the South Pole and Byrd if aircraft support is not provided.

The National Science Foundation has agreed to fund the operation and maintenance of logistic support for our general national effort. This has previously been provided by the Department of Defense. By directive of the President of the United States, the Department of Defense still must procure the airlift aircraft necessary in that operation. The National Science Foundation has no capability in that area.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, and I again direct my remarks to the chairman of the subcommittee, there is a very direct national defense aspect included in this program, for these airlift aircraft are operated for a period of 7 months in Antarctica by Navy personnel in support of our general national effort.

During the other 5 months of the year the aircraft are used by the Department of the Navy for other military purposes. So there is a national priority with reference to national defense that is much broader than the responsibility of the National Science Foundation.

I take this time for the purpose of recommending that this committee again look at this item when they go to conference. I hope that the other body will insert funds for these aircraft into the procurement program of the Navy, and that it will be agreed to in conference. These aircraft are essential for the operational safety of the Navy support, and to prevent a severe curtailment in the level of the U.S. effort in Antarctica.

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

Mr. Chairman, in response to the remark by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would say that during our hearings we discussed this matter with the Navy. I think we all recognize that these planes are needed for the work of the National Science Foundation. We asked Navy witnesses from which appropriation these planes should be financed. Admiral Weisner, when asked about whether this program should be financed by the National Science Foundation or the Navy, stated:

I would, I suppose in all candor, have to say that I would rather not have things not directly related to our objectives and our Navy requirements come out of the Navy budget.

But we do agree that this program must be financed, and I feel that a way can be found to finance it.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the response of the distinguished chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: In past years I have proposed amendments to strike the procurement funds for the F-14 aircraft. I must say that the report of the committee before us today, pages 22 and 23, makes clear that we are in what might be described as a pretty serious mess as far as the F-14 program is concerned. I might venture to say that I think we would be in less

of a mess today if my amendments had been adopted last year or the year before to cut off the program then.

I think Grumman Aircraft would also be better off. Grumman Aircraft is in terrible difficulty today, and I think Grumman Aircraft, which is a major industry in my State, would have been in better shape if the F-14 had been canceled 2 or 3 years ago.

This bill contains \$570 million of funds for procurement of that aircraft. I am not proposing an amendment at this time to strike that amount for two reasons. First of all, as I understand it, the availability of that money is needed if the United States is to hold Grumman to its contract. Otherwise, the Government would be in violation of the contract, and not Grumman.

The second reason that I do not propose the amendment this year is that I think it is clear that the sum of \$570 million is not going to be spent, as a matter of fact. I do not see how it can be spent under the conditions laid down by the Congress in the authorization bill.

At the time the report on the bill before us was drafted, the final language of the conference report was not available. Yesterday, however, we adopted the conference report, and the conference report makes perfectly clear that the amount for the F-14 is authorized only pursuant to the contract, and if the contract price is met. If that cannot be done, then the Secretary has to come back to the Congress with recommendations, but it is clear he cannot go ahead and renegotiate the contract and pay a higher price for these planes than the \$16.8 million per unit that is, in effect, the contract price.

We certainly are in a most unusual if not unique situation. The \$570 million that is included in this bill is to be available, the committee says, only in accordance with law—and, of course, that must be so.

The conference report which we adopted yesterday makes very clear what the law is.

Grumman says it is impossible for them to go ahead under the present contract. Grumman says it has already incurred a large loss—\$65 million—on the F-14. The figures are there for the Members to read on page 22 of the committee report.

Some of the experts predict that the Navy is going to give in to Grumman and come back to ask the Congress to approve a higher price. Certainly that action should be opposed, if it happens.

The committee has said clearly in its reports that the existing price of \$16.8 million is too much for this aircraft, that it is not worth it. Certainly we would not want to see a higher price authorized.

What is the alternative, then? I will say, so far as my own position is concerned, I would hope the Navy and Grumman would work to negotiate a termination of this contract on some fair basis which would reimburse Grumman for such losses on the aircraft as are necessary to eliminate the risk that Grumman might go bankrupt as a result of this situation which has been allowed to develop.

If the Secretary of Defense comes back here and asks for an authorization for a new contract which would provide for the termination of the F-14 program and reimbursement for Grumman for the losses it has incurred to date, I would be for it.

In many respects, Mr. Chairman, Grumman deserves to be in its present difficult situation and hardly deserves to be reimbursed for its losses. I believe the company and the Navy have deceived the public and the Congress—and perhaps even themselves—about this airplane. Grumman shaved its bid on the contract for the airplane to an unrealistically low level, fully expecting, in my judgment, to be able to squeeze more money out of the Congress for the airplane later on. It exaggerated the capabilities and distorted the figures on the airplane in order to make its capabilities look greater and make it look like something more than the warmed-over F-111 which it is.

Despite all this, I see no reason to make the many thousands of employees of the Grumman Co. suffer for the mistakes and misrepresentations of company officials with regard to the F-14. Reimbursement of Grumman for its losses to date on the F-14 should put the company back on a sufficiently even keel long enough to seek other contracts and hopefully to stay in business.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the action of the House today in approving \$570 million for procurement of 48 more F-14's in order to remain in compliance with the Navy's contract with Grumman is the beginning of the final chapter on the F-14. The sooner we terminate this aircraft the sooner we can get on to the business of developing and procuring a tactical fighter than can meet the real threat that our tactical air force faces and will face in the latter 1970's and 1980's; namely, the Soviet Foxbat. At its best, the F-14 would not have that capability and, in fact, the F-14 is not sufficiently greater in capability than the F-4 to justify its price tag, which is more than five times that of the F-4.

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

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law: \$3,080,940,000, to remain available for obligation until June 30, 1974.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 28, line 6, strike out "\$3,080,940,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,070,940,000".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out \$10 million which has been placed in this bill by the committee for the so-called ABRES program. ABRES is another word for advanced ballistic reentry systems program. It is a program that does violence to the SALT agreement by proposing to develop a hardened warhead,

a so-called silo killer. It is a program that was under active consideration in the authorization bills, both in the House and in the Senate, and it was decided by the conferees on the part of both the House and the Senate that no funds be allocated for the ABRES program.

However, the Appropriations Committee put \$10 million into this bill for the program. If a rule had not been granted on this bill, it is my opinion that the appropriation for this item would have been subject to a point of order, because there is no authorization for this program.

The SALT program intended to provide for an equality of deterrence between the Soviet Union and the United States.

It was a carefully worked out formula. Neither side was supposed to have or develop a first-strike capability. It was upon that theory the agreement was signed by both nations.

Yet here is the first effort to get around that purpose and thrust of that agreement by moving to find a way of overcoming the ABM installations authorized under the SALT agreement.

Certainly if we start this kind of a race, it is only natural to expect that the Soviets will do the same thing. What value is there in coming to an agreement for a limitation of weapons when almost immediately steps are taken to violate it?

Mr. RHODES. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RHODES. I am sure the gentleman is well aware of the fact that the SALT talks dealt with the deployment of weapons and not with research and development. I am sure he is aware of the fact, also, the upgrading of existing weapons systems is not unauthorized under the SALT agreement. This is not a violation of the SALT agreement clause.

Mr. YATES. I can tell the gentleman that the Senate Armed Services Committee debated this issue, and they came to the conclusion that it may very well constitute a violation of the SALT agreement.

I agree with the gentleman there are certain limitations imposed on the weapons systems themselves, but this is a move to break down the first-strike capability agreement entered into between the parties.

For that reason I urge the support of my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the authorization for research and development is at a certain level or amount for each of the services. We are below the authorization figure in every instance, and therefore the committee is not out of order in providing funds for the advanced ballistic reentry systems program.

We have not instructed or mandated in the report or in the bill any specific warhead development. This is a research and development program. What may come out of it we do not know. Certainly there is no intention on the part of anyone to violate the SALT agreement or to take any step not in keeping with the policy of our Government.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. May I add, also, the fact that the research and development programs in this bill have been cut very decidedly below the budget level; so much so that the military services are quite concerned about their ability to carry on a proper research and development program.

A research and development program is very definitely one of our most important weapons. We depend upon research and development to bridge the gap between the weapons we have today and the weapons we must have on tomorrow. We are always short in numbers of weapons because they cost so much in this country. Therefore, we must stress R. & D. programs in an effort to continue the development of weapons that we will require on tomorrow to stay reasonably modern.

There is also the fact to be kept in mind the Soviets are pushing R. & D. very vigorously. They do not fail to take advantage of any breaks available. It would be a serious mistake to make any further cuts in that program.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman believe it is most unusual when the signatures on the SALT agreement are hardly dry that we take the first steps to violate that agreement?

Mr. MAHON. I do not propose that we should violate our agreements. There is nothing in the report or in the language that violates that agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

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

In response to my good friend from Illinois' statement, I would say this in no way violates the SALT agreement. My good friend from Florida pointed out that this is a research and development item.

We have already taken out of the research and development budget of the Defense Department in this bill, nearly \$1 billion from their research request, that is a substantial cut. To take \$10 million more out of the program at this time, I think would be very unsound and ill-advised.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I wish to agree with the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Arizona, and the gentleman from Ohio in opposing the Yates amendment. But, I wish to object more broadly concerning the R.D.T. & E. funding as well as make some observations and comments about the bill as a whole.

I am pleased with the decision in the bill, the recommendation of the subcommittee that they have in retaining the funds for the Trident and for the B-1. I think they have done a reasonably good job in Navy modernization. In general, they have made recommendations that coincide with the President's budget for the maintenance of our current military capability.

But, I take strong exception to the decision of the committee in reference to

R.D.T. & E. As I read the committee report, the committee cut \$974,839,000 out of the research, development, test and evaluation program. I think that cut is too substantial. I have read the committee report. It indicates, and I read from the report on page 202, that this is an approximate increase of more than 4 percent above the sum provided in the previous fiscal year.

That is about a cost of living increase in the last 12 months. The figure for R.D.T. & E. was to small last year, and I regret very much that the committee has not made available sufficient funds in the research, development, test, and evaluation field for fiscal year 1973. I think this cut is abnormally large. I hope the other body will restore it, and I trust that in conference the error, as I see it, in this program will be remedied.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I might say concerning the gentleman from Michigan, he has served on this subcommittee for many, many years, at which time he left to assume the present position which he now has. He was the ranking minority member, so he knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I know that during the height of the war in Vietnam, the services were called upon to curtail or reduce many of their research, development, test and evaluation programs. That was understandable, but now as we are winding down that conflict, it is my judgment that if we are to maintain the kind of military capability that is essential in a strategic or tactical way in the decades ahead, the investments which we make now in this area are essential. I just do not understand how this committee, and particularly this subcommittee—and I have the greatest respect for that group since I served with them 12 years—how they could take such unwise action in this essential area.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I find the gentleman's remarks quite interesting, because I assume that he is very knowledgeable about what is happening. He said that we are winding down the war. He should give us some evidence of that. We have not yet had any evidence of that. On the contrary, there has been an increase in the bombings. I say the remarks—

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me answer my dear friend, the gentlewoman from New York—and, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for regular order, and I refuse to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Michigan has control of the time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the question the gentlewoman from New York asked without the gentlewoman making a speech. On the evidence—if I can speak to my

dear friend, the gentlewoman from New York, the evidence is that at the present time there are less than 40,000 U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam. There are no combat troops in South Vietnam. The commitment of the United States is quite in contrast now between what it was when this administration took over, and I am proud of the fact that we have gone from over 540,000 U.S. military personnel with a heavy combat commitment down to the point where we are at the present time.

The gentlewoman from New York ought to also be proud of the fact that there are less U.S. military personnel in Vietnam than there were before, instead of being critical.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me go on with my own observations and comments in further reference to this appropriation bill.

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

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves in a very interesting situation. While the gentleman from Michigan has stated that there is not enough research money provided for in these appropriations, I have also been reading a great deal about the fact that the President of our country is talking about taking initiatives to settle many issues between the nations in conflict peacefully. I also note, in reading very carefully the committee report, that the appropriations we are being asked to act upon today is in support of the largest defense bill in history, and that includes research and development increases for research and development for more weapons of destruction. These facts would seem to be in conflict with the policies enunciated by administration claims that it seeks to calm international tensions and to find a way in which we can settle disputes peacefully.

It is not true, in addressing the statements made by the gentleman from Michigan, that we only have 40,000 men in arms in Indochina because we have 150,000. If you take into consideration the kind of military activity that we are conducting in Indochina, we are in fact intensifying our effort in Vietnam. Our Armed Forces in Indochina, if we include the members of our naval and air forces, are 150,000 men at this particular moment in history, and instead of winding down, as the gentleman has indicated we are doing, we are increasing our bombing and our military activity in Indochina.

It is quite clear that there is a serious conflict in the statements and the deeds that we do.

The administration on the one hand claims it is winding down the war, and on the other hand its representatives are coming in here requesting support for the largest defense bill in the history of this country.

Despite this, the spokesman of this administration is asking for more research and development, for more deadly weapons systems, instead of asking for more support for housing, health care, child

care, and for public service jobs and all the social programs that we need.

If the gentleman from Michigan would like to respond to my statements I would be glad to yield to him. Evidently the gentleman does not desire to do so. I see that he is busy doing other things.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out again that this defense appropriation is the largest in history. The statement that we are winding down the war is untrue. There are provisions in this bill of a very significant nature for the war in Vietnam. The administration has asked, as a matter of fact, for an increase in its funds in Vietnam so it can continue the war, and accelerate the bombing, all of which will bring about the further destruction of the people and land in Indochina and seriously injure the American people further.

To request more funds for research and development is merely another way of saying that we seek even more weapons to destroy the Indochinese people which in the end, as I have said, will lead to the further disruption of the American people and their social needs in this country.

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

Mrs. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentlewoman say three times that this is the largest defense budget in the history of this country. For the gentlewoman's information, in terms of constant dollars this is the lowest defense budget since the year 1951. There should be no question about this as we deliberate on this bill today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if I may return to the amendment under consideration which was to strike out \$10 million for the development of a hard-nosed warhead, I will read from the Washington Post, of August 29, 1972, an article entitled "Of Senators and 'Silokillers.'"

The article says:

There has been a proper commotion over reports that the Defense Department wants to develop a new type of counterforce technology. By enabling U.S. missiles to destroy hardened targets, including missile silos.

Which is what this proposes.

The article continues:

The modernized re-entry vehicle (RV) planned by the Department would significantly erode mutual deterrence on which the strategic arms agreements rest. The program would directly contradict this country's assurances that it did not intend to develop capabilities which the Soviet Union could construe as having first-strike potential. To launch so provocative an endeavor at the very moment Congress was considering the Moscow agreements seemed a reckless departure from the prudence and restraint which has marked the administration's approach to strategic matters.

Now comes the good news that Senate-House conferees on the defense procurement bill have declined to authorize funds for development of a hard-target RV. How this occurred is a tale worth relating. It affords some encouraging glimpses of legislative scrutiny of military programs, and it suggests some important ways in which mem-

bers of Congress can help the President control dubious bureaucratic impulses.

Now in spite of the fact that the Senate and the House conferees on the authorization bill refused to make the money available to develop the hard-nosed missile, this Appropriations Committee is now asking the House to continue the development of the missile. Let us save some money and let us sustain our pledged agreement.

My amendment would strike that out and continue to uphold the validity of the SALT agreement. I urge support of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 28, line 6, strike out "\$3,080,940,000" and insert "\$2,636,440,000".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike the amount of \$444,500,000 which the committee has placed in research and development for the B-1 bomber program.

This is one of the new cost overrun programs.

The cost of building the three B-1 prototypes has risen from an original estimate of \$450 million to \$875 million each—it has doubled—and despite this large cost increase, the Department of Defense claims that production costs per plane will be held to \$35 million. I do not believe it. That estimate is too low, and this, of course, does not include the cost of missiles and it does not include the cost of the warhead.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the B-1's advantages do not greatly outweigh those of the B-52 which is now the bulwark of our bomber fleet. The United States presently outnumbers the Soviet Union by a ratio of 4 to 1 in bomber strength. The B-1 is definitely not needed to maintain superiority because the B-52 is more than adequate.

Let me cite these figures from the report by the Brookings Institution:

In the case of the late model B-52's, each of approximately 100 planes on alert at any given time, when newly equipped, will be capable of carrying 20 nuclear tipped air to surface missiles as well as high yield gravity bombs. This adds up to a payload of 600 megatons. Assuming that only one-third of these weapons are delivered, this part of the alert bomber force alone would have the capability of destroying more than 20 percent of the Soviet population and 70 percent of Soviet industry.

This is a quotation from the Brookings Institution report. It shows the B-52 is still a most adequate member of the triad. The B-1 capability is not very much greater. Even if a follow-on to the B-52 program were necessary, it is extremely doubtful whether the B-1 is the correct aircraft. It has an inferior range as compared to the B-52 and it has few advantages over the FB-111 and the modernized B-52.

For these reasons Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment is approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the agreement which the President made with the Soviet Union we agreed to an inferior position from the standpoint of the numbers of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles. In other words we agreed that the Soviet Union could have about 800 more intercontinental ballistic missiles or ship-launched missiles than we in this country have or will have.

This concession on our part has given some concern, but there was no agreement as to bombers, and we are superior to the Soviet Union in bombers.

The B-52 is being extensively used in training and in war. It is an old plane and is of course getting older by the day. We need to work toward having a replacement for the B-52 some time in the future.

We are proceeding very cautiously with the weapons system. The Defense Department is following a true fly-before-you-buy policy with respect to the plane. It seems to me it would be a great mistake and would place us at a serious disadvantage in our negotiations with the Soviet Union with respect to slowing down the arms if we should alter the B-1 program.

As the Members know, the "triad" of our strategic offensive power through the years has been the following: The ICBM, the intercontinental ballistic missile, and we have about 600 fewer land-based ICBM's than the Soviet Union; the second item is the submarine-launched missile; and third, the intercontinental bomber. We do not want to remove from this bill one of these three sources of military strength and deterrence to war.

So I believe the House will readily concur that this amendment should be voted down. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to offer an amendment today which would have prohibited the military from spying and collecting dossiers on American citizens and public officials. However, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the committee, has advised me that the committee would oppose such amendment. I would hope when I am through with my remarks that he might explain his reasons for that. I think they would be of interest to the House. Even though I might not individually agree with that position, I think the committee and indeed the whole House ought to know that this problem has not gone away.

Mr. Chairman, it has been nearly 2 years since the Army spying activities were first exposed. Members will recall when allegations were first made in 1970 that the Army intelligence operation was keeping dossiers on millions of Americans, including a large number of public officials, the Department of Defense initially denied they were engaged in any such activities, and then when the evi-

dence became overwhelming they promised not to do it any more. I regret to say that their second assurance was just about as valid as their first.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. I raised this point in the Appropriations Committee when I had a discussion with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas. I read to the committee an article that appeared by James J. Kilpatrick, certainly not a liberal columnist, in the Star on September 7. It is entitled: "Senate Report on Army Spying a Chilling Orwellian Document." It is a most appropriate title.

In various part of the column are assertions that really reflect upon the Army. I quote from one section of the column. He said this about the report of the committee:

The report covers some familiar ground, already traversed in hearings before Senator Ervin's subcommittee, but it contains much that is new. It transpired through the hearings last year that over a period of decades, going back at least to the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Army had been systematically gathering intelligence on civilians who might cause trouble. In the ensuing uproar, thousands of files and dossiers were destroyed, or so it was said, and orders went out to halt the surveillance.

Were the dossiers in fact destroyed? Has the surveillance ceased?

These are the questions unresolved, and we will not know the answer to them.

The point I am making is, if the gentleman will yield further, is that I suggested to the chairman that I thought that the subject should receive a very thorough investigation by the staff of the Appropriations Committee. Chairman MAHON at that time stated that such an investigation would be made by the staff of the Appropriations Committee. His agreement is timely. In fact, I think it is long overdue that we find out actually what the Army, in fact, all of the armed services which have been guilty of the surveillance of civilians, have been doing with their files. Have they, in fact, been destroyed? Is this practice still going on? What are the services doing in this field. We ought to know the answers to these questions.

I know the gentleman from Illinois in the well was one of those who was the subject of Army surveillance. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois was one of those under Army surveillance, too. I wonder how many Members of Congress are under Army surveillance, or how many Senators are under Army surveillance.

Is not that something we ought to know?

Yes, the matter ought to be investigated. I am grateful for the assurance by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that his staff will conduct a thoroughgoing investigation of this subject in order to make sure that these abuses do not continue.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I have an interest in this because one of the depositories of this information, Fort Holabird, is in my congressional district.

I should like to ask the gentleman in the well or the gentleman from Illinois what kind of assurance we can get that the files have been destroyed? What sort of evidence could we ask for that would give us the kind of assurance that we want?

Mr. YATES. I think that the evidence we can get can only come through the investigation of a good staff, and there is no better staff in the Congress than the staff of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. I believe that that staff should be authorized to look into this question thoroughly to find out the answers to those questions.

What has the Army done? What is it doing now? Does it have these files? Are they being destroyed? We ought to know the answers to those questions.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I will yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has been concerned about this matter for quite some time. The committee abhors any thought that the Army would conduct surveillance of civilians, and the information which we have received is to the effect that the process has been discontinued, and that all of the files have been destroyed except certain files that will be needed in pending court cases.

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

(On request of Mr. MAHON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MIKVA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. When this matter was brought up before the Committee on Appropriations, I advised that we would have an investigation to determine, insofar as it is possible, whether or not the files have actually been destroyed, and what files are being retained for court cases. I also stated that we would determine whether there has been any change in the program since we held a rather extensive hearing with regard to the subject some time ago.

The article by the columnist that has been read relates to things that happened in the past. The gentleman from Illinois, of course, is concerned about what is happening now and what may happen in the future. I certainly concur with him fully that this practice should never have been started and must not continue.

Mr. MIKVA. May I say to the distinguished chairman that the gentleman in the other body who conducted hearings on this very subject determined that in fact the various discontinuance dates the Army had given not only to me but also to the chairman of the committee and to many other Members of the House were not valid dates.

At one point a witness from the Army was questioned. I believe this involved the Fort Holabird installation, in fact. The question was asked, "Were all records destroyed?" He said, "Oh, yes." He said,

"Oh, yes" five times, and the sixth time he said, "We did keep one printout."

One does not have to be an expert on computers to know that if one keeps one printout, he has not destroyed the file.

The legislation I would have liked to have seen in this appropriation bill, and which I still hope the other body will put in, is a flat prohibition which says that no funds shall be spent for spying on civilians or public officials.

If they did not do it in the first place, and it now appears they did; and if they stopped when they said they did, and it now appears they did not; and if they stop now—it seems to me no harm could be done, and a great deal of good, if the Congress should declare as a firm public policy that money should not be spent for this purpose.

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

(On request of Mr. YATES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MIKVA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MIKVA. I am glad to yield further to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the thing to do now is to conduct an investigation, and then we will be in a better position to give complete and absolute assurance as to what the situation is, and then we can determine whether or not we need the kind of proviso the gentleman proposes incorporated in an appropriation bill.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I take it, from the chairman's remarks and his head nodding, that the staff of the subcommittee is going to conduct an investigation of this matter. The answer is "yes".

Mr. MIKVA. I am glad to be assured on that.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. I was informed a few weeks ago by a friend of mine that a particular item on me was in a dossier of the Democratic Study Group. Could it be possible that those files might have been turned over?

Mr. MIKVA. If the gentleman from Indiana wants to see any dossier on him, I will use my good offices with the Democratic Study Group to help him along. I am sure that any reference to him would be flattering. I am also sure no such "dossier" exists.

It has been nearly 2 years since the Army's spying activities were first exposed.

In the early months of 1971, Senator SAM ERVIN's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights held historic hearings in an effort to explore the history and the extent of military surveillance. That effort was hampered by the unwillingness of the Army to produce witnesses and documents which would cast light on the policies and practices involved.

In spite of those obstacles, Senator ERVIN's subcommittee has recently published a staff report analyzing the docu-

ments which were made available. The resulting story is one which should serve as a shocking warning to all Americans who value their freedom.

The staff report on Army surveillance reaches three essential conclusions. First, that the scope of the military's surveillance activities was considerably more extensive than anticipated. Second, the lack of civilian control over surveillance activities was matched by a total lack of central military control as well. And third, the enormous amount of data collected on private citizens and organizations was utterly useless even to the military organizations which collected it. "They were the most worthless damn (files) I had ever seen in my life," said the General Counsel of the Army. "It was a waste of paper." Nevertheless, the subcommittee was unable to assure that these useless, potentially injurious files had been destroyed in accordance with instructions from the Department of Defense.

For those of my colleagues who have not had a chance to read the staff report, let me summarize what the subcommittee found when it looked into the scope of Army surveillance in America.

Nine separate data banks were uncovered, each of which maintained detailed information on citizens and organizations whose primary common traits were their involvement in constitutionally protected political activities.

First, Fort Holabird "Mug Books. The mug books consist of six volumes of photographs and personal data, classified "confidential" and entitled "Individuals Active in Civil Disturbances". They were compiled by intelligence analysts at Fort Holabird and published by the Intelligence Command in May and October 1968. More than 1,000 individuals are profiled in these volumes—people from all walks of life and from all parts of the Nation. An example of the absurd but dangerous character of these profiles can be seen on page 7 of the staff report, where the profile of one nationally known civil rights leader is displayed. He is described as "a sex pervert" with a "subversive Communist background"—charges which are demonstrably false and utterly irrelevant to any legitimate informational needs of the Army in connection with its limited civil disturbance function.

During the Senate hearings in 1971, the Army General Counsel conceded that these mug books were not necessary to the Army's proper mission and promised that they would be destroyed. But the Senate staff found that there was no supervision or reliable documentation of the promised destruction, and that "It is unlikely that 46 percent of the volumes actually went into the incinerators."—at page 8.

Second, the CIAB compendium. This is a two-volume set of yellow, vinyl-covered looseleaf binders known as "The Compendium." Classified secret, the volumes are entitled "Civil Disturbances and Dissidence"—volume 1 is subtitled "Cities and Organizations of Interests" and volume 2 is subtitled "Personalities of Interest." The first volume lists 13 political organizations, 49 "racial" or-

ganizations, 16 antiwar organizations, and 27 international organizations which the Army watched for subversive activity. Included are the NAACP and the Urban League. The descriptions of the organizations are loaded with unsubstantiated insinuations and undocumented conclusions.

Volume 2 contains biographical sketches on 435 personalities of interest. The author appears to have been especially interested in people who participate in demonstrations—in accordance with their first amendment rights. The Senate staff report quotes Secretary Froehke as saying that "The destruction of all copies (of the Compendium) has not yet been assured"—at page 20.

Third, files of the Army Intelligence Command. The most extensive files maintained by the Army on civilian political activity were kept by the U.S. Army Intelligence Command—USAINTC—at Fort Holabird, Md. The central core of the Intelligence Command's files is the investigative records repository which contains approximately 8 million security clearance, criminal, and counterintelligence dossiers. A number of files have been developed specifically to keep track of civilian political activities unrelated or only indirectly related to the investigation of persons being considered for security clearances.

The order to destroy these files went out in late June 1970. Throughout the summer and fall numerous inspections were conducted to encourage compliance. Yet one of the witnesses who testified before the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee described how an officer in his unit concealed many of the reports in the bottom of security containers, and advised subordinates in other offices how they could circumvent the destruction order. The Senate staff concluded that:

Despite the efforts of the Army's higher officials, the complete destruction of the regional and local files of the Intelligence Command cannot be assured.—At page 43.

Fourth, files of the Continental Army Command. Like the Intelligence Command, the Continental Army Command—CONARC—maintained a nationwide network of computerized and non-computerized files on civilians unassociated with the Armed Forces.

The basic noncomputerized file at CONARC's headquarters at Fort Monroe, Va., was similar to the subversives file at Fort Holabird. Its primary purpose was to check on the loyalty of organizations and individuals and to monitor "disaffection" within stateside Army units.

Persons described in the computerized data bank range from members of clearly peaceful "establishment" groups such as the Unitarian-Universalists, Quakers, American Friends Service Committee, the Society for Ethical Culture, and SANE, to individuals alleged to be connected with the Communist Party, and personnel from Isvestia and the KGB—Soviet Intelligence. Convicted Soviet spies join Nobel Prize winners and entries from "Who's Who." Activities described vary from peaceful expressions of views to espionage. In most cases, however, the individuals were included solely because

they chose to exercise constitutionally guaranteed freedoms of speech, assembly, and petition. Some are cited for handing out pamphlets, making speeches, attending rallies, subscribing to periodicals, signing political advertisements, advocating voter registration, calling for the reform of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, signing an election petition, and speaking unfavorably of the Army, an officer, or the President. Others are included for opposing the war in Vietnam, participating in sit ins, sleep ins, and demonstrations, picketing—in one case of a shoeshop—and writing letters of support to Hanoi.

Fifth, files of the CONUS Armies. Each of the continental U.S. Armies conducted its own largely redundant but unsupervised intelligence operation, containing files on dissident and subversive activity. At least one subordinate unit, III Corps at Fort Hood, went so far as to computerize its files on national and local dissenters. Compared to the national data banks maintained by the Intelligence Command and CONARC, the Fort Hood operation was found by the Senate staff to be modest. Nonetheless, the independent development of this data bank—particularly in light of the huge files already existing at Fourth Army headquarters—demonstrates how easy it was for domestic intelligence activities to be initiated without authority from the Department of the Army and without consideration for efficiency or economy.

As with the Fort Holabird files, Army civilians had difficulty assuring the destruction of the Fort Hood data bank, according to the Senate staff report—at page 80.

Sixth, files of the Counterintelligence Analysis Branch, OACST. The mission of the Counterintelligence Analysis Branch of the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence was to analyze the mountains of data collected and stored by the major collection agencies—CONARC and ASAINTC. According to one witness before Senator Ervin's subcommittee, the major part of the information which flooded into CIAB related to totally civilian political activities in which the Army had no legitimate interest. Examples include black groups devoted solely to securing better housing, vigil groups in New England which met regularly to light candles and pray for peace, and student organizations interested in increasing the relevancy of their education. Financial information, sexual activities—especially illicit or unconventional—personal beliefs and associations were all reported in great detail, according to the testimony of former Army intelligence agent Ralph Stein.

Seventh, U.S. Strike Command computer. The U.S. Strike Command—USSTRICOM—was established in 1961 to furnish rapidly deployable, combat-ready forces in an emergency situation anywhere within the United States or overseas. During the late 1960's this mission included stepped-up efforts to assure rapid deployment of riot trained soldiers in times of civil disorder. To facilitate

this effort and to insure military security, USSTRICOM's Director of Intelligence undertook to develop his own computerized files on civilian political activity.

As was the case at Fort Hood, Fort Monroe, and Fort Holabird, the MacDill computer operation was undertaken in late 1967 and early 1968 without civilian authorization of any kind.

Eighth, computerized files of the directorate for Civil Disturbance Planning and Operations. The Directorate for Civil Disturbance Planning and Operations—DCDPO—was created in April 1968 when the Army anticipated that it might have to deploy 10,000 troops in each of 25 cities simultaneously. Accordingly, a 180-man unit was created to command Army operations on the homefront. To relieve overcrowding in the Army operations center, a new headquarters was carved out of a basement storeroom under the Pentagon's north mall. Completed in July 1969 at a cost of \$2.7 million, this domestic war room was equipped with extensive teletype networks to MI group emergency operations centers throughout the country, situation maps, closed-circuit television, hot lines, an illuminated switchboard, and a computerized data processing center. DCDPO published a computerized survey of recent and expected political protests. As the sample printouts in the Senate staff report show, no demonstration was too peaceful or legal to be included. No evidence of the destruction of DCDPO's files was received by the staff investigators.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

After discussing the incredible extensiveness and uselessness of Army surveillance as documented in its report, the Senate staff investigators conclude with the question which brings us full circle: how can Congress and the American people reassert control?

It is unlikely that we will ever know the full story of Army surveillance or to what extent it has been cut back. Already numerous measures have been taken to tighten security on counterintelligence operations. Short-term agents have been replaced with career personnel who are less likely to come forward and tell what they know. Others have been threatened with prosecution if they talked.

Perhaps the most realistic way to protect against a resurgence of Army spying is to increase the cost of getting caught by strengthening the laws prohibiting such invasions of constitutional rights by the military. Appropriations limitations can be useful in this regard, and ultimately Congress will have to meet the issue head on by enacting legislation specifically prohibiting military surveillance of private citizens and public officials. Without such controls written into law, there is little to separate us from totalitarian military states other than our good intentions. A nation which values liberty requires a firmer foundation than that. I am hopeful that the Senate will take the first step by writing into the bill before us a provision prohibiting these funds from being used to finance the network of military surveil-

lance operations uncovered by Senator ERVIN's subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, from the item under title V entitled "Research, Development, Test, Evaluation—Air Force" on page 28 of the bill, the committee has stricken \$35,800,000; requested to continue the development of the airframe for a future advanced medium STOL—short takeoff and landing—transport aircraft but has requested the appropriation of \$16,000,000 for the development of a new engine for this aircraft. I believe that this was a mistake and arose from a misunderstanding by the committee. The committee apparently was under the impression that the airframe development would require a new engine and that the engine was 3 years behind the airframe in development schedule.

Yesterday the Air Force stated:

The Air Force will seek to explain more fully to clear up any misunderstanding that may exist as to its plan relative to the AMST transport. The prototype aircraft program is not dependent on engine development. It will use existing engines. The engine development program is a separate technology program which, if successful, might later provide an option to improve the prototype if a decision should be made at some future time to go into production.

I contemplated introducing an amendment which would restore the funds to continue the development of the airframe of this medium STOL transport but then I decided not to do so because I think that the committee should have more opportunity to have the Air Force explain any misunderstanding that has taken place. Accordingly, I hope that the other body may be able to return these funds to the bill and that the conferees from the House will have had time by then to clear up a misunderstanding that apparently exists with the Air Force in regard to this program.

There are many reasons that this program is most important. It is a program which requires no long-range commitments and no great outlay of funds.

In order to appreciate the need to demonstrate applicable new technology in this area, it is, of course, essential to understand the contribution of tactical airlift to our national security. Fundamentally, we know from past experience that the ability to respond promptly to threats against our national interest or that of our allies can serve to deter aggression, or prevent small conflicts from expanding into larger ones. In this connection the design goals for the AMST prototype have been influenced in a major way by the needs of both the Army and the Air Force, and reflect much of the experience gained by these services during the conflict in Southeast Asia. With these realistic design goals, it is expected that an aircraft such as the AMST could eventually improve our rapid reaction capability by augmenting our strategic airlift forces during an initial deployment, and by permitting a much more rapid buildup of tactical airlift capability in the contingency area itself. Moreover, the AMST could enable the United States to minimize the re-

liance on U.S. ground forces when and where appropriate by providing for improved support of indigenous ground forces and both United States and allied air forces.

The Air Force and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are working together to exchange short take-off and landing—STOL—data; this coordination between the Air Force and NASA should produce accelerated progress in STOL technology. The AMST prototype aircraft will demonstrate numerous major improvements such as the capability to operate from shorter fields, greater payload capability, lower cost to accomplish tactical airlift workloads, and increased survivability against ground fire because of the ability to fly steeper approaches and departures. These numerous major improvements in STOL technology will stand this country in good stead as our civilian airplane manufacturers look more and more to this field in an effort to contain our constantly burgeoning massive commercial jetport development, jetport development that is being fought by local residences wherever such massive jetports of the future are being planned.

I trust that when and if the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives shall again have an opportunity of approving this prototype medium STOL transport development program, they still restore these funds so that we may get on with the job. At least five aircraft manufacturers have made proposals for this project. One of them is Bell Aerospace Co. which is located in my district. If the program were restored and Bell's proposal should be accepted, it would do wonders for a serious unemployment situation existing in western New York.

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. I thank my distinguished friend for yielding and I would like to commend him for his remarks. I rise in support of his very articulate position and say also that I appreciate the leadership that he has shown on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the capability to provide responsive, flexible tactical airlift within a theater of operations is an integral element of our military posture which enables us to reinforce deterrence. In this regard, I firmly believe that it is essential that we support the advanced medium STOL transport—AMST—prototype program—an advanced development program which is part of a long-term effort to modernize our tactical airlift forces. The cost to support this important STOL—short takeoff and landing—development program is relatively modest, but the potential payoff is quite high.

Today, the bulk of the tactical airlift requirement is fulfilled by the respected, but dated, C-130. The C-130 is based upon the technology of the early 1950's. Although it has been continuously modified and improved over the years, the C-130 simply will not be able to respond as effectively to future contingencies as could an AMST based upon modern

technology, as I will elaborate upon subsequently. This is an important consideration when we determine the development programs we should support, and when we look ahead to the future of our tactical airlift forces.

The objectives of the AMST prototype program relate in an indispensable way to these considerations I have mentioned. First, the AMST program will demonstrate applicable new technology which, after additional engineering development, could provide a medium-sized—that is, a C-130 class—jet STOL transport. Next, the program will provide a low-cost development option for modernization of the tactical airlift force. Third, the program is designed to yield increased visibility on costs associated with short-field performance. Also, the program will define STOL operational rules, safety margins, and related design criteria. All of these objectives have direct, essential applicability to the long-term effort to modernize our tactical airlift capability. In addition, successful achievement of program objectives could well benefit to some degree—as you will recognize—broad aviation developments in the United States and this country's future position in world aviation technology.

The potential value of the AMST prototype program can be illustrated in part by some examples of the improved capabilities which would be made possible by the program.

The AMST will be the first tactical airlift transport to incorporate the wide-bodied concept now used in virtually all new commercial transport aircraft. This feature will permit highly efficient use of cargo compartment space. Although both the C-130 and the AMST will be able to carry cargo and wheeled vehicles, the AMST also will accommodate troops seated alongside the cargo. Moreover, the AMST would have the capability to carry many items of military equipment—such as self-propelled artillery, mobile shops, vans, and components for ground-to-air and ground-to-ground missile systems—which are too heavy and/or too large to be carried in the C-130.

Because of its short takeoff and landing capability, the AMST could operate into many airfields not useable by the C-130, and therefore provide much more flexible and responsive tactical airlift. To illustrate, there are more than 650 runways in the European area alone which are unsuitable for the C-130 but which are useable by the AMST. This becomes particularly important when considering factors such as the potential denial of many runways due to hostile action, and the effect of adverse weather which is common in Europe. Further, the AMST would be capable of providing logistics support of operations at dispersed airfields which may be used, for example, by the Army's helicopters and the Air Force's A-X close air support aircraft.

Not only could the AMST improve our tactical airlift capability, it also could do this in a highly cost-effective manner. The AMST prototype program will emphasize a low production-cost air-

craft which is simple, reliable, rugged, and easy to maintain. Moreover, extensive analyses have shown that most tactical airlift workloads can be accomplished at a lower cost through the use of the wide-bodied concept to be employed in the AMST, than through the use of the current narrow-bodied designs.

For the past couple of years, the Air Force has actively pursued a broad spectrum of study and research efforts intended to provide a cornerstone on which to base a confident program for a new STOL transport. It is evident that the potential for building a successful STOL transport is now in hand. Also, the basic design goals for the aircraft will permit a prudent design approach well within the state of the art.

Now I would like to make another observation which I feel is particularly pertinent to our deliberations. Contrary to some misconceptions, the prototype aircraft will be based on the use of existing turbofan engines. Indeed, not only the prototype aircraft, but also any eventual production version of the AMST, could use currently available engines. The Air Force does have a separate advanced-technology engine development program underway which could eventually result in a high performance engine suitable for use on a future version of the AMST—but the AMST prototype is not dependent on this new engine. I wish to repeat—the AMST prototype will be designed to use currently available engines.

Also of importance is the fact that the Air Force is maintaining close coordination with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—with respect to STOL technology developments. This close coordination should prove of considerable benefit to the Air Force, NASA, and industry, and provide an across-the-board boost to our progress in this field.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, the AMST prototype program is a well-conceived, soundly based element of the long-range effort to modernize our tactical airlift forces. The program is moderate in cost, and will permit the Air Force to examine multiple technological options designed to provide the means to improve our tactical airlift capabilities in a cost-effective manner. Moreover, the program contains no commitment to a production decision. In consideration of these factors, and in consideration of the importance of effective, efficient tactical airlift to our deterrent posture, I strongly urge you to support this program.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I include quotes from the Senate and House Armed Services Committee reports on the AMST prototypes which I feel are critical to the discussion here today. I feel it is important to establish a favorable legislative history for this program in the House, notwithstanding the committee's decision to delay the program. I feel quite sure the Senate will have time to clear up the misunderstanding and when the conference report comes before us, we can all vote with confidence for the restoration

of funds for this program. I want to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleague and neighbor from New York, HENRY SMITH for his leadership role in educating the House on the importance of this program and I am sure he will take this cause to the Senate where he has enlisted the active support of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate, Senators JAVITS and BUCKLEY.

The Senate and House reports follow:
SENATE REPORT ON AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SAFEGUARD ABM, AND ACTIVE DUTY AND SELECTED RESERVE STRENGTH, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

ADVANCED MEDIUM SHORT TAKEOFF AND LANDING TRANSPORT

Committee recommendations

The committee recommends approval of the \$51.8 million requested. The objective of this program is to design, fabricate and evaluate a prototype transport which will demonstrate new technology which, after additional engineering development, will provide a low cost development for the modernization of the tactical airlift force. It will also provide data and costs associated with short field performance and define short takeoff and landing operational rules and related design criteria. Design and performance goals rather than rigid specification requirements have been established and include the takeoff and landing capability required to conduct safe, routine operations in and out of 2,000-foot airstrips with a 15-ton payload and at least one-half internal fuel on board, normal turbojet or turbofan power transport aircraft cruise speeds, and sufficient internal fuel for a 500 NM radius of action. The program also includes as a separate effort the competitive development and test of an advanced turbofan demonstrator engine for specific application to this aircraft.

Committee considerations

There is a major deficiency in the funding identified with this program. The request includes \$35.8 million for the aircraft but the Air Force has stated that an additional \$34.2 million is required in fiscal year 1973 to support a competition to satisfy the direction of the House Appropriations Committee (Report No. 92-666 on the FY 1972 appropriations) on November 11, 1971, that this be a competitive effort. There was sufficient time before the budget was submitted to the Congress to have permitted inclusion of the requirement for these added funds in the budget, but this was not done. The Air Force states that if the program is approved, reprogramming will be employed to provide the \$34.2 million if needed. An examination of contractors' proposals will determine if more than one technical approach should be pursued.

The committee supports this advanced development prototype program. The committee strongly urges a program which considers a potential application of this development to commercial transport use. In this regard, the tendency in the military departments to establish performance goals which are unique but not essential to a military application should be avoided. The Department of Defense should coordinate its efforts with those of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which is developing a smaller 50,000-pound STOL transport for civilian use. If successfully developed, the Department of Defense Medium STOL Transport could make a significant contribution to commercial aviation and could improve the

position of the United States in the international commercial transport market.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT ON AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1973, FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION FOR THE SAFEGUARD ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM, ACTIVE DUTY AND RESERVE STRENGTH, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The conceptual and preliminary design of the Advanced STOL prototypes will be completed. These efforts, through future flight tests, will lessen the technological risks and provide decisionmakers with possible production options based on demonstrated hardware. Also included are developments involving airframes, avionics, ECM (EF-111A), power plants and other aircraft related equipment.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier the misunderstanding on the AMST program. In the September 13 and 14 issues of the Aerospace Daily, this subject was discussed. Since I am very hopeful these funds will be restored in conference, and I will do all I can to clear up the misunderstanding, I feel it is appropriate to the debate to include the two aforementioned articles at this point:

AMST CUT IS "ABUSE OF PROTOTYPE CONCEPT," INDUSTRY OFFICIALS SAY

Cut of funds for continued development of the Air Force's Advanced Medium STOL Transport (AMST) from the Pentagon's fiscal year 1973 budget by the House Appropriations Committee "amounts to abuse of the prototype concept," industry sources close to the program said yesterday.

The sources, stressing that AMST is "an ideal prototype" program, were miffed by the cut and said it seriously hampers U.S. chances of getting an economically viable fleet of military and civil STOL transports to replace aging aircraft now in use.

They said commercial STOL "is unlikely to occur before military STOL," and that "there is a genuine need for (new) military STOL aircraft" to replace the Lockheed C-130 fleet. The committee members, by cutting the Air Force's requested \$35.8 million to proceed with AMST, "are denying themselves this development," The Daily was told.

"We should go with" the program, the sources said. The committee's action "amounts to abuse of the prototype concept," initiated by former deputy defense secretary David Packard.

The sources said several aerospace companies "had perfectly satisfactory solutions" to the AMST requirement "and then the committee abruptly shuts it off." The companies met "Department of Defense and, by implication, congressional desires on what kind of aircraft it should be," The Daily was told.

AIR FORCE SEEKS TO CLEAR UP HILL'S "MISUNDERSTANDING" ON AMST

The Air Force said yesterday it will go back to Capitol Hill to "clear up any misunderstanding" on its Advanced Medium STOL Transport (AMST) aircraft program. On Monday, the House Appropriations Committee released its report on the Pentagon's fiscal year 1973 budget, in which it cut the AMST proposal by \$35.8 million (Daily, Sept. 12).

Companies participating in the program objected to the committee's action, indicating it was confused on several issues, including the engine. The action, sources said, amounted to "abuse of the prototype concept," initiated by former Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard (Daily, Sept. 13).

The Air Force apparently agrees. Yesterday, it issued the following statement:

"The Air Force will seek to explain more fully to clear up any misunderstanding that may exist as to its plan relative to the AMST transport. The prototype aircraft program is not dependent on engine development. It will use existing engines. The engine development program is a separate technology program which, if successful, might later provide an option to improve the prototype if a decision should be made at some future time to go into production."

The Air Force did have some difficulty conveying its ideas on the program to the House Appropriations Committee when it testified March 22. On one occasion, a reading of the testimony reveals, Lt. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, deputy chief of staff for research and development, asked if he could "start over" in his description of the program. "I think we have gotten way off the track . . ." he said. On another occasion, Air Force Assistant Secretary for R&D Grant L. Hansen said, "Somehow or other, I have not been able adequately to portray to you the picture that this (new) engine is on option for improvement in the prototype, and not a part of the prototype program itself . . ."

The committee's decision to cut the airframe portion of the program but to retain funds for work on an advanced engine is reprinted as it appeared in its report on page 69 of this issue of The Daily.

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

Mr. SMITH of New York. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I would also like to associate myself with the gentleman in his remarks with regard to the STOL aircraft.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MINSHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. I would like to point out to the committee that this matter is discussed in some detail, the STOL aircraft, on page 225 of our report. I will not take the time now to read the section.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed by the committee action on the advanced medium STOL prototype. Over the past few years, we have been giving special attention to the efforts of the Department of Defense to make improvements in the process whereby weapons systems are developed and acquired. With the special encouragement of former Secretary of Defense Packard, the DOD initiated a number of actions in this regard—one of the most important being that of "prototyping." In brief the prototype approach is designed to avoid many of the problems experienced in the past which resulted both from excessive reliance on paper studies and from concurrency between development and production of weapons systems. Hardware prototypes developed under this new approach will confirm technical feasibility and permit evaluation of the utility of a design against requirements before any further steps are taken in the program. This appears to be a laudable approach to develop-

ment—one we should encourage whenever possible.

In this connection, the Air Force currently is conducting prototype programs for two aircraft—the lightweight fighter and the advanced medium STOL transport—AMST. Both of these programs are designed to yield important technical and cost information early in the development process. And both of these programs would be laying the groundwork for possible important improvements in our defense capabilities at some time in the future—although I wish to emphasize that neither program now involves a production decision or commitment.

I wish at this time to focus my remarks on one of these two programs—the advanced medium STOL transport—AMST—prototype program. Some questions have been raised concerning the AMST prototype program, and I believe it is in the best interest of our review of the defense bill to fully understand the need to support this program. Of course, it is evident that one reason we should lend our support is to demonstrate our continuing encouragement of improved DOD management processes, as characterized by the prototype approach. In addition, there is another very important reason for support, and that is to provide a sound basis for any eventual modernization of our aging tactical airlift forces.

With respect to this latter point, I wish to note that the current workhorse of our tactical airlift forces—the C-130—has been in production since the early 1950's. Its record has been an admirable one and we certainly can expect it to remain an essential element of our tactical airlift capability for some time to come.

Nevertheless, the C-130 cannot last forever, and it is inevitable that at some time in the not-too-distant future, the Air Force will have to begin replacing its C-130s. Furthermore, technological progress over the past two decades, and also technological process which is imminent, will permit us to develop a new tactical airlift transport with capabilities noticeably superior to those of the C-130. The AMST is being specifically designed to take advantage of these new technologies, to yield the superior performance which is now achievable, and to provide technological options which could permit timely and cost-effective modernization of our tactical airlift capability.

Of course, as I inferred earlier, support of the AMST prototype program does not entail any commitment to production. This is a key aspect of the prototyping procedure. We can provide a firm basis for any eventual modernization of the tactical airlift forces without undertaking undue risks, either in terms of technical uncertainties or in terms of unknown cost factors.

At this point, a few words are in order about the type of aircraft which can be expected to be developed in the AMST prototype program. Briefly, the AMST will have a gross weight of about 150,000 pounds, which means the AMST aircraft will be in the C-130 class.

It will be designed to use currently available jet engines—and will not be

dependent on the development of new engines, as some have thought. The AMST will be able to carry considerable payload; in fact, it will be able to carry many items of military equipment which cannot be carried by the C-130 because the items are too heavy or too large. Also, the AMST will have short field performance, which means that it will be able to use a much greater number of airfields than are now usable by the C-130. And it will have a wide-bodied design—similar to that of modern commercial transports—thereby increasing airlift efficiency, particularly when transporting mixed loads of cargo and troops. These and other features in combination would permit the AMST aircraft to increase the overall effectiveness and efficiency of tactical airlift movements. In this regard, I understand that the AMST is expected to have low operational costs, as well as low unit-production costs.

In summary, I believe it is essential for us to encourage the improved management processes now being used by the DOD, and to lay the groundwork essential for any eventual modernization of the tactical airlift forces. Taken together, these factors lead me to one conclusion—that we should support the AMST prototype program. Accordingly, I ask you to give this important program your favorable consideration and support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from New York (Mr. SMITH) has explained the circumstances regarding the short takeoff and landing aircraft adequately.

I think there was a misconception in the report, because, as was brought out in the colloquy with Mr. SMITH, the report being proposed by the Armed Forces is being supported by this group.

I hope that the other body at least gives thought to this STOL program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to attempt to clarify what appears to have been a misunderstanding in testimony before the subcommittee on the advanced medium STOL transport—AMST—prototype aircraft.

As a result of the misunderstanding, the committee has deleted funds for the project and has referred critically to the program in the committee report.

The advanced medium STOL transport program calls for a prototype aircraft.

The project is properly authorized and is supported by the Air Force. In fact, the Air Force currently is considering proposals from industry to carry out this developmental program.

During subcommittee hearings, questions were raised about the powerplant for the aircraft. This area apparently is the center of the misunderstanding because it was not made clear why the development of the aircraft should proceed before the decision was made on the required engine.

As a result, the committee has recommended funds to continue development of the engine but has deleted the funds required for the development of the prototype aircraft.

The Air Force is emphatic that the prototype aircraft program is not dependent upon engine development because the Air Force already has an engine available that can be used during the prototype stage.

ENGINE DEVELOPMENT SEPARATE

At the same time, the Air Force believes the engine development program should proceed as a separate technological program which may well provide an option later for improving the capability of the prototype aircraft when and if it is cleared for production.

Mr. Chairman, I had considered offering an amendment to the pending bill to restore these funds for the prototype aircraft but have decided, instead, to offer this brief explanation as part of the legislative history in the House debate and to make an appeal for restoration of funds to the Senate Committee where the misunderstanding may be clarified with expert testimony.

It would be unfortunate if the decision of the House Committee on delaying the advanced medium STOL transport program were to prevail because of the unfortunate misunderstanding about the details of the development of the aircraft as related to a potential future improved powerplant.

While there is a potential future relation between the AMST and the new engine, that should not delay development of the AMST because the engine development is running at a slower pace.

In fact, the Air Force tells me that it is entirely likely that the AMST would go into production with engines that are currently available.

This background is provided in an attempt to respond to the statement in the committee report which says:

The Committee does not believe that it would be useful to build and test the air frame without the required new engine.

INTEGRAL TO LONG TERM

The Air Force is convinced of the need and Congress has approved the development of the AMST as part of a long-term effort to modernize the tactical airlift forces of the Air Force.

The committee refers to the possible extended utilization of the C-130 aircraft. The C-130 is based upon the technology of 20 years ago and, despite modification and improvements over the years, the aircraft will not be capable of providing for future contingencies for which the AMST is designed.

The C-130 has limitations on cargo space which cannot be overcome but for which the AMST is being designed specifically.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, I express my regret that the committee has seen fit to delete the funding for the AMST prototype program at this time.

It is particularly unfortunate since the rationalization obviously was based upon a misunderstanding of the capability of an existing aircraft and the Air Force program for development of a new powerplant for use in future aircraft.

Before this appropriation bill completes its journey through the Congress, I hope sincerely that the AMST item will be restored and the program will be al-

lowed to go forward in the interest of national defense.

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

There has been a great deal of discussion in the Congress and in the press as to the characteristics which our fighter aircraft of the future should possess. We are all aware of the continuing repartee between advocates of multi-purpose fighter aircraft and those in favor of aircraft designed, developed, and procured to perform certain tasks exceptionally well. I do not wish to add to this rather technical discussion, but rather comment upon the basic reasoning which forms the foundation of our need for an air superiority fighter—specifically our need for the F-15.

To have a better understanding of this need, we must first recognize that the tactical air forces are an essential element of the general purpose forces which the United States maintains in support of its collective security commitments with its allies throughout the world. Further, we must realize that the success of all other tactical air missions depends upon first attaining and maintaining air superiority—that is, eliminating effective interference by the opposing air forces. Theaterwide, or even local control of the air, permits better use of friendly tactical air forces, while denying the enemy the opportunity to use his air forces effectively.

It is an accepted fact that prospective adversaries in many parts of the world are likely to be equipped with Soviet-designed, first-line tactical aircraft. Success in any combat which may occur with these adversaries will, therefore, be dependent upon the superiority of our aircraft as compared to those produced by the Soviets. In this respect, current fighter aircraft of the Soviets, and those which we know are in development, continue to emphasize maneuverability. Analyses of simulations and combat experience have shown that the performance of our best current fighter, the multipurpose, proved and venerable F-4E, is marginal against the best current Soviet fighters. Soviet fighters Mig-23 Foxbats on the line and later designs now in development or testing would have a decided advantage in maneuver capability over the F-4E.

Combat experience in Southeast Asia has shown that encounters between fighters capable of high altitude and supersonic flight, normally take place at subsonic speeds at medium to low altitudes. One reason is that positive identification, when required, can often be achieved only at visual ranges. Another reason is that the turning radius is so large at high altitude and sustained supersonic speed that multiple-pass, visual combat—that is, dogfighting—is impossible.

The energy loss associated with sharp turns at high altitude and/or high speed inevitably drives the combat to lower altitudes and reduced speeds. Thus, actual combat experience has demonstrated that agility in the air at medium and low altitudes is a prime requisite to success.

To provide this agility an aircraft must have a low ratio of aircraft weight to

wing area, a high ratio of engine thrust to aircraft weight, good visibility, excellent flying qualities, and endurance in the combat arena. These are the qualities which provide good acceleration and climb, short turning radius, and the stability needed to bring the airplane's armament to bear on the opposing aircraft. Accordingly, these are the qualities being designed into the F-15. It is here, on time, on cost, and on target.

A planned orderly production flow of this aircraft is needed to assure us air superiority in the 1975 time frame. The Air Force and McDonnell Douglas, Inc., have judiciously worked toward that end, and in my opinion, arrived at one of the best production schedules I have seen. To disrupt that plan as the committee has suggested will be both costly and drastically effect the operational availability of this much needed aircraft.

Gentlemen, from these comments, it becomes apparent that we have a very substantial need for the F-15 as conceived and designed—to provide us with the ability to attain and maintain air superiority in the post-1975 time period. We must plan and act presently for now-needed as well as future "follow-ons" are concerned, in the defense of our Nation and freedom everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 713. (a) During the current fiscal year, the President may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

(b) Upon determination by the President that such action is necessary, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide for the cost of an airborne alert as an excepted expense in accordance with the provisions of Revised Statutes 3732 (41 U.S.C. 11).

(c) Upon determination by the President that it is necessary to increase the number of military personnel on active duty subject to existing laws beyond the number for which funds are provided in this Act, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide for the cost of such increased military personnel, as an excepted expense in accordance with the provisions of Revised Statutes 3732 (41 U.S.C. 11).

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall immediately advise Congress of the exercise of any authority granted in this section, and shall report monthly on the estimated obligations incurred pursuant to subsections (b) and (c).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 38, line 5, strike out the comma and insert the following: "for a period of 60 days."

And on line 7, strike out the period and insert the following: "and there shall be no further expenditures for said purpose beyond said period without first obtaining the approval of the Congress" and reinsert the period.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, section 713 is a very interesting section. I think it could be called, "The Congressional Surrender Section," because under the provisions of that section the Congress surrenders to the President acting as

Commander in Chief, the authority which rightfully belongs to the Congress under the Constitution.

Under section 713-C the President is given the power in calling up members of the Armed Forces to do so without having to come to the Congress for appropriations to pay for those called up. In other words, the President may call up thousands of members of the Reserve and keep them on active duty for as long as he wills, without asking the Congress for money. Payment for the troop's salary is automatic under the operation of this section. What happens to Congress' control over the pursestrings?

Last year after I offered a similar amendment the Senate placed a proviso into section 713(b) limiting its applicability to limits that were established under the Selective Service Act. Under the Selective Service Act there are limits to the numbers of personnel who can be called up in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. These limits cannot be broken by the President. But he can control the Reserves. Under the law the President now has the authority, after he declares a national emergency, to call up as many as 1 million members of the Reserves. If he does so all that happens under this bill is that the Secretary of Defense drops a note to the Congress a few months after the President has issued his proclamation, telling the Congress that the President has acted in this way. What my amendment does is to restore to the Congress the power that is rightfully in the Congress, and says, "Mr. President, you may have the power in a national emergency to call up the Reserves, but at the expiration of 60 days you are to come back to the Congress and let the Congress review your action by reviewing your request for funds to continue those reservists on active duty."

This restores to the Congress its rightful position as the keeper of the taxpayers' purse.

My amendment would review the President's awesome power to call up the Reserves. It would give the Congress the power to determine whether or not the money of the people of this country should be used to continue the reservists on active duty and to pay them. Obviously, if the Congress thought not, the Congress at that point could refuse to make the money available, in which case the reservists would be deactivated.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that my distinguished and able friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) is unduly concerned about the language in section 713.

This provision has been in the law since 1961. It certainly has never been abused. It has been used only once, and that by President Kennedy. I think we should consider what the provision does not do. It does not provide any authority to increase active duty strength beyond that that is authorized by other law. The annual provision in other acts which place a firm ceiling on active duty personnel is not repealed or otherwise affected by this language.

The President cannot exceed the ceiling by increasing the draft, or by accepting increased enlistments.

What does this provision accomplish? Why should it remain in the bill? Why should the amendment be defeated? Because the provision simply makes possible and provides that money will be available for paying the costs of those additional reservists whom the President may call to active duty in some emergency pursuant to existing law.

The call to active duty of the reservists inevitably results in personal hardship and financial dislocation to the individual reservist. In fairness and equity I believe that the Congress is obligated to assure that the reservists who are called to active duty will receive their justly deserved pay and allowances and other entitlements.

That is all that this section does, and it should not be tampered with. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Under section 713(c) as it presently exists the problem is that Congress surrenders by this section its constitutional power to oversee expenditures. My amendment limits that delegation of power to the President: The President may hold the reservists on active duty for an indefinite period under this section without congressional approval of any kind. This gives excessive authority to the President. Congress has a proper role to play in this Government, too. Congress should be given the right to review the President's action 60 days after the President acts.

Mr. SIKES. We do not know what the future may hold. We do not know what emergency may develop. This section has never been abused. It should stay in the bill. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES), there were—ayes 14, noes 54.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Sec. 715. No part of the appropriations in this Act shall be available for any expense of operating aircraft under the jurisdiction of the armed forces for the purpose of proficiency flying, as defined in Department of Defense Directive 1340.4, except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Such regulations (1) may not require such flying except that required to maintain proficiency in anticipation of a member's assignment to combat operations and (2) such flying may not be permitted in cases of members who have been assigned to a course of instruction of ninety days or more. When any rated member is assigned to duties, the performance of which does not require the maintenance of basic flying skills, all such members, while so assigned, except those of the rank of colonel or equivalent or above (O-6) in noncombat assignments, are entitled to flight pay pre-

scribed under section 301 of title 37, United States Code, if otherwise entitled to flight pay at the time of such assignment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee on what I think is an excellent bill in many respects.

I have a few objections which I intend to raise at a later point.

On this particular question that we are on right now, section 715. I think it is a very important issue. We are trying to save money, of course, which is the purpose of defense oversight.

FLYING PAY FOR COLONELS AND GENERALS

The committee has said that paying flight pay to senior officers where there is little likelihood of their ever returning to a position which requires operational flying is not justified. The bill as proposed strikes much deeper than that statement indicates. It establishes a dangerous precedent by denying flying pay to rated officers serving in noncombat rated positions.

Included among those affected are nearly all colonels and generals in air staff, and appropriate admirals counterparts and members of the joint staff, research and development, and other noncombat positions. Promotions for most lieutenant colonels and assignment to staff duties requiring flying experience would result in a reduction in pay. I suggest that this bill ignores the affect such action would have on our junior rated officers—and at a time when we are taking other actions to make a military career more attractive.

The bill as written will directly affect the colonels and generals, admirals and commanders most likely to return to operational flying, most likely to be combat commanders, and most likely to be assigned to the air staff or high Navy positions.

Experience shows that most colonels who become combat wing commanders were assigned to essential staff and support duties prior to assumption of command. Of the 52 colonels in Southeast Asia flying combat today, 37 were in nonflying duties prior to their assignment to combat. Under this bill each would have been identified as not likely to return to operational flying.

They would not have gotten preference pay and they would not have been flight efficient.

A total of 1,150 colonels and 62 generals, removed from active flying by the Air Force prior to the Vietnam conflict because they were over 45 years old and had more than 22 years rated service, were returned to operational flying in support of Air Force combat activities in Vietnam.

Had these fliers not been available, replacements would have taken 12 to 18 months to train at a cost of \$98 million, which is more than enough to pay all of their flight pay for 30 years. The immediate savings are more than offset by the value of a reserve of trained experienced pilots, available, ready and willing to serve.

I am not offering an amendment on this section. We have passed the money stage and we are just at the limitation

stage so clearly an amendment on just the limitation would not be practical. But I would hope the committee would further review this particular question with the Senate and that the Senate would re-review this issue and perhaps not just have a blanket categorical limitation for all people in high positions, but would use perhaps a little more discretion and allow a little more flexibility such that we can keep highly technical qualified people with some kind of hand on the stick or controls of the aircraft. These will be the people making the decisions in the navy and in our air force in the future and I think that many of these leaders should remain flight proficient.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, the committee report states:

A morale problem has been created among nonrated personnel who receive less pay for doing the same jobs than the rated personnel receive.

The services have no evidence a morale problem exists among nonrated officers as a result of flying pay for rated officers. Conversely, the morale of flying officers will suffer seriously if flight pay is denied solely on the basis of rank and assigned duties. All officers were aware when they chose a military career that aviators were receiving and would continue to receive flight pay so long as they remained qualified.

This bill will reduce the attractiveness of a rated career. It will affect the incentive for a young officer to strive for promotion to the rank of colonel since a promotion will result in a loss of pay. The bill will penalize our rated people for accepting responsible jobs in planning, research, and other critical staff positions. A young officer who is considering the rewards for voluntarily continuing a flying career with expected family separations, long hours of alert and combat flying, and hours of practice and study to maintain his flying skill, cannot help but note his probable reward for success is a promotion to colonel accompanied by a loss in pay. The Air Force has a survey which shows that 82 percent of the young flying officers would change their career plans if they were to lose flying pay when serving in staff positions at later stages of their careers. When we consider the cost of training a replacement versus the cost of an individual's flight pay, our required course of action is crystal clear.

Section 715 of this bill is not a cure for real or imagined morale problems among nonrated officers. It is a breach of faith with the flying officer who has voluntarily accepted the sacrifices and hazards attendant with flying and expects to continue to receive flight pay when assigned to noncombat duties.

This bill, if passed, may result in a situation similar to that of the submariners where large bonuses are needed to obtain sufficient volunteers. The money saved by denying flight pay to colonels and generals does not warrant the risk of demoralizing the rated force and jeopardizing the services' capability to recruit and retain volunteers for a flying career.

I do not support the provisions denying flight pay to colonels and generals on

the basis of present duties. These provisions should be removed from the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, the committee report asserts that flying pay is generally justified for three specific reasons: Namely, to retain younger rated officers; to induce rated officers to continue with a career in the service; and to reward for flying when you were a younger officer. I have reviewed the discussions the committee had with the service witnesses during hearings. The specific reasons asserted by the committee are there but they do not address the basic reason for flight pay.

Since 1913, the Congress has recognized the need for flight pay to recruit and retain qualified volunteers for flying duty. In the Career Compensation Act of 1949 we established flight pay as an incentive for individuals to enter and remain in a flying career.

Annually since 1954 we, the Congress, have authorized the services to pay flight pay to certain members not required to participate in flying. By our repeated actions—actions which the services did not request—we established an implied contract with each rated officer in the military services. If we deny flight pay to colonels and generals, we will void the implied contract we have with thousands of career officers, as well as create chaos with the morale and retention of the rated force. I believe the bill before us, which would break faith with career flying officers, is an affront to the career flying officers.

This action could deter some from seeking promotion to colonel if such promotion will mean an economic bind.

I would like to remind you the services predicted in the late fifties that such action would come to pass and proposed legislation to reduce flight pay for flying officers during the latter phase of their careers. The Congress chose not to enact the proposed legislation—rather we gave the services a broader authority to pay flight pay to rated officers not required to participate in aerial flight.

Obviously, some of my colleagues feel flight pay needs to be reevaluated. I will agree to a reevaluation but also believe a precipitous action will do serious harm to all military fliers.

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

SEC. 734. Funds appropriated in this Act for maintenance and repair of facilities and installations shall not be available for acquisition of new facilities, or alteration, expansion, extension, or addition of existing facilities, as defined in Department of Defense Directive 7040.2, dated January 18, 1961, in excess of \$50,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may amend or change the said directive during the current fiscal year, consistent with the purpose of this section.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to ask the chairman in charge of the bill a question with respect to a couple of statements in the committee report concerning the B-1 bomber. I realize that the amendment to strike the funds for the B-1 bomber was defeated, which I think is regrettable, but nevertheless, there is an additional question raised by

the language of this report which I believe ought to be resolved.

I take it one of the factors in the defeat of the amendment is indicated in the statement on page 42 of the committee report that—

No decision has been made on production of the B-1.

In other words we are merely voting funds to build a prototype, or rather three prototypes.

But then, Mr. Chairman, going over to page 228, the statement is made in the second paragraph that "the B-1 long-range strategic bomber is to replace the present aging B-52 aircraft." I would appreciate it if the chairman would indicate whether or not this is intended to constitute some sort of a verbal indication that we will eventually go to production on this aircraft.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the future course of the arms race is unpredictable at this time. We are all hopeful that ways can be found to slow down the arms race rather sharply and safely in the coming years.

We are providing hundreds of millions of dollars for the development, for the research and development funds for the B-1 bomber. It is the expectation that the prototype bomber will be flown at least a year as an experimental vehicle before decisions will be made as to whether or not it actually shall be placed into the operational force.

So there is no decision on production. We have not burned the bridges behind us. There is no decision on the production of the B-1 bomber and that decision will have to come later and will have to be made in the light of the facts at that time as to whether it is an acceptable weapon and whether or not it will be needed at that time.

So I think there is a meeting of minds as to what is contemplated here. I agree that the statement read last by the gentleman might tend toward a different view, but that is not intended.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the chairman. In other words, it is not intended by this language on page 228 to indicate any kind of commitment to go into production on this plane beyond the prototypes.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

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

SEC. 735. During the current fiscal year upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$650,000,000 of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority: *Provided further*, That not less than \$25,000,000 of the authority granted in this section shall be available only for a

program to substitute civilian personnel for military personnel.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 48 of the bill, at line 9, in Sec. 735, delete "\$650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750,000,000", and at line 20 change the period to a colon (:) and insert the following: "Provided further, That not less than \$92,950,000 of the authority granted in this section shall be available only for the civilianization of kitchen police program of the Department of Defense."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed will permit civilianization of kitchen police duties in the military services to continue. If the amendment is not adopted, the Army will not be allowed to continue the civilianization program that it has begun, and the other services will have to drop contract KP which already has been accomplished.

Let me make it clear, also, that kitchen police duties for military personnel will continue for basic trainees and for troops on field assignments. This will be true whether or not the amendment is adopted.

The amendment will not add to the cost of the Defense program. It provides no additional money in this bill. The services have stated that they want civilianization enough to give up other programs in order to obtain it. My amendment gives them authority to come back to Congress for reprogramming. Thus, Congress retains control.

Now let us talk about costs. Figures which were quoted yesterday in opposition to this amendment are not accurate. I am sure my good friends on the committee have no desire to mislead the House. Let us say they just do not know any better. On yesterday, you were told it would cost \$250 million a year to carry on this program and that eventual costs would be a half billion dollars.

That is not true. The \$250 million cost includes all types of civilianization. My amendment refers only to KP duties, and the actual cost given to me by the Department of Defense is about \$125 million. The half billion dollar figure quoted yesterday apparently came out of thin air. I find no basis for it. In any event, we are not talking about additional money. The services will take this cost out of their hides.

I have specific cost figures for the Army, and they are comparable for the other services. The Army states that the average cost per year to the Government of an enlisted man at the grade levels which perform KP is \$8,327 per person, and it is estimated that 12,000 man-years of KP duty are performed. The armywide average for soldiers who pull KP is 4 days per month; 1.1 civilians are required to replace each soldier for KP duty. The average annual cost for contract personnel, including both contract and direct hire, is \$4,962. It is estimated that the total cost of a civilianization program for all the services will be \$123.2 million per year. To use military manpower will cost twice as much, Mr. Chairman, twice as much.

The bill which is before us contemplates the use of civilians for KP. The services already have taken cuts in military personnel preparatory to using contract KP. If my amendment does not prevail, it will be necessary to add additional military personnel for KP duties at very much greater cost, or to cut back on military training programs. Full use of the military personnel for training and military duties have been projected without KP duties.

In the old days, an enlisted man did his KP duties because he could not help himself, but he did not like it. We live in a different age. This is an important morale factor. We are trying to have an all-volunteer force. Onerous duties like KP are resented and this helps to keep people out of the services. Kitchen police duty interferes with training. Any good platoon leader or company grade officer will tell you that one of his big problems is absences caused by KP assignments.

Please remember that the Navy and the Air Force already have substantially accomplished civilianization of KP. The Army has embarked on the program. The bill, without my amendment, would reverse the entire process and require KP duties in all the services.

It is well to bear in mind that the contract KP jobs are from the lowest level of employment skills. They are the people in whose ranks are found the highest percentage of unemployment. Many of them are on welfare. Those that are taken off welfare represent a double saving to the Government. In this program, they can be given jobs, they can receive training, they can begin to build hopes for the future. It has been stated that the elimination of civilianization of KP would cause approximately 70 small business firms to go out of existence—small business firms. These are considerations which should not be disregarded and this amendment should be approved.

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

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of this amendment, and I wish to underscore his emphasis upon the approach of the volunteer army. Failure to adopt this amendment would cause a retrogression in that program. It is very essential that this be supported.

Mr. Chairman, under consideration is the withdrawal of service funds and language that would require military personnel to resume all KP and custodial duties. I rise to strongly protest this action that seeks to return our young military men and women to dishwasher and janitor duties.

All services, particularly the Air Force, have made huge strides in doing away with major irritants of military life. Since KP and custodial duties ranked at the top, they have received priority consideration for elimination. Without these menial and extra jobs, service life is more attractive and people feel they are doing the job for which recruited and trained.

Without a draft—we ask the services to compete with business and Govern-

ment service for their recruits. In deleting KP and custodial funds, we are saying that peeling potatoes and sweeping floors are "wholesome and character building duties" that will help attract and keep an all-volunteer force. I am sure my colleagues will agree that the "opportunity" to scrub floors or latrines does not make enlistment more appealing.

Besides turning away many young people considering voluntary service, those now on board will protest loudly and reconsider their career plans. For example, already, over 250 airmen from one base have written the Air Force voicing very strong opposition to such action.

I join the military services and their members in their opposition. There is no reasonable basis to put our military people back at KP and custodial jobs and cripple the services' diligent efforts to reach an all-volunteer force. I urge my colleagues to join me in restoring KP and custodial funds to this bill.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would guess that in my congressional district about 98 percent of my taxpayers do more than four days a month of menial chores. They mow their own lawns. They help their wives hang out the clothes. They help do the dishes. They help sweep the floors. They do all kinds of things they would love to have somebody else do for them, but they cannot afford to hire it done, so they do it.

They do not like to do it. They feel it is demeaning, no doubt, but they do it, and this includes the Congressman from that district himself.

Now we are asking the taxpayers not only to do all those menial chores but also to pay taxes so that the enlisted men will not have to.

I cannot go back and tell my taxpayers, since most of them have served in the military in one capacity or another, that the average fighting man in the military is so busy he cannot find 4 days a month to do this kind of work.

We are trying to tell the taxpayers that these men are so terribly busy that this is taking them away from work that would really be a part of professional duty. They are not going to believe it, and I am not going to try to tell them that.

I feel very strongly that the amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Florida made a statement that those who opposed civilian KP for the military services did not know what we were talking about yesterday. Let us look at the facts. What is in the record?

In this budget today there is \$99 million just for the Army civilianization of KP. There is \$22 million in here for the Navy. There is \$1.3 million here for the Marine Corps, and that was just a rough estimate, and it will go up to \$5 or \$6 million. For the Air Force it is \$76 million. That is a total of nearly \$200 million in this budget alone. How can we say that this program is going to cost only \$120 million a year?

Furthermore, it is only about 80 per-

cent implemented. We have put this \$200 million in this program so that they can close the program down and fulfill existing contracts.

However, looking down the road, this program, if fully implemented—and the facts are there—will cost \$250 million to \$300 million to the taxpayers of this country.

I have had the privilege of visiting various military installations over the past year, and just as recently as 2 weeks ago I sat down in a messhall with some GI's in the 2d Division in Korea and talked with many of them. I said, "Fellows, how would you feel about it if you had to go back on KP?" They have civilian KP's there. I think they are paying for it themselves. But they said, "If we have to, we would naturally not like it, but we would not object; we would do our jobs." That is the way the average GI feels about it in today's Army.

The next thing you know we will have to give them breakfast in bed.

This is an undue burden on the taxpayers of the United States, using \$300 million, a sum which I think the taxpayers of this country should have back in the General Treasury. We can put some of this money back if this amendment is defeated.

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

It seems to me that, with all due respect to the learned and undeniable dedication of the gentleman from Florida, what is proposed by this amendment is wrong in several respects.

First. It seeks to do something that ought not to be done as a matter of basic policy; namely, to remove from the spectrum of military service a little drudgery, a little unpleasant duty, a small measure of the realities of daily life. I think it is good for people to have a cleanup detail once in a while, whether they are 4-star generals or buck privates and whether they are expert pilots or apprentice mechanics. KP duty is something, as a matter of basic military policy, we ought to require, not escape. It is essentially limited in practice to the three lower grades.

Second. No matter the fancy talk, there is no blinking the fact that what is involved in the amendment before us is approval by this Congress of civilian contract funding for KP that will approach in cost nearly half-a-billion dollars by the end of fiscal 1973. I do not believe the people of our separate constituencies want us to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to hire somebody to do the military's kitchen details, particularly when the services have no such thing as an 8-hour day, and the argument that KP detail detracts from military specialties is contrary to the realities of military life in peacetime.

Third. The amendment suggests that no money cost is involved because the services may come back to the Defense Subcommittee requesting reprogramming. This means that they would ask to take money from other appropriated funds and use it for civilianization of KP. The short answer to this is that such reprogramming will require subcommittee approval and the subcommittee is already

strongly opposed. It also would suggest that there are funds appropriated to the military that are not really needed and I would expect that the funds sought to be so reprogramed should be returned to the general treasury funds and that the committee will so recommend.

Fourth. Last and perhaps not least in the consideration of this amendment is the compelled conclusion that if a man will not come into the Armed Forces because he might have to give 1 or 2 days out of the month to KP he ought not to be taken in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, what on earth are we coming to in the proposal implicit in this amendment? There is not a single, valid reason why the taxpayers of America should pay hundreds of millions of dollars to hire civilians to do KP duty for the military in any service. As indicated in the report which is presently before this House, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended the termination of all such civilian KP at the end of April next year.

I earnestly recommend to my colleagues that, in the public interest and in their own political interest, they manifest a firm determination that the Congress declines to hire housekeeping details for the U.S. military services, particularly at a time when the country is operating at a huge and continuing deficit.

I urge the defeat of the amendment. The argument that there are fiscal advantages in civilianization of KP because it costs less to hire a civilian are inapplicable, because the military is not on an 8-hour day or a 5-day week. It is a matter of detail and assignment. If they are assigned to KP or cleanup detail as the gentleman from Ohio has correctly said, of course, they will undertake the obligation. It is an obligation which is inherent in the service. We ought not to go so far soft with our military as to approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield for a clarification with respect to the cost?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. KP is one thing; housekeeping details are another thing. The services are moving toward eliminating KP and also the housekeeping detail work at posts, camps, and stations. If we completely civilianize KP, it will cost, as the gentleman said, about \$275 million annually. But if we civilianize the housekeeping business of maintaining the camp, post, and station, that will cost, if it is done fully, about \$210 million annually, according to the figures given. So, in round figures, the total amount of money we are talking about here is a cool approximately \$400 million or \$500 million.

Mr. WYMAN. As the chairman says, the annual cost is almost a half billion dollars, and it was, of course, that round figure to which I made reference in the colloquy in general debate yesterday.

I urge defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Florida. The irresponsible attempt to force the Defense Department to terminate the assumption of military KP duties by civilians must not be endorsed by the House.

At a time when our armed services are embarking upon a commendable program to attract and retain high quality volunteer personnel, we cannot frustrate this goal by directing them to wash dishes and cut grass in the name of the national interest. To do so would make a mockery of the new recruitment campaign of the "new action army."

Aside from the serious problems of morale, KP duties have through the years, frustrated training objectives. As General Westmoreland has so aptly stated:

Every single day, approximately 45,000 soldiers are drawn away from their primary duties to perform administrative chores. This confronts the soldier with tasks not directly related to his readiness mission, and frustrates the efforts of his leaders to build teamwork and a sense of professional excellence in their units.

As a partial justification for its action, the committee in its report implies that it is cheaper to use military, rather than civilian, personnel for KP duties. It lists the cost of employing a lower-grade enlisted man for KP duties at \$5,500 a year.

This figure ignores, however, the cost of commissioned and noncommissioned officer time in training that man and coordinating his activities. It also ignores travel time costs, payroll costs, and medical expenses, among many others. Indeed the actual cost of a productive enlisted man-year is closer to \$20,000 than \$5,500. This compares with the civilian employment cost, as quoted in the committee report, of \$13,200.

Moreover, studies have indicated that, because of management efficiency achieved through specialization, fewer civilians than military personnel are required for KP duties. Thus, in the long run, the civilian takeover of this program will produce significant savings for the Department of Defense.

Important too in our consideration of this issue is the fact that many thousands of poverty level individuals have been hired and trained under the new program to perform KP duties. We are acutely aware of the need of providing all who are willing to work the means of earning a livelihood. To terminate this program would rob many individuals of their dignity and condemn them to the welfare rolls.

Moreover, forcing the Defense Department to phase out the civilian takeover of these duties would result in almost 70 small business firms losing their entire market and going out of business.

To conclude, the committee's action would jeopardize the establishment of an all-volunteer army, raise serious morale problems, frustrate training objectives, waste the taxpayer's money and throw needy persons out of work. Thus for compelling human and economic reasons, we must reject this move to thwart the very practical and sensible policy that has been instituted by the armed services. We

can do so by endorsing this amendment which will not involve any extra appropriation of funds. I urge my colleagues in the House to adopt it.

Thank you.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. SIKES' amendment to the defense appropriations bill to permit civilianization of KP duties to continue.

Under authority contained in section 8a of the Small Business Act the SBA becomes the prime contractor on Federal contracts and, in turn, subcontracts to small firms owned by minorities and other disadvantaged firms. Should Mr. SIKES' amendment not be adopted 30 black contractors and 10,000 employees working under 8a contracts would be unemployed. And, approximately 70 small business firms would lose their entire market and go out of business. If action taken by the House Appropriations Committee stands, the disadvantaged of our country will be severely affected. Tens of thousands of people who have taken jobs and been trained under this program would be unemployed. These people have some moral right to reasonable continuity of policy by Government and their hopes should not be destroyed.

Additionally, there is the concept of professionalism among members of our armed services. The "new" Army has placed advertisements all over the country for young men to join and learn a trade that will benefit them in civilian life. It is a waste of time for our servicemen to perform KP and janitorial services while they could be learning skills essential to the military service while on active duty and useful to them upon termination of their service career. Members of the armed services can contribute far more to our Nation by doing their best at the job they joined to do.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the thing that intrigues me is what are we going to do with all these potato peelers and floor sweepers when our armed forces get into combat situation? Are we supposed to bring those potato peelers and floor sweepers onto the battlefield?

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

During the past year it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Recruiting and Retention of Military Personnel. As a major portion of our inquiry, we visited numerous military bases for the express purpose of determining those factors which influence young men to enlist or reenlist in the Armed Forces. In addition, we held formal hearings wherein enlisted personnel representatives of each

of the services were encouraged to give us the benefit of their views on factors which attracted and held men in the service. We talked with literally hundreds of servicemen—from raw recruits to seasoned command sergeants major.

We also conducted a review of the surveys and studies on the attitudes of young people toward military service over the past several years.

As we completed this endeavor one point became quite clear—if we expect young men of high caliber to enlist and remain in the Armed Forces, we are going to have to treat them in a more professional way. If we are to retain men with the capability to operate and maintain sophisticated machinery and weaponry, we are going to have to present a continuing challenge to these men.

Mr. Chairman, I am not against the principle of hard work. I am not against a man's getting his hands dirty in physical labor. I am not advocating a white-collar Army. But I see no reason to require military personnel to perform tasks which bear absolutely no relationship to their primary function, which is to become as proficient as possible at their trade.

An Appropriations Committee staff member was quoted in the press the other day as saying that some Congressmen still wash dishes and cut the grass, and do not like shelling out half a billion dollars so GI's do not have to do the same. I contend this is not a valid comparison. No Congressman is required to wash dishes or cut grass as a condition of his basic employment. His wife may require him to do so.

There can be no doubt as to the adverse impact this bill can have on military morale if this amendment is defeated. It will make the all-volunteer force recommended by the administration more difficult.

It may very well be that some Members do not feel that an all-volunteer force is feasible or desirable. If that be the case, let us abandon the objective, because it is not realistic to enact expensive programs to make service careers more attractive on the one hand, and then on the other negate that action by adopting a policy which runs counter to the objective.

Concern has been voiced about the coddling of servicemen by removing these duties. I share the concern about coddling. I would suggest however, Mr. Chairman, that coddling is taking place at the policymaking level, rather than at the kitchen level.

Another major factor seems to have been overlooked in this bill. As I understand it, the bill calls for termination of all civilian employment in KP by the end of next April.

Promises have been made—and inferred—that these duties would be removed. To reinstate these duties and thereby break these promises to potential recruits and present servicemen alike will have a decidedly adverse effect on the credibility of programs which have been initiated under the all-volunteer movement.

There is one final point related to cost. The figures which we have been fur-

nished are conflicting. However, unless we attract a sufficient number of qualified men to meet our commitments and deter aggression, cost becomes academic.

My colleague from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) will explore yet another problem which will be created by removing the civilianization programs from the Department of Defense. He is gravely concerned about the impact on a number of small businesses, predominantly minority owned and staffed. His points are well made, and I share his concern.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. I just want to ask the gentleman a question. Did the gentleman say they will not join the all-volunteer force if they have to do KP? Does the gentleman have any figures—concrete figures—to support that statement?

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida which enables the services to continue the practice of hiring civilians to perform KP functions.

During yesterday's debate, I was informed by members of the Appropriations Committee that the cost of hiring a civilian to perform these functions is almost double that of using military personnel. I was referred to the committee's report which served as a basis for the arguments the gentleman offered.

Mr. Chairman, I take issue with those cost estimates and I do so on the basis of information provided to me by the Department of the Army. The committee claims that the cost of one soldier for 1 year is \$5,500. According to the information provided to me, the cost of one soldier in the grade of E-3 is at least \$5,911, and this figure—and I want to emphasize this—includes only the soldier's base pay and allowances, and possible incentive pay. A more realistic estimate of the cost of one soldier for 1 year is \$8,328; this figure includes the cost of PCS travel, training, support, social security payments, and educational benefits, but it omits such additional costs as health care and, where applicable, the \$1,500 combat arms enlistment bonus.

But cost is not the main issue. I raise it only to place in perspective the argument presented during yesterday's debate.

What we are really talking about is whether or not the promises that we have made to lower ranking military personnel will be fulfilled. In addition we must consider the impact on morale and thus on enlistment and reenlistment, and thus on the feasibility of an all-volunteer force if we were to reinstate what military personnel themselves consider the No. 2 irritant.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no other area of employment, Federal or private, which utilizes the concept of performance of extra duties above and beyond those for which the employee is hired. For instance, I do not believe General Motors will hire and train a man as an auto-

motive mechanic and then use him as a dishwasher after hours. I do not believe IBM would train a computer programmer and use him as a potato peeler, and I do not believe the civil service would approve of utilizing a statistician for slinging hash. In each of these cases and in every other area of public and private employment, except the military, personnel are hired for specific functions and not required to perform additional duties of the sort we are talking about today.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Florida for this amendment. He has accomplished an unusual feat. By this amendment the services can remove a serious negative morale factor at no additional cost above the Appropriations Committee has recommended. I commend him and urge my colleagues to support him.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. SKES). The committee report on the KP civilianization program states that this program should be terminated because it is too costly. Mr. Speaker, this simply is not the case.

I submit to my fellow Members of the House that this program is actually cheaper than it would be to have military personnel perform this work. I base this statement on figures compiled by Maj. Gen. John A. Kjellstrom, Director of the Army Budget, who has been kind enough to release a fact sheet on the KP civilianization program. According to the committee, and I quote:

The average man-year cost for a lower ranking personnel who performs KP duties is about \$5,500. The civilian man-year cost is about \$8,800.

But, listen to the figures on Major General Kjellstrom's fact sheet. Again, I quote:

What is the total cost per year of enlisted men performing KP? Answer: Total cost is \$8,328. What is the average annual cost of contract personnel? Answer \$5,313.

If you multiply the \$3,000-plus difference by the 10,000 people currently employed under this program, you will quickly see that the continuation of this program would mean a savings of more than \$30 million a year.

But, this \$30 million represents only the surface savings to the Federal Government if the civilian contracts are retained. In my State of North Carolina, at Fort Bragg, approximately 1,000 civilians are employed to perform the KP work there. In a letter written by Charles A. Burgess, Jr., manager of the Fayetteville, N.C., office of the Employment Security Commission of North Carolina, to my distinguished chairman and friend, GEORGE MAHON, Mr. Burgess states the following:

All of the initial hiring [for the Fort Bragg KP Civilianization Program] was done through this office, with the majority of individuals hired falling into the disadvantaged category. Additional recruitment has also been maintained through this office. Salaries paid have been competitive in the area and have contributed significantly to a rise in the standard of living of many of our disadvantaged applicants. [The contractors] have completely met all requirements of an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Their management practices have been excellent. This area has been fortunate in not having suffered a significant overall rise in our unemployment rate, and there is no doubt that this organization has contributed to the high employment rate existing. The cessation of the present contract would have an adverse effect on the economy.

Now, if this contract is canceled, what do you think is going to happen to these 1,000 people from the Fayetteville area, as well as those from the Goldsboro, N.C., area where Seymour Johnson Air Force base is located, as well as the other thousands of individuals employed by this service across the country? Most of these people will qualify for welfare relief or some other federally subsidized program. Consequently, there would be a further savings to the Federal Government of approximately \$1,000 to \$2,000 per person, or a total of \$10 to \$20 million per year.

The committee report also states that the program was rejected by the committee because there were no studies carried out on the effect of these duties on military discipline. Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, this program has not had a chance to be tested. It only came into effect last year. In fact, the Marine Corps has not even instituted its program yet. This program was planned to be carried out over a 3-year test period.

Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with those in favor of cutting unnecessary Federal spending. And that is precisely why I am voting for the Sikes amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same as a fiscally responsible action.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to some of the statements dealing with the question of KP. I assume that many of you men at one time or another have served in the armed services as an enlisted man as I have. I served for a good many years in that capacity in the infantry before I became an officer.

I can tell you, in my opinion, after the basic training which this legislation in no way affects, because individuals will continue to do KP during basic training—that after that period the job of KP is an absolute minus so far as the advancement of military training is concerned. It has for years been one of major problems affecting morale among the troops who have finished basic training and who are developing skills in the service.

When I hear someone say that the average GI does not really care whether he does KP or not—I do not know what has happened to the average GI because I can tell you, it has been and in my opinion still is one of the most hated and resented activities.

So far as I am concerned, we are not trying to build an Army whose capabilities to fight and to defend this country rest on his capabilities of cleaning the grease traps and scraping frying pans and waiting on serving lines.

This, to me, does not make sense. We have worked to try to develop a Volunteer Army, and I support this concept.

But, you are not going to develop a volunteer army if you follow a course of action that requires a trained and skilled fighting man to spend 4 days a month getting up at 4:30 in the morning to go to work in the kitchen.

Now no one is talking about active duty overseas or in combat areas, our men will have to serve KP there. They will know how to take care of themselves by their work in basic training. This is a vote against the volunteer army. It is saying—Let us keep the draft because you are going to find the resentment is tremendous on this issue. I want the draft to end. This speaks nothing to the fact that 50,000 civilian jobs will now be sacrificed, if this legislation goes through, and these are 50,000 people with low skills or with semi-skills who are going to go right down the drain and I think we will end up paying for them and pay far more for them, in terms of welfare and other support programs than we are paying for them in the jobs that they presently have.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder where the gentleman gets his economic analysis on which he bases the idea that the only way the people on welfare can get jobs is by having them do KP for the troops. Are there not any other ways in which the people on welfare can go to work?

Mr. PEYSER. I did not say that. I said there are 50,000 men and women who are working in these programs who will be thrown out of work.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Does the gentleman not think they will get any other kinds of jobs?

Mr. PEYSER. With the unemployment we have now, to throw out of employment 50,000 more people who now have jobs of cleaning grease traps and pots—those jobs do not require a great many skills, and these people may not find any other jobs.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Does the gentleman not think we can put them to work cleaning up the streams, picking up tires, and other kinds of trash from vacant lots?

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I notice on page 28 of the report it says:

Another fact considered by the Committee was that, although planning to implement the civilianization of KP worldwide, the services did not, nor do they intend to, reduce their military personnel strengths.

Is the gentleman aware of that fact?

Mr. PEYSER. I think the point is the civilians who are in this program now are going to be terminated, because obviously if there is no money and no allocation they will be out of work.

I believe the main thing I am saying is that the men who are being trained to defend this country should not be working in the kitchen as a method for furthering their career or defending this country.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very able statement. Let me endorse the fact that the program before us phases out military personnel for KP duty. It is planned to use civilians, which cost the Government less money.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

I believe that there are four principal reasons why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida should be adopted.

First, the adoption of this amendment will not increase the Pentagon's budget by one dime. Instead it will give the military services the opportunity to continue the civilianization of KP duty. If the military services are really serious about instituting this program, then they will have the option to continue. If not, they can stop the entire program.

Second, the continuation of the civilianization of KP would permit more time for training of men to be soldiers and sailors. The reason that we have an Army is to train men to fight, not to be kitchen boys. More than 45,000 military personnel waste time every day involved in these kinds of nonmilitary duties. The civilianization of KP will help us restore the importance of training for combat roles, rather than secondary duties.

Third, if this amendment is not accepted, more than 10,000 employees, currently working as civilians under contract doing KP duty, would lose their jobs. Most of these individuals are marginally employable and many members are of minority groups. Unemployment is too high for this House to throw an additional 10,000 workers out of work.

In addition, more than 30 black-owned firms, who currently have KP contracts, would be put out of business if the committee's recommendation on the civilianization of KP is adopted.

Fourth, I believe that this House should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida in order to make Army life more attractive. Many of us have doubts about going to an all-volunteer Army. But there is little doubt that it now will occur. As a result, we must take those steps necessary to make Army life attractive and maintain the high retention rates needed to develop an effective all-volunteer force.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and give the military services the opportunity to continue the civilianization of KP.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, when the cause is just, some very strange coal-

tions are made. Even though those coalitions may be on a temporary basis, nevertheless they are made when the cause is just. Today, I am acting in a true spirit of bipartisanship. I left my eyeglasses at home and I borrowed a pair from the Republican staff member on the Banking and Currency Committee. So not only do we have a coalition—temporarily—but we have a true bipartisan approach insofar as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter on this amendment because, for me, it is terribly important that the amendment be passed. I have heard the Members on the floor of this House and in private conversation lament the astronomical rates of unemployment. We should indeed lament those astronomical rates. I have spoken on this floor about the black rate of unemployment which, on the national average, is twice as high as the white rate of unemployment. That average does not reflect the true rate of unemployment in the black communities. Many who are unemployed are not even counted because they have stopped looking for jobs. So many people have simply given up hope and do not even register for jobs because they know the jobs are not there.

If the committee action is permitted to stand, what we shall do is add to the rolls of unemployed. For the benefit of my colleagues who are talking about finding jobs elsewhere, I would submit that in the city of Baltimore, as well as in your cities, I am sure you have literally thousands of people who are seeking employment but the jobs are not there because through our genius we have automated and "cybernated" many people out of jobs.

Let us consider other aspects of this amendment. When we last voted on the HEW bill, I well remember the acrimonious debate directed against those who are on welfare. I remember all of the cruel and unkind remarks that were made about "the parasites on welfare," about "those who do not want to work." Now here we have people who do want to work. They do want to work as evidenced by the fact that they are working. If the action voted by the committee is allowed to stand, what are we saying to those people? We really are saying to them: "Even though you want to work, we will take the cuts in this particular budget in such a manner as to force you out of work and force you onto welfare." I do not think this House wants to do that. Continuing in a true bipartisan spirit today—motivated in part because of the borrowed eyeglasses—the administration has put out many statements about its interest in black entrepreneurship. Many members of the administration have indicated that in this area the most glowing achievements have been made. I am not at all sure that is true, but some efforts have been made. It has been indicated that 70 small businesses will go out of business if the action of the committee is allowed to stand.

May I add that of those 70, 30 are black businesses. Thus, in effect, what we will be doing is stymieing the effort

that the White House is so very proud of—spurring black entrepreneurship.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to applaud the gentleman for expressing an articulate statement. I should like to associate myself with his remarks and urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I, too, applaud the gentleman in the well. I rise in support of the Sikes amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying hopefully if the House takes the right action on this, then maybe there is a possibility of some new coalitions being formed in the future again, when the cause is just.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. I would gladly yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), and I wish to commend him for his leadership in this matter. I also commend the gentleman from Maryland for his persuasive argument in support of the amendment.

As most House Members know, I have been working toward an all-volunteer armed force for many years. Certainly, one of the most important reasons for continuing the program of civilianizing KP duties is that it enhances considerably the prospect of an easy transition to a completely voluntary force. Members have heard the comments from base commanders across the United States praising the effects of civilianizing KP on the morale of the low-ranking enlisted men.

Even those with reservations about the all-volunteer concept should be able to support the KP civilianization program. For one thing, it will save the taxpayers money. Reductions in active duty strength can be made where civilians are used, in increasing numbers, for KP and similar nonmilitary duties. If the military is forced to use active duty personnel to perform these tasks, our military size will be forced upward, at substantially higher cost. The higher expenses involved in using uniformed personnel are recognized universally. Furthermore, the principle purpose of the civilianization program to free the serviceman to return to his unit for training and performance would be served—so would the most cost-effective way to use military personnel.

It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the program which the pending amendment would continue does not eliminate KP duty by low-ranking servicemen altogether. Such details would still continue in basic training, and during periods of fields training.

A further consideration which the amendment raises is the matter of jobs.

As a number of my colleagues have pointed out, the elimination of the civilian KP program would put 10,000 people out of work. These people are primarily unskilled, drawn from poor and minority groups. To eliminate their jobs would not only force them back into dependency on public assistance, it would also deprive the local economy of their salaries. In Hawaii, for instance, two separate contractors employ 141 individuals in the performance of KP contracts, and the contracts themselves mean about \$1.5 million to Hawaii's economy. Are these 141 people and the others among the 10,000 now employed in this program to be ignored as they stop paying taxes and slip back onto welfare?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it deserves mention that the pending amendment would not increase the Defense budget by a single dollar. It merely permits the reprogramming of other funds by the Secretary of Defense to meet the costs of this project. In effect, Congress would be saying to the Pentagon, if you really want to continue this program, then put it high on your own list of priorities.

The reasons for supporting the Sikes amendment are numerous and compelling, and I urge the House to adopt it overwhelmingly today.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman. I rise in support of the Sikes amendment.

I strongly support the Sikes amendment to civilianize nonmilitary duties now performed by military personnel. It will make the hoped-for all volunteer military more attractive. In the long run it will make our military more effective and economical. It can, and should, result in reductions in total active duty forces.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) has ably pointed out a subsidiary benefit of this amendment. Black contractors will be prominent among those providing these nonmilitary services.

I urge the adoption of the Sikes amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, throughout history we have seen that defense, as essential as it is, is economically a drain on the general economy. Whether we like it or not, I do not believe that the economy of any nation ever has stood over a long period of time spending over 50 percent of its total income on defense without ruinous inflation. That is what we are threatened with here in the United States today. Whatever our feelings, the American people are tired of war, and if they are tired of war and we see evidence of that every day, we are going to find it awfully hard to get sufficient money through the Congress for necessary defense.

President Eisenhower was right when he said one of the most dangerous things we have is the industrial-military complex we have built up. Too many groups,

too many companies are making profit out of national defense, for us to get an objective analysis. Just as here, there is great pressure from the contractors. We have let too many military people retire, and go to work for military contractors. Too many military leaders have gotten to where when they think of defense, they think of the fringe benefits, of personal comfort. We have reached the point and where some of our ships have one less gun than the Russians have, so that our captains and admirals can carry aboard their cars in order to have them to drive around in when they dock.

We started the move presented here some years ago. We hired caterers to serve Bolling Field and some other places around here. We stopped the military from doing their own clothes cleaning and shoe repairing so private enterprise could get their cut. I asked then what would happen when our troops got beyond the delivery limit of the local bakery. None of these contracts we deal with here provide for supplying this service in the forward or battle areas.

We have a limited amount of money and I think are going to have even less for defense in the years ahead. The effect on the economy, the feeling of the people are going to force it. Now we have inflation at a rate of about 10 percent per year. We are running \$30 or \$40 billion behind in our tax collections against expenditures. With this situation should we not put our money in real defense, weapons and essentials instead of spending these billions with catering contractors. Do we have enough money really for ships, planes and guns.

A general called me on this issue, and in an hour he spent 55 minutes talking about the necessity for keeping this money in the bill so we can have somebody to serve them, and 5 minutes talking about the need for the Cheyenne helicopter which would need to defend us in time of real need.

My friends, we are going to be battling with the military from now on trying to get them to use the money that we can afford to provide for defense, because they are always going to be here supporting the fringe benefits, the come-on area. I say to you before we add \$94 million here, let us realize that as of now—and I am giving you the rough figures; it is in the report—we have \$42 billion in the hands of the military unexpended.

We have in excess of \$8 million unobligated. Of course, if we tell them to pay these contractors for KP or catering services if they use their own money, they can do it, but every time they use it they will be using money that could be and should be used for real defense which this country, unfortunately, may need in the future.

My friends, let us start now to tell the military about American public sentiment; about the American economy; about the inflation that faces us, that we must insist them to do first things first; that they are going to face cuts in the money available and should help us to keep the money we can get to do the

things that need to be done, not only the money they have on hand but also the money they get, for real defense. We would be the stronger if this were done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to emphasize the personal pronoun, but I enlisted in the volunteer military service in 1916, and I peeled my share of potatoes, onions, and carrots, and I washed my share of pots and pans. I even made my share of the coffee, with plenty of salt-peter in it.

I do not know what the shooting is all about here today, but I am afraid there are too many former military officers in the House. I enlisted as a buck private in the rear rank, and I did not particularly care for these jobs such as kitchen police, and that was an incentive to me to strive to obtain the rating of a corporal so that I could get away from them.

However, to serve my turn on the kitchen police force did me no harm, so far as I know.

I have also been a valet to a horse and as a so-called dog robber. I have shined officers' boots. I have been through these things and never did I feel that I was the scum of the earth. I had a job to do and I tried to do it.

Apparently it was a different Army in 1916, 1917, and 1918. Is it now proposed to put housemaids on destroyers and other warships to take care of the job of peeling potatoes and other such duties? What is proposed to be done?

What is wrong with a private or an apprentice seaman peeling a few potatoes and onions and performing some of these other tasks if it will save—as I know it will—the taxpayers millions of dollars? I repeat that it is a good incentive for these servicemen, starting at the bottom, to seek to be something other than privates and first-class privates or whatever they are called these days.

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

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

Mr. MINSHALL. The gentleman was in the service some good many years ago. I am sure he has not been in a modern day mess hall. I have done my share of peeling potatoes, too. The modern day mess hall has dishwashers, has potato peelers, has electric mixers. There is really not much to do except to have a cleanup detail today so far as KP is concerned. There is nothing wrong with that.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman agree that if we ever got into a shooting war with Russia whereby we could throw our fringe benefits at their fringe benefits, we would win the war hands down?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what would happen in another war. I simply say that if we can save the poor, overburdened taxpayers of today a substantial amount

of money by letting these newcomers to the service do a few of these jobs, that is not going to hurt them. On the contrary, it will be good for them. If the servicemen of today and the future are to be wet-nursed—if there must be civilians hired to blow their noses and tuck them in bed—then this country is going to have an organized mob and not a military force worthy of the name.

This amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sikes amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider the Sikes amendment today I cannot help but look further down the legislative road to a very major decision we must make next year, and that is whether we extend the draft or depend upon an all-volunteer military service.

I do not think there is any person in this room who really, truly, deeply wants the draft to be continued. So as a nation we are doing our very best to achieve a volunteer army.

There are several incentives for a man to make a career of military services. One of them is pay. We have done very well in this respect.

Four years ago there were 1 million less men in the armed services of the United States than there are today. Today, 4 years later, the cost for personnel is \$10 billion higher than it was 4 years ago. Obviously we have done very well by the military man, and I do not think he need cite inadequate pay as a reason for not wanting to make a career of military service.

There is something else, though, besides pay that we have to consider. The gentleman from Iowa made a very fine statement which I enjoyed tremendously. However, I think the significant point of the gentleman's statement is that though he willingly and proudly peeled potatoes and onions, he did not stay in the U.S. Army.

He became a radio announcer and later one of the most valuable Members of this House of Representatives. He did not make a career of service in the U.S. Army.

We do not have the same kind of a personnel requirement today as we had in World War I or in World War II or in the Korean conflict or even in the present conflict.

Today's military unit is mechanized; it is a highly skilled type of individual that we must have to operate these highly complicated weapons systems. We need a more highly skilled type of personnel than ever before.

So the second thing beyond pay that a man must have if he is going to make a career of anything, is a sense of pride, a sense of professional dignity, and the feeling within himself that he commands the respect of other people because of the job he holds and the job he does.

I served on a subcommittee several years ago when the gentleman from Connecticut, our former colleague, Congressman Kowalski, made the charge that the U.S. military was making a bunch of servants out of its enlisted men. We held extensive hearings on that subject and

found even then that the feeling was very, very deep.

Ask a GI today the main reason why he does not want to make a career in the military, and he will say in all frankness, "I am sick of that damned Mickey Mouse."

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I cannot yield. I am sorry.

That is what he will say to you most every time. "I am sick of that damned Mickey Mouse." And KP is a part of it. He wants to feel dignified and that he is doing a job which commands the respect of his fellowman.

Every hearing that we ever had in the Armed Services Committee shows KP and the indignity of the work enforced on these people is very definitely an impediment to making a career of military service. It will very definitely be an impediment to an all-volunteer service, and it may very well put us in a position next year that none of us want to be in. It may put us in a position next year, if we are to follow a course of responsibility, where we will be forced to give the President standby draft authority which will encourage enough volunteers so that we can achieve an all-volunteer service.

I do not want to be in that position. I say let us dignify the armed services and make it a true profession. Let us adopt the Sikes amendment and get rid of this Mickey Mouse.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. It sounds good to say that this will release enlisted men for more professionalized training. I have heard that we have a lot of enlisted men with so much time on their hands that a drug problem is developing of major proportions. Does the gentleman want to give them more time to engage in this?

Mr. GUBSER. I do not believe the gentleman by any stretch of logic can associate the drug problem with leisure time. I suggest we take the leisure time and give them a little better training and more training. That is what makes the armed services click—training and lots of it—not peeling potatoes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that most of us would be in favor of this amendment if we could make it retroactive to about 30 years ago. It would then eliminate a lot of KP duty which many of us did.

I think that we need to keep things in perspective. Just what members of the armed services are affected by having to be on KP? Well, actually the only ones who are affected are the younger ones who are in the lowest three grades. By the time a man has been in the armed services long enough to have progressed to a career status, he will no longer serve on KP, because he will have a rank above the third grade. That is the kind of man you are trying to keep in the armed services and he will not be doing KP. So let us bury the ghost once and for all, putting men on KP for the first years of their military training, it will hurt the armed services.

You are not really doing anything like that.

Now, it has been said that for some reason doing KP causes a man to feel he is not respected. We certainly have won a lot of wars with people who did not have self-respect if that is true, because members of our Armed Forces have always pulled KP. You do not equate respect with doing this kind of duty. You do equate respect with whether a man feels he is in a unit of which he is proud; an Army of which he is proud; a citizen of a country of which he is proud, and is doing a job of which he is proud. Even if part of that job consists of doing KP, there is nothing about this which should cause him to be less proud.

There has been disagreement, as to the total cost of the program. I do not intend to say whether it is \$250 million or \$300 million, but I do think it is important to look at how much the cost for one man year of KP is, comparing the civilian with the military. These figures came to our subcommittee staff, from the Armed Services. These are not figures that I dreamed up or that the staff dreamed up. These came from the Pentagon.

The Army says that in order to hire a civilian for KP, it will cost them \$6,300 a year; the Navy says it will cost \$7,000 a year; the Marine Corps says it will cost \$7,700 a year. The Air Force originally said it would cost \$11,000 for every person they hire to do KP on a civilian basis. We did not believe that that was really true, and we were not able to get a better figure out of them, so we assumed it might be as high as \$10,000. This makes the average of all three services something like \$7,750 for one man year of KP on a civilian basis. But that is not all. There are benefits involved which are equivalent to fringe benefits of other employees, such as insurance and the like. This adds \$1,050 so that the actual total for a civilian man year of KP is \$8,800. But that is not the whole story, because while the enlisted man works a full day of about 12 hours on KP, the civilian works 8 hours. So, if you pay the civilian overtime, you have a cost which is half again as large. So, you have a figure of \$13,000 for every man year of KP. As against this, it costs only \$5,500 for a man year, employing an enlisted man of the three lowest grades.

So, that is what we are really talking about as far as cost is concerned. Now, if it were really important in getting an all-volunteer armed services, I suppose I would agree that it would be worth the cost to do away with KP. But it is not that important. The thing that is important, as I mentioned before, is whether or not a person has the job which was promised to him, for which he is trained, which he feels is a job which is worthwhile. KP can be a part of such a job.

Now, I am very much interested in the fact that there are those who feel that to deprive certain civilians of this type of job is a terrible thing.

I thought that in this country we were interested in retraining people, particularly the people in the lowest areas of capability, the hard-core unemployed, so they can hold good jobs. So just answer me this: If KP is such a terrible

job that an enlisted man should not be allowed to do it, because it is demeaning for him to do it, because it tears down his self-respect to do it, then why is it a proper job for anybody else? I cannot see that type of reasoning.

So, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the idea of spending \$300 million for this purpose, in a year in which we will have a budget deficit of vast but unknown proportions, in which we have inflation still with us, is just not commensurate with good sense.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I presume many Members in this Congress did, I did KP duty for \$21 a month in World War II. I had been a practicing lawyer for about 10 years, and I had a doctor's degree in law. I did not find this duty something onerous to me.

However, we are not faced with the same situation today in 1972 that faced us back in the 1940's. Today we are faced with the situation of trying to get a smaller cadre type army, or a cadre type military service. We are going to have to have very ably trained individuals and able persons capable of being trained. We are going to have to appeal to them to enlist mostly on a volunteer basis. The problem that we are now confronted with is how to get people who are highly technically trained to voluntarily do this type of work when they can attain more useful employment in the private sector.

It is going to save money to do this KP work by civilians in my opinion. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is aimed not at adding dollars to the bill, but aimed instead at adding to the ability to transfer funds. It is not going to add a penny to the bill. It will let the services, if they feel like it is a wise thing to do, to spend money in this particular field.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BENNETT. I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona later if I have the time, but I would like to finish what I wish to say.

In World War II, when I first realized there was no adequate cadre in the platoon in which I was, I also realized the difficulty they then had. Many of these people had been highly skilled in civilian life, but had no military skills. So I, a lawyer who had been practicing law for 10 years with no adequate military background at all, still had to take over that platoon. I had to train my own platoon in basic training, in addition to doing KP. That was all right. That was fine for the early 1940's, but not fine for the 1970's when the skills required are much more complex.

In 1972 we are confronted with the fact of trying to get able people to enter the service who will know all about these various new weapons, or who can be trained to know how to handle them, and who will be career service people from the beginning, not just people who may enter the service for some casual purpose and then go on to something else.

The fact is that the requirements for the entering private, and as to his po-

tential attainments as a specialist, are vastly higher than they were in World War I or World War II. The fact is also that, when we are going to a minimum, cadre-sized military establishment, that such smaller and voluntary establishment must be highly capable and the volunteers must have a high potential. Capable young men will not volunteer for military duty when large portions of their working time is to be occupied with duties that do not require them to do a work which challenges their trained and educated abilities. That is just a fact of life.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida is making a very helpful statement, and I am impressed by it. I have asked him to yield because there are so many cost figures floating around from so many sources and there has to be confusion. I have figures that were provided to me on yesterday by the Department of Defense. I had them double-checked and was assured that they are accurate figures.

The present average annual cost for an enlisted man now performing KP is \$8,328 per year. The average cost for civilians on contract KP is \$4,962. It takes 1.1 civilians to do the job of a GI. Even though the GI may work longer hours, the contractor uses more modern and efficient equipment to accomplish his work and the personnel requirements are about the same. The savings per individual is \$2,870 in favor of the contract personnel. The advantage to the taxpayer from contract KP is obvious.

If we must have military KP rather than contract KP—we will have a requirement for more military personnel. The number was reduced on the assumption that we would have contract KP.

Each of the additional military personnel in the bill, will cost \$2,870 more than his counterpart on contract KP.

The Government will save significantly on contract KP. I repeat it. I have said it time and again, there are no reliable figures which would refute this fact.

Mr. BENNETT. I agree with the gentleman and I will say to the gentleman from Florida, that apparently no consideration has been given in the committee's figures to veterans' pensions and widows' pensions and disability service-connected compensation and that sort of thing; and if you average those things in as a cost of military personnel, those figures might be rather considerable.

Mr. WHITE. The fact is also that the figures that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) gave—you should take into consideration the cost of training these men—the amount of training that goes into training men for MOS is going to be delayed before he finishes his KP.

So you are going to lose more money that way.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. I think the figure of eight thousand and some odd dollars that the gentleman from Florida mentioned for military personnel was for all grades of military personnel. We should bear in mind that only the first three grades have KP, so it would not be fair to use that figure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this question has been rather well discussed and I think I sense that the House is growing a little weary of the discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. What the services are proposing is to civilianize what they call kitchen police and civilianize the house-keeping chores on military bases.

When this program is completed, if we permit them to complete it, it will cost a total of approximately a half billion dollars annually—about \$257 million for the KP program and about \$210 million for the other programs.

People have been to see me and have urged me to help the contractors who are involved—and I have had a few telephone calls and I know the attitude of the Pentagon.

We must take into consideration the welfare of country. If we should pose the issue to the American public today—do you want to raise taxes by the sum of a half billion dollars to eliminate KP and a bit of work around military bases—they would respond in my judgment with a resounding “no” to the question.

Army officials told us they did not reduce the size of the Army in seeking funds this fiscal year for the civilization of KP duties.

So, I have to disagree with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) with respect to his statement to that effect. There is nothing in the testimony that will bear out that contention. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Army indicated he did not wish to make a corresponding reduction, or any reduction, in Army military strength as a condition for the congressional approval of this program.

No; you know we have a tough enemy in the world—lean and tough. If he concludes that we have, instead of a correspondingly strong military force, a welfare organization, he will say, “I told you so—they are fat and incompetent and we will eventually take them over.”

The Secretary of the Army came to me, and I admire him—and said he wanted to make a plea for the elimination of menial tasks in the Army. I said, “Mr. Secretary, you have already said too much—stop right there. There are no menial tasks if work needs to be done. This country cannot survive if we lose respect for necessary honest labor. That is the way we are moving and we are moving that way rather fast.”

I have grown weary of those misguided people who constantly talk of avoiding menial tasks. We probably do not need people in the Army who want to avoid the facts of life and avoid doing the things that the average citizen has to do. I believe in the American work ethic and in the dignity of labor and I would like to see the American people trample un-

der foot the idea that necessary work is demeaning.

Shall the Government foster the idea that essential toil is demeaning or dishonest? I say—no. Let us vote down this amendment.

I would like to ask the Members if you would want an Army made up of people who have been taught that it is demeaning to soil their hands—or protect their environment? I believe that soldiers want to be challenged.

I believe they want to be tough and self-reliant and not dependent upon somebody being imported onto the base to take care of the facilities provided them by the American people. They want to be treated like men and not like children. I suspect the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) is here today because of some of the experiences he had in the military service. He is tough and he learned early. I suspect most of the people in this hall today are here because they have been tough and strong and self-reliant from the days of their youth. That is what I would guess.

Mr. Chairman, should the services undertake to wean servicemen from the harsh realities of life and put them into a country club atmosphere? If we have that kind of Army, we have lost the contest with those who oppose us. Our opponents in the world are lean and tough. Shall we have an Armed Force which has as a watchword dependence and not self-reliance?

There is an important ingredient in life called pride. Shall we take steps toward building up the pride of our fighting men so they will have that priceless ingredient? Will we do it by trying to pamper them when they really want to develop self-reliance and responsibility?

I was just wondering this morning, when I contemplated the debate which would take place today, just how long it might be before the Pentagon in efforts to entice people into the services would ask us to provide our stalwart and able-bodied military men with golf carts to convey them from the barracks to the mess halls in order to insure an all-volunteer army.

Did the armies of the past succeed because they were tough and self-reliant or did they succeed because they were soft?

Mr. Chairman, I might point out we do not call upon our military men to perform tasks which the average citizen does not perform. The average citizen cleans house and mows his lawn and looks after his environment. The average housewife, although she may have a college degree and is well trained, does KP every day. I wonder how many of the Members asked their wives how they should vote on this measure today?

Have our people forgotten that involvement in the environment is everybody's job? This applies to our military installations. I hope we will take into consideration what the people of the Nation want and deserve. They want a strong and reliable and dependable military force.

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

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement.

I wonder if the House has taken into consideration the statement the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) just made, that these men are drawing \$4,000 in wages, which is probably less than the minimum wage. From time to time we are faced with bills where the railroad workers go on strike and then we are compelled to vote on compulsory arbitration matters to put these people back to work. I wonder if the committee gave consideration to the minimum wage and the time-and-a-half provisions for overtime and the double time for working on Sundays? All these union people who will be working to serve this magnificent all-volunteer Army might some day decide to go on strike and then we will have a bill before us and we will be compelled to vote to send them back to work, and then we will be compelled to vote for compulsory arbitration. Did the committee take into consideration those matters.

Mr. MAHON. I would say the committee did not take into consideration all the matters the gentleman discussed. The committee took into consideration the matter of having a strong, lean, tough military force, a military organization that would be able to defend its country and portray a posture that will help maintain the peace of the world.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. MAHON. During my discussion of KP, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) asked me to yield for a question. At the time, I was not clear as to the import of the question. I would point out that if organized groups should be hired to serve our forces on military bases and should decide to go on strike, an intolerable situation would arise. Do not Members think we ought to have our military forces more self-reliant and independent and, therefore, in a much better position to serve the public interests in time of emergency? The gentleman from Illinois makes a good point.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would say to the distinguished chairman I would suppose, then, there are also many other civilian employees who ought also to be replaced by soldiers.

I would say also if there is an additional cost, we have something significant being accomplished here, and if there are Members who feel that this is something so important to the taxpayers that we ought to do it, then may I say we have a House restaurant; we have a chairman of the Committee on House Administration who is trying to save money in the House Restaurant.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I did not succeed to the rank of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), but I did rise to the rank of colonel, and most of my time in duty in those 14 years was occupied in training soldiers for combat duty. I want to say

one of the most difficult things to do is to try to set up a training schedule and get people into combat situations when they are constantly required for menial tasks. It is a waste of training time.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. I say that our job in the infantry and armed services is to get men ready to defend our country. KP does not do anything like that. I want to say that as a former serviceman I was only able to achieve a rating of marksman, and I can tell you from experience that dishpan hands are bad for the trigger finger.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman's point is well taken, and I thank him for his contribution. Serving on KP accomplishes no military purpose, and can, indeed, detract therefrom, as he indicates, in my judgment. If this is such a valuable idea, then I would say let us in the House of Representatives also volunteer for KP and save the taxpayers some more money right here.

Mr. Chairman, what we would not ask of ourselves, let us not ask of our military men, and for their sakes, for the sake of the minority enterprises involved, for the sake of the low-income people now being utilized in the program, I urge your support of the Sikes amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we could arrange some time limitation at this moment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments conclude in 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, each Member will be recognized for 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SIKES yielded his time to Mr. HENDERSON.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, as one Member among very many here who served in the Armed Forces, I heartily support this KP amendment, and I advocate that it be expanded to include chauffeuring services, valet services, and liquor-serving at parties and the like. If we did expand it, perhaps there would be a few more lieutenants and captains, and even light colonels, driving their own cars instead of being chauffeured around by GI's, serving drinks themselves, and collecting the dirty glasses at party's end. I doubt that the national defense capability would be diminished one iota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, once a marine always a marine. I take pride in the fact that the branch of service in which I served, until they were apparently dragged kicking and screaming into this idea, stood up strong against it.

I can only say, "Chesty Puller, where are you now that we need you?"

I was a little boy when World War II started, and I remember a song which came over the radio. It went like this:

This is the Army, Mr. Green.

We like our barracks nice and clean.

You had a housemaid to clean your floor,
But she won't help you out any more.

I really do not believe the Congress, considering the deficit this Federal Government is facing, really wants to put profit into KP. This could become the decline and fall of the American civilization amendment.

I may amend the amendment I am going to offer in a few minutes, so that the limousines I want to eliminate for some of the higher officers in the armed services might be made available to privates.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the thing to remember in this debate is that what the action of the committee, without the Sikes amendment, would be doing would be to prevent a projected improvement in the military forces that has been underway for some time.

A few years ago we had a colleague in this body from Connecticut, Frank Kowalski, who pointed out that a lot of military people were being drafted to walk dogs around the park and to mix martinis for generals. The public was aroused by these charges, and the services took steps to eliminate menial duties of this kind that had no bearing on the proper performance of a complicated and challenging military assignment.

Then 5 years ago, a House subcommittee found on a trip to Korea that an Army private, who had \$8 or \$9, could get a Korean to do KP for him, but the fellow who did not have that money available had to perform the KP. I remember objecting strongly to the Defense Department over this discrimination and they eventually came back and promised to eliminate Army KP over the next 5 years.

Six months ago the Army announced that KP would be eliminated by next year. Now the committee's action would reverse this very valuable step away from Mickey Mouse assignments in the Army.

If we want a volunteer Army to really function, then we need to get people into it who are really interested in their jobs. Our Subcommittee on NATO visited U.S. Army installations in Germany last winter and we found troops who were bored, discouraged, and dissatisfied. Why? Because they were being used in ways that did not really call on their talents or abilities. They were not challenged. They were just killing time.

On the other hand, we later visited a remote Air Force installation in Turkey. It was a dreary, deserted, cold section. Yet the morale of the men there was sky high. Why? Because they were being used in a job they knew was valuable and necessary and exciting.

The way to get a voluntary force is to keep the men interested, working on military specialties, not menial servant tasks. I support the Sikes amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) for whom I have the greatest affection, a question. Do these people have a right to strike?

Mr. SIKES. Yes they have a right to strike, but in 7 years of contract operations I am told not one day has been lost through strikes.

Mr. KING. Mr. SIKES, I understand from other people that they do have a right to organize and to strike. If you come back from a hike and you find that these people have gone on strike—then what do you do to feed your men. I oppose the amendment. This is not a welfare program.

Mr. SIKES. In that case, which appears very unlikely, the GI would fall back on his basic training and his field training experience and do the job himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, if I thought the adoption of this amendment would make the difference between a volunteer Army and not having one, I would certainly support the amendment, but I cannot buy the argument that this is going to save money.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is going to cost us \$94 million which we do not have, and I do not believe a nation with a debt of \$450 billion already can afford to spend \$94 million for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think this debate has been helpful but very confusing. It is obvious we do not know what it costs for a military man to perform kitchen police. We do not know what it costs for a civilian employee to do the job. I would refer to the committee's report on page 32 and commend them with regard to the civilianization program generally.

I have been saying for years, as the chairman of the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, that we ought to be doing more work with cheaper civilians where it could be done. There are certain jobs that obviously must be military in nature. There are others that may be done by civilian employees or contract employees.

With regard to KP as in the Sikes amendment, one-fourth of the cost or \$25 million of it must be used for inhouse civilian employees. They do not have the right to strike, and it can be done cheaper by them than it can be by the draftees.

I believe because of the studies that we have done, that kitchen police, in the limited respects that the Sikes amendment proposes, can be done cheaper in that way.

From all the figures I have heard today, I would ask the Members to make their decision on one basis; namely, Do you believe you can get people to stand in a KP line and dish out the food, cook it and peel potatoes cheaper than at these salaries we have been talking about? You can in my district. You can do this work for less than \$6,000 per man-year. We

have people who want to work, need the work, and at less than the cost figures used here today.

I would remind you that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. GALIFIANAKIS) talked about 1,000 people at Fort Bragg, performing the KP control, which is not in my district, but this committee and the Congress ought to know whether that procedure used by the Army at Fort Bragg is cheaper. It has been in operation for some time, and we ought to know. From my observations, I believe it is cheaper.

For that reason I support the Sikes amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE yielded his time to Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke at length on the importance of the program to civilianize nonmilitary duties in the Army. Today, I again rise in support of the Sikes amendment, and I shall make my remarks brief.

I was intrigued, Mr. Chairman, by the committee's glowing praise for the virtues of nonmilitary duties:

The Committee is of the opinion that such duties do not detract from the serviceman's image. As a matter of fact, the Committee believes that these are wholesome and character building duties which enhance a serviceman's pride in the services and facilities made available to him by the American people.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I have been concerned for quite some time whether all Members of Congress, and our staffs, have been taking sufficient pride in the services and facilities made available to us by the American people. It might be useful for the committee to look into the possibility of requiring each of us to report once a week at 5 a.m. for 14 character building hours of mopping the House kitchen, cutting the west front lawn, or cleaning the latrines in the Longworth Building.

Of course, the people who are presently holding these jobs would not be too pleased with being thrown out of work, but I am sure they can be persuaded to accept their sacrifice as essential to sustaining the wholesome quality of the House. Furthermore, the taxpayers will welcome the reduction in expenditures for House administration, since one 14-hour-a-day Congressman—already on the payroll—will be able to replace two civilians.

Naturally, there will be some problems in arranging for Members to perform these duties on Mondays and Fridays—but with the enhanced image of the House created through this program, Members will easily be able to spend a greater proportion of their time in Washington.

On balance, I think the Sikes amendment is a necessity if we are to achieve a volunteer Army. I urge its support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this measure is an attempt to get

a volunteer Army at any price—to take the responsibility of defending our country off the shoulders of the upper middle class, the college kids, for whom this country has done the most, and to put it on the shoulders of the gung ho kid and trying to sweeten it up by taking KP duty away.

With all our national debt and our annual deficits, caused in large part by our tremendous military expenditures, I have made a vow: I am going to vote only for those things you can throw at the enemy and to vote against anything else.

I am intrigued in looking at the very liberal antiwar Members who usually vote against the military, and now seeing them in league with the hawks on the ground that this measure will take people off welfare. It looks as if we have to broaden the term, "military-industrial" complex to include the "military-industrial-welfare" complex.

Mr. FLOOD. How can you possibly keep your mouth shut with this going on? Can you imagine me for 3 hours saying nothing?

You cannot train combat troops, hanh? You cannot train soldiers if they are on KP, hanh? You cannot train airmen or sailors if they have to do KP, hanh? You cannot teach pride of service, hanh? Tell that to the Marines; tell that to the Marines. Semper Fidelis.

This unholy alliance of these shadowy doves over here to starboard locking arms with the chief hawk, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) smells to high heaven. Does that need a KP washout?

Tell it to the Marines. Knock this thing down. It is nonsense.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable smoke in the form of a screen of potato peels and garbage that has been thrown at us this afternoon. All of this has been supplied by the Government Contractors Association who have a very vested interest in the outcome of this amendment.

But in this day of the modern army where you have garbage disposals, potato peelers, where you have dishwashers, all of this talk about KP taking away or destroying the training program of the GI's in the service is so much hogwash.

There is one basic issue in this whole debate this afternoon, and that is it is going to save the taxpayers \$300 million, and those who are saying that this defense bill is already too high, just keep in mind that \$300 million-plus figure when this amendment comes to a vote.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we need a self-sufficient and self-reliant military force that cannot be hobbled by some labor dispute on military bases. We need to be responsible at this time, and we need to remember that it would be damaging, at this strategic moment, to put our stamp of approval on a program that will cost, when fully implemented, about \$500 million annually and which would not promote military strength.

Let us have a self-sufficient army; let us vote down the Sikes amendment.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the House to approve the amend-

ment offered by Mr. SIKES to the Department of Defense Appropriations bill.

To discontinue the Armed Forces program turning KP over to civilian employees, would be to undermine the volunteer army concept by removing one of the most attractive incentives of the "new army."

The Sikes amendment, which has the support of both the House Armed Services Committee and the administration, would allow the Department of Defense to continue to civilianize these nonmilitary duties.

This past August, I visited a unit of the 6th Fleet in the tense eastern Mediterranean and spoke with many of the young men serving there, including a good number from my district. I was most impressed by the complicated and sophisticated jobs that these men were performing. I visited with naval and marine personnel but it is well known that today's Army also relies on highly trained and skilled men.

It is hard for me to comprehend how we can expect the Armed Forces to retain men of this caliber unless their total environment is brought up to the level of their peers in civilian life.

Currently the military has 10,000 civilian employees under contract. The majority of these are poor people and members of minority groups. Forty-five thousand military personnel are engaged in these nonmilitary duties at the present time and as the civilianization program proceeds that number will be substantially reduced.

The Army has so far civilianized only 46 percent of its KP functions. I believe that it would be very harmful to the morale of our GI's if we were to go back on our promise to end KP. In addition, I believe it would be taken as an indication that the all-volunteer army is not going to get the full support of Congress and this would be most unfortunate indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

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

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. SIKES, MINSHALL, PIRNIE, and LONG of Maryland.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 265, noes 116, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—265

Abourezk	Aspin	Bingham
Abzug	Badillo	Blatnik
Addabbo	Baring	Boggs
Alexander	Barrett	Boland
Anderson, Ill.	Begich	Bolling
Anderson, Tenn.	Belcher	Bow
Andrews, Ala.	Bennett	Brademas
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bergland	Brasco
Arends	Betts	Bray
	Biaggi	Brinkley
	Bieber	Broomfield

Brown, Mich.	Hammer-	Powell
Brown, Ohio	schmidt	Preyer, N.C.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanley	Price, Ill.
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Pryor, Ark.
Buchanan	Harrington	Purcell
Burke, Mass.	Harvey	Quile
Burton	Hastings	Quillen
Camp	Hechler, W. Va.	Railsback
Carey, N.Y.	Heckler, Mass.	Randall
Carter	Heinz	Rangel
Cederberg	Helstoski	Rarick
Chamberlain	Henderson	Reid
Chappell	Hicks, Mass.	Reuss
Chisholm	Hicks, Wash.	Riegle
Clark	Hillis	Rodino
Clausen,	Hollifield	Roe
Don H.	Horton	Rogers
Clay	Hosmer	Roncallo
Collier	Howard	Rosenthal
Collins, Ill.	Hungate	Rousselot
Conable	Hunt	Roy
Conover	Johnson, Calif.	Ruppe
Conte	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Conyers	Jones, N.C.	Sarbanes
Corman	Jones, Tenn.	Saylor
Crane	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Culver	Kazen	Schwengel
Curlin	Keating	Scott
Daniel, Va.	Keith	Sebellus
Daniels, N.J.	Kemp	Seberling
Danielson	Kluczynski	Shipley
Davis, Ga.	Koch	Shriver
Davis, S.C.	Kuykendall	SIKES
Dellenback	Kyros	Sisk
Dellums	Landrum	Slack
Dent	Latta	Smith, Iowa
Derwinski	Leggett	Smith, N.Y.
Dickinson	Lennon	Snyder
Dingell	Lent	Spence
Donohue	Link	Staggers
Dorn	Lloyd	Stanton,
Dow	Lujan	J. William
Downing	McClory	Stanton,
Drinan	McCloskey	James V.
Duncan	McDonald,	Steele
du Pont	Mich.	Stelger, Ariz.
Edwards, Ala.	McFall	Stelger, Wis.
Edwards, Calif.	McKevitt	Stephens
Ellberg	Madden	Stokes
Erlenborn	Mailliard	Stratton
Esch	Mallory	Stubblefield
Eshleman	Mann	Stuckey
Fascell	Martin	Taylor
Findley	Mathias, Calif.	Thompson, Ga.
Fish	Mathis, Ga.	Thompson, N.J.
Fisher	Matsunaga	Udall
Foley	Mazzoli	Van Derlin
Ford, Gerald R.	Melcher	Vanik
Ford,	Metcalfe	Veysey
William D.	Miller, Ohio	Waggonner
Forsythe	Mills, Md.	Wampler
Fountain	Minish	Whalen
Fraser	Mink	Whalley
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	White
Frenzel	Moorhead	Whitehurst
Frey	Mosher	Widnall
Fuqua	Moss	Wilson,
Galifianakis	Myers	Charles H.
Gettys	Natcher	Winn
Gibbons	Nelsen	Wolff
Goldwater	Nix	Wright
Gonzalez	O'Hara	Wyder
Grasso	Passman	Wyllie
Gray	Patman	Young, Fla.
Green, Pa.	Patten	Young, Tex.
Gubser	Pepper	Zablocki
Gude	Perkins	Zion
Hagan	Pettis	Zwach
Haley	Peyser	
Halpern	Pirnie	
Hamilton	Poage	

NOES—116

Abbutt	Colmer	Hall
Abernethy	Cotter	Hanna
Anderson,	Coughlin	Harsha
Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Hathaway
Annunzio	de la Garza	Hays
Archer	Dennis	Hébert
Ashbrook	Devine	Hogan
Ashley	Dulski	Hull
Aspinall	Eckhardt	Hutchinson
Brooks	Evans, Colo.	Ichord
Burke, Fla.	Flood	Jacobs
Burleson, Tex.	Flowers	Jarman
Burris, Mo.	Flynt	Johnson, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Garmatz	Jonas
Byron	Gaydos	Karth
Cabell	Gialmo	King
Carlson	Goodling	Kyl
Casey, Tex.	Green, Oreg.	Landgrebe
Celler	Griffin	Long, Md.
Claawson, Del	Griffiths	McCollister
Cleveland	Gross	McCormack
Collins, Tex.	Grover	McCulloch

McDade	O'Konski	Skubitz
McKay	Pelly	Smith, Calif.
McKinney	Pickle	Sullivan
Macdonald,	Pike	Symington
Mass.	Podell	Teague, Calif.
Mahon	Price, Tex.	Teague, Tex.
Mayne	Rhodes	Thomson, Wis.
Michel	Roberts	Thone
Mills, Ark.	Robinson, Va.	Ullman
Minshall	Rooney, Pa.	Ware
Mizell	Rostenkowski	Whitten
Mollohan	Roush	Wiggins
Monagan	Roybal	Williams
Montgomery	Ruth	Wyatt
Morgan	Sandman	Wyman
Murphy, Ill.	Satterfield	Yates
Nedzi	Schmitz	
Obey	Schneebeli	

NOT VOTING—51

Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Rees
Baker	Fulton	Robison, N.Y.
Bell	Gallagher	Rooney, N.Y.
Bevill	Hansen, Wash.	Runnels
Blackburn	Hawkins	Ryan
Blanton	Kee	Scherle
Brotzman	Long, La.	Shoup
Byrnes, Wis.	McClure	Springer
Caffery	McEwen	Talcott
Carney	McMillan	Terry
Clancy	Meeds	Tiernan
Delaney	Mikva	Vander Jagt
Denholm	Miller, Calif.	Vigorito
Diggs	Murphy, N.Y.	Waldie
Dowdy	Nichols	Wilson, Bob
Dwyer	O'Neill	Yatron
Edmondson	Pucinski	

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I did have an amendment to offer at this point but I have decided not to do so. I did this partly out of deference to the desire of Members to terminate this debate and partly because my amendment was subject to a point of order. But I did want to take the opportunity to briefly discuss its contents in the hope that I could plant some seed here for future growth in the minds and determinations of those of us who are interested in seeing our military perform useful tasks.

We have just heard the wisdom of the House with respect to operations that the military normally conducted and which now seem to be fit for civilians to do and less fit for the military.

My amendment was directed to something that the military is very well equipped to do and civilians not so well equipped to do. It would have provided that \$25 million, roughly 1/3,000 of the moneys herein appropriated for the Department of Defense, be used to help cities and towns handle emergency medical situations. We lose every year on the highways about 50,000 people. Frequently a person dies in his wrecked automobile, because of rush hour traffic conditions and the inability of squad cars or ambulances to get there in time.

The Defense Department is already experimenting in some five locations like Fort Riley and Fort Carson with the idea of providing helicopter ambulance service to an emergency. It should be encouraged to expand its efforts.

We have some 390 major military installations in this country; that is, those which employ more than 500 persons—to provide this kind of service to the communities around them, and what community would not be grateful for it?

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, more than 50,000 Americans die each year on the highways, and 1 million Americans die every year of heart attacks. It is estimated in the testimony we have had be-

fore the Public Health Subcommittee that one-half of those 1 million could have lived had help been provided in time.

We have seen the military very efficiently perform rescue operations in the jungles of Indochina. We have seen hundreds and indeed thousands of men lifted to base hospitals from the sites of their wounds. Why can we not do that for Americans back here at home?

Why could this not be made a part of the mission of the military—not the main mission, but a part of the mission of this huge Military Establishment, which is so capable, so dedicated, and so anxious to earn the gratitude and support of the American people? This would be a way to do it. We preach "civil action" programs to countries which receive our military assistance. Why not practice what we preach?

It is my earnest hope that in the next Congress authorizations for emergency medical service assistance and military assistance for safety and traffic will receive the support of this House. As we wind down the war, let us wind up the peacetime usefulness of the military back here at home.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. I believe in a strong national defense, and particularly I believe in the importance and necessity of expenditures for research and development, test and evaluation.

Moreover, I recognize the force of what has been said about the size of this appropriation when it is expressed in terms of constant dollars. Nevertheless, we have a very serious financial situation in this Government. Expressed in any terms, this is a very large bill.

Our current budgetary deficit is estimated at some \$25 to \$35 billion. We are faced with a situation in this country where the Executive insists, chiefly, as I believe, in necessary response to international realities, on very substantial appropriations for national defense, while the Congress insists on ever-increasing and ever-proliferating expenditures for an expanding variety of social programs. The result is an ever-increasing gap between income and outgo and an ever-growing and inflationary budgetary deficit.

This, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, is a dangerous situation to which, in my judgment, neither this Congress nor the Executive has really addressed itself nor has either branch as yet indicated any serious disposition to do so.

The answers are not easy, but I believe that as we prepare to pass this largest single appropriation bill in all of our history it is at least an appropriate time to pause, to reflect, and to note that our general financial irresponsibility is a vital problem which we will continue to neglect only at our national peril.

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

Mr. Chairman, I find it incredible that after the strategic limitation SALT agreements President Nixon made with Russia and after President Nixon's cor-

dial visit with Communist Chinese leaders that the defense budget request is \$6.1 billion higher than requested last year. I commend the Appropriations Committee for its action in removing \$4.3 billion from that history-making budget request. Nevertheless, the proposed appropriation for military outlays remain the largest since World War II, nearly \$1.8 billion above last year's expenditures. The effectiveness and efficiency of these expenditures I think are best illustrated by our continued unsuccessful involvement in Southeast Asia. We can invent "smart bombs," but we cannot overcome half of a half-starved, tiny Asian nation armed with punji sticks. I call now, as I have called before, for a complete overhaul of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Services. If 18 years, over 56,000 dead, 303,000 wounded, 539 prisoners of war, and 1,128 missing in action; and approximately \$109.7 billion spent—since 1953—plus Mylai and secret bombing missions—if all of this has been insufficient to pacify the 20 million people in North Vietnam, is not it time to install new management? If we must continue losing, cannot we at least have some new faces in command?

About \$74.6 billion. The largest annual military outlay since World War II. With half that money, Adolf Hitler would have taken Milwaukee.

I notice several other items of concern. The committee has added \$50 million for Grumman to build extra aircraft to cover "actual and anticipated" Vietnam losses. Also added was \$65 million for LTV for 24 more attack planes, built in Texas, to replace "actual and anticipated" war losses.

I do not agree with these important features in this bill. It is crystal clear that errors could be corrected, and our national defense more effectively and efficiently handled. Therefore, I shall vote against this measure and urge the Committee to bring us another bill treating enlisted men with more dignity and the top brass with less deference. It is not hard to spend money in this field. Let us seek to do so more wisely.

All of us are equally concerned about our POW's and MIA's. I submit the way to help them is not by creating more of them.

Since President Nixon resumed the bombing of North Vietnam last April, we have lost 93 planes and 100 pilots as POW's or MIA's—at this rate of continuation of the Nixon Vietnam policy promises is the loss of some 180 planes and 200 pilots a year.

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

Sec. 743. Of the funds made available in this Act for the alteration, overhaul, and repair of naval vessels, at least 35 per centum thereof must be made available for such work in privately owned shipyards: *Provided*, That if determined by the Secretary of Defense to be inconsistent with the public interest based on urgency of requirement to have such vessels altered, overhauled, or repaired as required, such work may be done in Navy or private shipyards as he may direct.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WYMAN. My point of order is that section 743 as presently worded is contrary to the rules of the House in that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill in violation of rule XXI, subsection 2. The section contains the positive amendment in line 25, page 51, that a certain amount of work must be made available, and on page 52, lines 3 and 4, there is a specific direction to the Secretary of Defense.

Paragraph 842 of the House Rules Manual, pursuant to rule XXI, subsection 2, provides: "Propositions to establish affirmative directions for executive officers, even in cases where they may have discretion under the law so to do,"—"are subject to the point of order," as are positive requirements in such legislation constituting legislation upon an appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the section be ruled out of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The point of order is conceded. The Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Page 51, line 21, insert a new section 743 as follows:

"Of the funds made available by this Act for the alteration, overhaul, and repair of naval vessels, not more than \$646,704,000 shall be available for the performance of such works in Navy shipyards."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the language of the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Does the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am simply trying to protect my rights on grounds the gentleman from Wisconsin—

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wishes to argue, I wish he would argue it and not take up my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to state his point of order?

Mr. WYMAN. I make the point of order that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin in the form in which it is presently worded does not constitute a limitation, but is rather legislation upon an appropriations bill contrary to the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Does the gentleman from Wisconsin care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do, Mr. Chairman. I submit to the Chair that this is definitely a limitation on the amount of money which may be spent for a specific purpose. I would suggest to the Chair that it is clearly within the rules of the House as a limitation on an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI).

ski). The Chair has examined the amendment and feels that it is a valid limitation on the funds made available in the bill and overrules the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is language which seeks to do within the rules what the amendment would have done that was approved by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee of this House and that is to establish the mandate that not more than 65 percent of the funds for alteration, overhaul, and repair of naval vessels be done in Government yards.

This is to deal with a problem which we have seen developing not only in the shipyards, but in ammunition facilities and in other defense procurements of the Defense Department where more and more of the money is being spent in Government-owned and operated facilities.

I have offered this amendment to accomplish two objectives. One is to get more alteration, overhaul, and repair done for the funds that are included in this bill and, second, to preserve a vital defense capability throughout this country.

I think the record is clear, and we had some outstanding testimony before our subcommittee, that we can get more for our money by putting it into private yards, where there is an obvious capability to perform it, than we can through the concentration of this effort in the Government-owned and Government-operated yards.

We had the testimony of Admiral Rickover, a Navy man, in which he pointed out to us—and I use his exact words—that poor productivity exists and has existed for a long time, in referring to the operation of the naval shipyards.

We had a distinguished firm of accountants who appeared before us and made it, in my opinion, incontrovertible that we can get this work done more cheaply, more efficiently, and with better returns for the taxpayers of this country if it is done in private yards.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. May I just continue, and then I will yield a little bit later if I have the time.

Mr. Chairman, unless we do what the language of this amendment would require, we are going to see, as we have seen for a number of years now, a smaller and smaller percentage of this vital navy work done in the private shipyards of this country, and a larger and larger percentage of it done in the Government yards.

I think these defense facilities are worth keeping, for if we are to have this concentrated into the Government yards we are going to lose the capability of these expandable and capable private alteration, overhaul, and repair facilities.

We cannot afford to have this base destroyed, and that is what is going to happen if we permit these yards to wither on the vine and finally become extinct.

Then the question is going to arise where are we going to go when we need this expanded capability?

So I suggest to you this is a vital part

of the industrial base of this country which is so necessary for the defense of this country, and specifically for this vital work that we need to have in time of a national emergency.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman whether or not his amendment makes the bill substantially the same as the bill reported out by our full Appropriations Committee without any dissenting views.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There were no dissenting views expressed in the full committee, as I understand it, although I happened to be away and could not be there. It is my further understanding that the motion was made for the chairman to seek a rule, because a rule was necessary in connection with this bill and only when the appearance was made before the Committee on Rules was the concession made with respect to section 743.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, only when the appearance before the Rules Committee was made, as I understand it, was the deletion of this particular amendment made from the general authority of a rule relating to this legislation.

Now I would have preferred the legislation as it did come from the subcommittee and from the full committee, because there was a measure of flexibility which was provided for the Secretary of Defense. But since the gentleman from New Hampshire made the point of striking this out on a point of order, which in my opinion was against his own interests as an advocate for the public—or Government shipyards. This language had to be substituted, because it clearly is within the rules as a limitation.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYATT. Then do I understand that the gentleman's amendment leaves the bill substantially the way it was as reported out by the full committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Precisely, with respect to the 35 percent figure.

Mr. WYATT. That is what I mean.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is as it was reported from the full committee.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. You made the statement that you can get the work done cheaper in the private yards.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That was the clear testimony before our subcommittee.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I do not agree with the testimony nor with your statement.

There was a ship called the *Kitty Hawk* that was built at the New York Shipyard, across the river from Philadelphia Navy Yard. It was towed into the Philadelphia Navy Yard and it cost the taxpayers \$3½ million to straighten out what they did not do to it. In fact, they overdid—they built a bulkhead and behind the bulkhead was a machine shop that they did not even know was there.

When I hear these remarks that you can get work done cheaper in the private yards, it is not so.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am referring to the testimony that came before our subcommittee and I think there was no way of taking away from or damaging that testimony.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Amend the amendment after line 4 thereof by inserting immediately prior to the word "vessels" the word "surface".

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take the 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, similar to the language in the original section 743, failed to reflect the testimony and consensus before the Defense Subcommittee that the limitation which is now proposed should apply to surface vessels only.

At the time the matter was discussed in subcommittee the word "conversion" was removed because there was never any intention to have the requirement apply to submarines.

I have offered this amendment simply to reflect that fact. Submarines are not subject to this formula—and should not be. There was no testimony before us in support of having them subject to it.

Therefore, I have offered this clarifying amendment and I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will accept it because it reflects what was done in the Appropriations Subcommittee of which he is a member. I remain opposed to the gentleman's amendment whether or not my clarifying amendment is adopted, and I urge the defeat of the Davis amendment as a limitation on the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy that is against the best interests of the national security.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments.

Mr. Chairman, this is not here today—the classic 65-35 issue we have had in the past. It is a rigged up program to really have the private yards gut the navy shipyards of the United States. It is rather simplified language that has been presented to the committee and would have the effect of

helping out a few of the larger private shipyards—would not help out the smaller private shipyards—would close one naval shipyard on the west coast and close one naval shipyard on the east coast. If you look for just a minute at the statements that have been made and refer to the charts I have here that perhaps some of the Members of the House can see—the statement have been made by the proponent of the amendment that we have to keep our private yards and that the naval shipyards are hogging all the business—that we have to keep this viable capability that has grown up and it would cost more money to repair and construct ships in naval shipyards.

I do not want to get into a fight between the public and the private yards as to where we have done our best jobs and where we have done our worst jobs. We all know of some of the problems of the private yards in the country. We all know about the *Kitty Hawk* and the *Guiterro* and the mistakes they have made. We know of some of the 100-percent overruns that have been made in some of our private shipyards.

But look at the chart. This is a chart of all the naval ship work that has been apportioned to public and private yards over the past 20 years. As we can see, naval ship employment, according to the red line, in 1953 was at 130,000 employees. In 1961 it was at 98,000 employees in the naval shipyards. Today we have 65,000 employees in the naval shipyards.

The effect of this amendment is strongly opposed by the Navy Department. They say this amendment, which would purport to transfer \$110 million worth of work from the naval shipyards, or the remnants of the naval shipyards to the private yards would not work, because the private yards have a capacity for only \$32 million of that \$110 to \$112 million worth of work. The effect of the amendment would be to lay off 10,000 to 12,000 employees in our naval shipyards.

We might be able to do it by cutting 1,500 men out of every shipyard: By cutting 1,500 out of Boston, by cutting 1,500 out of Portsmouth, by cutting 1,500 out of Norfolk, by cutting 1,500 out of Charleston, and by cutting 1,500 out of Pearl, and we could get down to the numbers. That would have the effect of having 30,000 people changing jobs, because that is what veterans' preference means when you take 12,000 people out of a program under our civil service system with a very simplified amendment like this.

The original committee section 743 amendment as we had it before it was struck on a point of order provided a safeguard, provided that the Navy could except certain provisions and certain requirements in emergencies, but that was legislation on an appropriation bill. Legislation is handled by the House Committee on Armed Services. The House Committee on Armed Services is going in just exactly the opposite direction from this proposed amendment, because we on the House Armed Service Committee are concerned that we are putting our naval shipyards out of business. The

fact that we have only some 65,000 people left in our naval shipyards would substantiate the fact that we are more probably right than the allegations that have been made heretofore.

If the Members will look at the chart further, I suggest they look at the large black line. They will see in 1953 there was \$1 billion worth of Navy work. The blue line, which represents the Navy, indicates the navy yards were doing at that time three-quarters of all the work and the private yards were doing one-quarter of all the work. Then we see how the lines have changed since that time. This year the Navy is spending \$4.5 billion for new construction, alterations, repairs, and conversions. The amount of money which is going to the private yards, which it has been alleged are going out of business, is right here, \$3.5 billion worth of work. More money is going to the private yards this year than has ever gone to the private yards in the history of our naval shipbuilding. They are getting 73 percent of all the naval shipbuilding dollars. So here are the navy yards with 65,000 employees. There seems to be a desire to persecute them further and run them down to 50,000 employees. The Navy is trying to survive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. (By unanimous consent, Mr. LEGGETT was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the naval shipyards are down here trying to survive on about \$700 or \$800 million worth of work. They have told us actually this 65,000 figure is too low. If we want to operate 10 naval shipyards, which really constitutes five garages for our naval capability on each coast, we really should have 72,000 employees and not 65,000 employees.

And if we take the total down to 50,000 employees, believe me, Boston is going to close, or Hunter's Point is going to close, and we are really going to have the fat in the fire. There is a massive amount of misinformation which seems to be permeating congressional desks.

I received a letter today from my very good friend, Ed Hood, of the Shipbuilders Council. He said:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: From 1966 to 1971 the volume of Navy alteration, overhaul, and repair work placed with private yards dropped from slightly more than 40 percent to about 16.5 percent. The remainder has been assigned to the government-owned and operated naval shipyards.

Undoubtedly, it is confusion like this that has moved my colleague from Wisconsin to make the statement he has made, because if you look at the statistics that I put in the RECORD under date of May 1 at page 15053, the figures show that there was 16.4 percent of alterations and repairs at one time performed by the private yards, but that was not this year in this budget. That was last year. It was 3 years ago, back in 1971. Since that time the private yards last year just finished 19.1 percent of the alterations and repairs. This year in this budget they get 24.2 percent of the alterations and repairs, not the figures that have been sent to Members of Congress al-

legedly by a firm that has got expertise in this area.

The private yards are going to get \$222 million worth of alterations and repairs alone this year, which is the fifth largest allocation that has ever been made to private yards in this category in the history of the private yards and the U.S. Navy. They are also going to get 50 percent of the conversions, which the amendment author very cleverly kept out of this amendment. The private yards are going to get \$302 million in conversions, and that figure has only been exceeded one time in naval history.

So the private yards in the complete history of all Navy alterations, repairs, and conversions, will receive this year 34.6 percent, the second largest percentage ever. Over the past 10 years, since the Appropriations Committee became concerned about this, the private yards received better than 36 percent of the total of alterations, repairs, and conversions, so the 35-65 request has been respected. If you average new construction—and recognize that the naval shipyards have not lain a keel or had a contract in better than 6 years—we find that the private yards are this year getting, I said, \$3.5 billion, they are actually getting \$3.66 billion, the highest amount ever awarded to the private shipyards in the United States—72.9 percent of the work.

I would say, "Do not take my word for this." Of course, I argue for naval shipyards as a practical matter. It so happens that the Navy tells me that my particular Naval Yard of Mare Island is not jeopardized by this amendment. The cuts are going to come from some place else. What they say in their analysis of the amendment is that the Department of the Navy requests the elimination of the proposed section 743.

The Navy in the past has found it extremely difficult to comply with this type of statutory provision.

In 1963 the Navy had to transfer from the west coast to the east coast a whole squadron of destroyers in order to comply. In fiscal year 1973 the private repair work approximates 25 percent. When conversions are added, the privates get almost 35 percent. When they add new construction, they get 73 percent. The Navy confirms that. Then they say that the effect of the amendment would be to transfer \$110 million worth of shipwork, and they say that a review of the 1973 overhaul schedule, with the objective of determining the feasibility of assignment of additional work to the private sector, reveals a maximum of \$31 million, for which private yard capability definitely exists, which means that \$79 million worth of work for repairs and alterations, would not be done at all, according to the word that was received yesterday by my office from the Department of the Navy.

They confirmed that better than 10,000 employees would have to be laid off, which I do not think the President would like to have happen before election time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

I believe to understand what is before us here, we have to understand the semantics of the naval shipyard work. The Davis amendment applies to "repairs, alterations, and overhauls," which, except for new construction, amount to about two-thirds of shipyard work, the other one-third is conversion work.

The total amount of money in this appropriation bill for these two categories is about \$1.5 billion, of which, in accordance with the consistent policy, 35 percent of the dollars go to private yards.

In this bill as it is, unamended, of the repairs, alterations, and overhauls category, 24 percent goes to private yards, and of the conversions category, 50 percent goes to private yards. Together these amount to 35 percent of the ship-money dollars going to private yards.

What the Davis amendment would do is to assign an additional \$49,176,000 to private yards of the money assigned to navy yards for repairs, alterations, and overhauls. Now, that would be all right except for the exact reason that this money has to come out of the naval shipyard money. In short, conversion money cannot be used to compensate for such a switch because ships under conversion are already in the private yards, they are dead ships, they cannot be transferred back to navy yards because they are dead ships, unmanned, and in drydock. One simply cannot pull them back to comply with this rider Mr. DAVIS wants to put on the bill.

As a consequence, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT), pointed out, this would cause the discharge of a large number of employees of the naval shipyards. It would cause a tremendous perturbation in the Navy's work and scheduling.

As a matter of fact, the shipyards would have to respond, if the amendment is agreed to, possibly by the closure of a couple of yards.

That is not the kind of thing that ought to be done by a rider on an appropriation bill.

The private shipyards are already getting over \$2 billion worth of new construction money here. If this switch in allocating work should be done, it should be done in an orderly fashion, by the Armed Services Committee, and not by a sudden rider here on the floor. I suggest that is the proper way to go about it.

The reason why the problem came up is that most of these conversions are

being done on the east coast of the United States. That is where the 50 percent of the conversion dollars mostly go to the private yards. That makes it a little tough for private yards in the Great Lakes area and on the west coast. They are short on conversion business and would like to get some additional repair and alteration money. They do have a problem, and it should be met, but it should not be met with a hammer such as this amendment today amounts to. It would shatter this bill and shatter the naval shipyard structure.

We have to depend on these naval shipyards to home port our Navy people. That is why we have the repair and alteration done at the navy shipyards, to as large an extent as we can, because when we bring the men back from overseas, we want to bring them back to their families. Ships under repair, alteration, or overhaul generally still have their crews aboard. At a navy yard the men can be where their families live and wait for their return. We should not elect, if possible, to send them to private yards where the men's families are not. Many times, the old sailors around here know, such yards usually are way out in the boondocks. The men would have to come back from Vietnam, or come home from the Mediterranean, and if their ship is not sent to its home port and home yard they still will not be home. They will be traveling on a train, airplanes, and automobiles and when they finally get to see their families, they have to start back to the ship the next morning before they have a decent opportunity to look at them.

That is not the thing we want to do. We want an all volunteer service. We need naval complexes where men and families can be together when not overseas. Ships being converted are usually unmanned, so sending them to private yards for this purpose is not a morale impairing factor.

The thing which the Davis amendment would impose, just to help out some private shipyard to the sum of \$49 million, is the kind of thing that would be tremendously costly in the end.

I urgently ask that this amendment be defeated and that the matter be taken up in orderly fashion by the Armed Services Committee at an appropriate time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, one thing has not been mentioned here today. Incidentally, I am speaking in opposition to both amendments. This country has a fine group of naval shipyards which we must have in order to maintain our defenses properly in time of national emergency.

Long before most of us came to the Congress the Congress invested billions of dollars in these naval shipyards, billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

We must utilize these naval shipyards to their best ability.

I know all about the Ernst & Ernst report and their questions, and I know that the naval shipyards have had to correct the work of private shipyards on numerous occasions.

I say to you, I cannot say to my constituents that we should close down the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, even though the naval shipyard is not located in my congressional district, and we have invested billions of dollars in that facility.

Therefore, I urge the defeat of both amendments.

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

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania yielded his time to Mr. LEGGETT.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Davis amendment for two main reasons.

The testimony over a period of years has been overwhelming that the work can be done cheaper in the private yards.

Second, in a time of national emergency this Government calls upon the private yards to do the work and depends on them. If we do not give them a fair share of the repair and conversion work during other years, they will not have the capability of doing the work in time of emergency.

I call your attention to the chart that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) submitted. It is very confusing. It includes construction and repair; we are talking about repair. One of the lines has to do with the number of employees and the other lines with the dollar amounts. But the gentleman has admitted that in 1971 the private yards were doing only 16 percent of the work. If you follow that green line and look at the other years, you can see it must have been a much lower percentage that was done in other years.

In terms of the national interest, I hope that the Davis amendment will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out in the first place that there is a great difference here that has not been recognized by all the speakers between new ship construction and alteration, overhaul, and repair work. What we are talking about in the Davis amendment is alteration, overhaul, and repair work.

The reason why the bulk of the new ship construction has been in private yards is for the simple reason that it is cheaper to do it there. Our private yards are starving for alteration, overhaul, and repair work.

It is very clear from a very careful CPA study which has been done and other testimony before the subcommittee that the alteration, overhaul, and repair

work can be done cheaper by the private yards.

We must maintain this capacity or it will dry up and you will have the yards closing.

This is an economy measure, and I urge my colleagues to pass the Davis amendment and reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT), and the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER). I wish to say that I concur that this legislation should come out of the Armed Services Committee. Definitely, the Committee on Appropriations tried to legislate when it added section 743 which was subject to a point of order.

When I first came here in 1965, this subject, 35-65, was before the House, and the late Mendel Rivers submitted and succeeded in getting enacted Public Law 89-37, section 303, which says:

SEC. 303. The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

That is the law right now. It ought to remain the law and to go back again, to again establish limitations of 35-65 which the Davis amendment in effect would do, would be disastrous for naval shipyards.

The Navy has found it extremely difficult to comply with the type of limitations required by the proposed Davis amendment. To attain the objective of the amendment would require extensive rescheduling of shipyard assignments to place an additional \$110 million in private shipyards during fiscal year 1973. Considering that we are 2½ months into this fiscal year and the advance planning leadtime required before an availability can be started in a private shipyard—it is believed that it would be January 1, 1973, before additional work presently assigned to naval shipyards could be shifted to private yards, such reassignments will have a serious impact on fleet operating schedules due to location, start date, and duration of overhaul. There will also be the impact on naval shipyard workload requiring additional rescheduling of fleet work.

The naval shipyards have suffered a drop in employment of 24,700—27 percent—since June 1968, and are now operating under the low efficient employment level for the navy shipyard complex. The result of a shift of the additional \$110 million of ship overhauls to private shipyards would be a loss of approximately 5,500 man-years in the naval shipyard workload.

Since this loss of workload would be for the last 6 months of the fiscal year, it would require that approximately 10,000 employees be reduced in force. Reduction in force notices would have to be issued in October and November 1972 to start separation of employers in January 1973, when the workload will have been reduced. Based on past ex-

perience it is estimated that RIF notices would have to go to 20,000 to 30,000 employees in order to remove 10,000 employees from the rolls. This would have a devastating effect upon naval shipyard employees.

Due to the complexity of most ships required to the reassigned to achieve the 35-percent split, the majority of the work would be necessarily assigned to a few private shipyards who had or could develop the capacity to do the work. Thus, the assignments would not have the effect of increasing the workload of the smaller ship repair yards which is apparently the aim of the Davis amendment. There exists the question as to whether the private sector could develop the required capacity in sufficient time to accomplish these overhauls as currently scheduled. If not, there would result in an adverse impact on Fleet readiness and deployment schedules.

One other negative result would be the serious impacts on recruiting and retention for the proposed all-volunteer Navy of having these ships overhauled in out-of-homeport areas. In summary, all matters considered, defeat of the Davis amendment is necessary to prevent the production of a chaotic condition in naval shipyards.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by Mr. Davis of Wisconsin. I would like to point out two instances: No. 1, the private yards have been handling conversions which go in as unmanned ships. However, the overhaul and alternations of manned ships which we have, what are we going to do with the military personnel on board? Will the facilities be available for them?

Second, civilian personnel comes to 10,000 or 12,000 employees. In case of national emergency, they are not available. We have seen enough loss of jobs. This country cannot stand higher underemployment or unemployment. Therefore, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I feel it will be a threat definitely to the Navy. The naval shipyards are doing a splendid job of repair work. They have been cut tremendously as pointed out by previous speakers. I hope very much that the amendment will be defeated.

Section 743 of this bill will cost approximately 10,000 to 12,000 people their jobs. It will decrease the capabilities of our naval shipyards to maintain the present stature of our fleet—which presently is second to none. The naval shipyards presently have the skilled labor and capability to work on our naval vessels. We cannot expect to lose this skill and expect it to be immediately absorbed by the private sector. We do not want to lose track of the fact that the naval shipyards have been the primary repair facilities for our fleet. It is impossible to expect private yards who normally handle commercial vessels to be geared to accommodate military vessels. It should also be pointed out that it is imperative to maintain and improve our present status for the well-being of the sailors; because most of the naval yards are adjacent to the naval bases by design so that

the men can be with their families while the ships are undergoing repairs. Private yards handle most of the conversion work which does not require the men's presence on board ship. I believe we must consider the well-being of our men and their families, and it is our obligation to fulfill this commitment to them.

In my estimation, section 743 is advocating the elimination of some naval shipyards which is sheer folly at a time when we must maintain our defense stature. I would advocate increasing the manpower and facilities in the naval yards so that they can undertake new construction. Approximately 90 percent of all new construction today is contracted to private yards. This construction could be done as economically in the navy yards if we would assign the work to them. It goes without saying that this work would reduce our unemployment which would spur the economy and improve our defense stature. It was originally thought that new construction could be done cheaper in private yards than in naval yards. However, recently we have seen where large cost overruns and unexpected costs have greatly increased the costs of new construction far in excess of its original estimates. A few facts:

We have seen naval yard employment reduced from 95,000 in 1963 to approximately 68,000 today. Section 743 of this bill would cause an additional immediate reduction of approximately 10,000 to 12,000. Simultaneous to this period of navy yard reduction, the private yards were increasing significantly from approximately 115,000 in 1963 to approximately 130,000 in 1971. Last year alone a shipyard in my district because of reduction in force lost approximately 612 employees.

It should be pointed out to the Members that this section of the appropriations bill 743 in effect is telling the Navy how they must spend their money. You and I know that this is the job of the Armed Services Committee. I should not have to point out the folly of having people unfamiliar with the problems trying to find solutions. This will only create chaos which can so easily be avoided by leaving the usage question up to the Armed Services Committee who are the experts in the field.

In conclusion while we are presently proceeding on the course that will eventually eliminate naval shipyards which section 743 will assist in doing, I feel we must stop and reassess our position before we have gone too far and remember that many shipyards are presently staffed below the efficiency level making them unable to perform even their main function which is to provide emergency care of naval vessels and to provide a strong base for expansion in time of war. I would advocate a program to provide a continuing flow of work to assist our shipyards to modernize and retain a continuing program of training skilled craftsmen while maintaining an efficient level of employment.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, in closing I say that we should vote against both of these amendments. It is said we are putting private yards out of business.

In this year alone, we have cut employees from naval shipyards—Portsmouth, 458 jobs; 540 out of Boston; 500 out of every single major shipyard in the United States including 1,000 from Long Beach.

If you look at the private shipyards, in 1962 there were 114,000; 115,000 in 1963; 116,000 in 1964. This month they have 135,800 employees according to Ed Head's figures sent to my office this morning. These larger private yard figures have only been higher for 2 Vietnam years in post-World War II history. Of course, additionally if you look at the private work under the merchant marine legislation passed by this Congress, there were 21 ships in the first half of this year awarded alone. That is more ships than we have awarded in any 3 previous years of the past 20 years.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California and rise in opposition to both amendments.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman from California. Although I do not have a navy yard in my district per se, this amendment would be the ruination of Philadelphia and all the other naval shipyards.

It is about time that we began to put some of the work in naval shipyards with those people who have the expertise of doing the work. I am not opposed to private shipyards in any way, but we have a very fine shipyard which is getting down to a very low level.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and this debate brings back memories of comparable amendments in similar debates beginning about 1958, and running through 1964. At that time we had a substantial decline in our shipbuilding program and a decline in the funding for repair, rehabilitation and overhaul. Comparable amendments were approved on the Defense appropriation bills in those years.

I think we need both the private shipyards as well as the Navy shipyards. It seemed to us in those days, as it seems to the committee at the present time, that this allocation of 65 and 35 in this area is a fair division of this work.

It is interesting to see how substantially we have increased through the Congress at the request of the President the new shipbuilding construction program. I am told that in the bill for fiscal 1973 we have \$600 million more for new construction than 2 years ago. This ought to help both the Navy yards and the private yards when you combine it with the formula recommended by the committee for repair, rehabilitation and overhaul.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hope that no one here now is going to be confused by this chart over here which, as you will note, includes ship construction and repair, and also includes conversion. We are not talking

about those matters here in this amendment; the construction and the conversion are a separate part of these funds, and are not related to this at all. We are talking about a limited subject.

So as I say I hope that no one will be confused by that chart.

We have been told here that so many jobs would be lost here and so many jobs would be lost there. I submit that in the net, only to the extent that we can find greater efficiency per man-hour in the private shipyards is there going to be any net reduction in employment. I suggest that we ought to be a little more concerned about expanding the job capabilities in the private sector of this country than we ought to be in saving those jobs which are entirely at Government expense.

I am concerned—and I do not have a shipyard in my district, and I do not have one anywhere near my district—but as a member of this committee my concern is that we get more for the defense dollars that we are spending. In the current atmosphere in this country those defense dollars are getting to be harder and harder to come by.

I think we have a responsibility here to get the most that we can for the dollars that we will be spending. Since this does not reduce the number of total dollars available for alteration, overhaul and repair, it means that we can get more done for the dollars that we spend.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Let us make no mistake about the issue that is at stake here. The purpose of this amendment is to maintain a balance between the work loads in the naval repair yards as well as those of the private shipyards. With a shrinking workload of all Navy work it is inherently unfair and seriously destructive in the long run to put a disproportionate share of this shrinkage into the private yards. To keep the majority of the private share of this work restricted to conversion work unnecessarily rewards some yards and unnecessarily harms others.

I sympathize with the need of the Navy to keep work for its own people. But such a shortsighted approach can do nothing but harm our Nation's overall shipbuilding and ship repairing capabilities. We cannot escape from the fact that a 35/65 ratio of Navy work given to private yards and to Navy yards is meaningless as long as the kind of work that is open for bid effectively restricts numerous firms from bidding—whether by geographical location or by the type of work offered.

The naval strength of this Nation has rested on the close working relationship between the Navy and private shipbuilding and repairing yards. I am fearful that a temporary advantage of giving as full as possible workloads to naval yards and only selected private yards produces a long-term detrimental effect on the ship repair industry as a whole. Without work on navy ships many private repair yards would not be able to continue functioning. This policy could result in greatly limiting private ship repair services and thereby kill the capability for an expansion of repair facilities in the future—an

expansion dependent on the private repair yards. We all hope and pray that such an emergency expansion will never be necessary, but we would be foolish if we consciously eliminated this capability.

My own personal involvement goes back over the last years during which time I have met with the past Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Chafee, and have carried on extensive correspondence with the Department. With this background I am absolutely convinced of the need to include this amendment in its present form, and I urge my colleagues to support passage of the amendment and to defeat any move which would alter its language.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations approved the so-called Davis amendment. It was stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I support the revised Davis amendment, and ask for an affirmative vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

SEC. 744. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense shall be utilized for the conversion of heating plants from coal to oil at defense facilities in Europe.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADDABBO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADDABBO: On page 52, after line 8, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 745. None of the funds in this Act for United States forces with respect to military actions in Indochina may be used except for the withdrawal within four months after the date of the enactment of this Act of all United States ground, naval, and air forces from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia: Provided, That there is a release within the four-month period of all Americans held as prisoners of war by the Government of North Vietnam and all forces allied with that Government: Provided further, That such withdrawals shall not be completed until there has been an accounting for United States servicemen missing in action by the Government of North Vietnam or any government allied therewith."

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would end within 4 months our Nation's military involvement in Vietnam. It is a straightforward amendment. I would doubt a single member sits here today who is unfamiliar with what it is intended to do.

I would hope a majority of Members

could see fit to support the amendment, for I believe there is no more serious business to be considered in this Chamber than the matter of war, which is really just a nice way of discussing death and destruction.

For too long now, we have had in this country serious and lingering struggles over the subject of Vietnam. And, from the beginning, through administrations of both parties, the Congress has let the Presidents have their way with Vietnam.

Possibly, the Congress was correct in doing so, but I, for my part, believe we would have alleviated much suffering had we acted years ago to interpose the will of the people on the prosecution of this sorry episode. Must we forever offer our sons as sacrifices to international upheaval? Is there no other way our Nation can compete for the minds of allegiance of other nations but with weaponry and destruction?

We have stayed too long, and paid too great a price. We have wanted to play doctor to the world, and have instead suffered infection. It is time, I believe, to come home and heal our own wounds.

It is also time to stop being hypocritical. Nothing is solved in squabbling over who was right and who was wrong. All of us, at one point or another, were wrong about Vietnam, and we are all the worse for it.

If there is anything wrong about this amendment, it is the timing of it. In a few weeks, our Nation will be choosing a President, and politics has always been closely intertwined with the agony of Vietnam. On both sides of the aisle, there are those who would use this issue for partisan gain, and that is as much of what is wrong with Vietnam as is the killing and destruction.

My own attitude is this: I believe that if the war could be stopped tomorrow, a deadline a month off would be grossly too much. If we do not set a deadline of whatever date, we have seen how protracted withdrawal can be. If President Nixon can impose a cease-fire tomorrow, he will have my enthusiastic support, and I feel confident, the support of all Americans.

But we have seen two Presidents in a row try to impose their own views on the combatants in Vietnam, and we have seen each fail, at least to date. We have all heard the debates in this House about similar amendments, of varying deadlines; we have read the polls, talked to the people of our districts; we have seen the demonstrations, watched social programs disappear for lack of funds—all of this for a futile goal of bringing democracy to a nation whose leaders now appear not to want it. Why do we not act?

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment not to withdraw America into an isolated shell, not to leave the South Vietnamese unprotected against the savagery of their northern brothers. If those who have a stake in the future of South Vietnam are willing to fight for it, I am willing to offer them the necessary arms to do battle.

But I am unwilling to continue to let America be her brother's killer: I am unwilling to let her sons be swallowed up

in the name of international one upmanship.

We have poured so much in lives and dollars and prestige into Vietnam. It is time for Congress to say: "This is enough. We have done more than enough, and now we are done with it."

My amendment would give the administration 4 months to fold up our tents, bury our dead, collect our prisoners of war, console the maimed and wounded, and return to our home shores for some sober reflection. It will take years, perhaps generations, before the stench of Vietnam leaves our nostrils. Let us begin to cleanse ourselves now by passage of this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day permission was granted for all Members to revise and extend their remarks, so everyone has permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with the amendment which is now pending.

This is an end-the-war amendment. We have voted on this subject many, many times. It was not too long ago, on the foreign aid bill, that we voted a similar amendment down. We acted again yesterday, when the gentleman from Louisiana brought before the House in the conference report on the fiscal year 1973 Defense Authorized bill. Insofar as I know, not one voice was raised in the House in opposition to the fact that an end-the-war amendment which had been added in the other body was deleted in the conference. It seems to me everybody's position is well known. It would be most ill-advised to adopt this amendment. Everyone's is on record on this matter. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be soundly defeated.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me. I merely want to emphasize and reemphasize what the gentleman from Texas said. This has been debated again and again. It has been debated and it has been over-debated and it has been under-debated and it has been re-debated and it has been outdebated and it has been indebated and it has been rebated—and here we are back again where we started.

As of yesterday we voted on the amendment. Not a single voice was raised to adopt it in the conference report during the general debate.

So Mr. Chairman, I certainly subscribe to what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas, has said. As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee I would urge that we expeditiously settle this matter. Oh, I know it would not be settled once and for all, but at least I urge we dispose of it for today.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which

would end U.S. military operations in Indochina within 4 months of enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the time is long overdue for Congress to take the initiative in ending this war. Despite the stated intention of the present administration to "wind down" the war, casualties continue to mount and the air war has been intensified to an unprecedented level. If we do not act to stop the war today we will almost assuredly be here again next year debating the same old arguments—only next year even more men, women, and children will have died, more of our men will be prisoners of war or missing in action, and more of our financial resources will have been squandered on a war which cannot be justified.

What are the prospects for ending this war by continuing our present policies? According to an article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, September 13, 1972, intelligence reports by the CIA and Defense Intelligence Agency indicate that the bombing which the President began last April has not been able to slow the flow of men and material to South Vietnam from the north. According to the article, the North Vietnamese can sustain their present rate of fighting for the next 2 years. The bombing of North Vietnam was a failure under the last administration and it is a failure now. Have not we yet grown skeptical of the absurdly optimistic predictions of officials who continue to see an end to this war "just around the corner?" On May 9 of this year, Presidential Adviser Henry Kissinger said in a news conference that we would be able to see the effects of the President's renewed bombing within a few weeks. Weeks and months have gone by. What does Mr. Kissinger say now?

Despite the contention that our role in this war is coming to an end, the facts indicate that we are still overly involved in this conflict. Since January of 1969, 91 U.S. servicemen have become prisoners of war and 467 have been classified as missing in action. Almost 15,000 U.S. soldiers have been killed in action since this present administration took office. And this has happened despite the administration's stated intention of bringing this war to an end. U.S. ground troops for the most part have been withdrawn from Southeast Asia. Yet at the same time, the air war has been intensified—a course of action which will almost certainly not lead to peace. The futility of our present bombing policy is obvious if it is intended to bomb the North Vietnamese to the conference table.

It is estimated that this year we will spend about \$5.8 billion on the war in Southeast Asia. In this bill alone there is \$2.5 billion for military operations in Southeast Asia. The resources of our Nation are not inexhaustible, yet we continue to neglect urgent domestic problems for which this money could better be spent. The war continues to drain our wealth and deplete our energy. It is up to Congress to bring this war to an end and we have that opportunity today.

Mr. Chairman, congressional action at this point will not damage our negotiating position. The North Vietnamese

already know it is already our intention to end our role in this war, setting a firm date for our withdrawal cannot make much difference, for the leaders of North Vietnam are not likely to substantially change their negotiating position. The fact is that our interests are not threatened by what happens in Vietnam and the cost of this war, both in human and financial terms, has been far beyond anything that could ever have been gained.

If our actions cannot be justified in terms of our security, they most certainly cannot be rationalized as protecting freedom or self-determination. The Saigon regime continues to imprison its legitimate political opponents and seems to be infected with corruption at the highest level. Democracy was certainly not enhanced last week by the report that the South Vietnamese Government has abolished all popular elections in the country's 10,775 hamlets. Now nearly all of the country's administrative officials from the province chiefs down to the hamlet level will be appointed by President Thieu. It is ironic, to say the least, that we should seek to prop up this regime in the name of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has both the right and obligation to legislate this war to a close. We have failed to exercise this responsibility. We now have a public mandate to end a war that has never been adequately justified in terms of our security and a war which has brought incredible misery to millions of people. We must take action now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House. I presume an amendment is something we should debate. I have risen in support of this amendment and I want to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABO), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, for his excellent presentation.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here today with a cold, hard fact. We are confronted here with the Defense appropriation which makes significant provision for continuing the war in Vietnam. As a matter of fact, the budget for the war in Vietnam is based upon an increase requested by the White House because of the increase in the bombing we have been conducting in Vietnam.

Many of the Members have been very cynical about debating this amendment, saying that we should please revise and extend our remarks in the RECORD. I sympathize with that. The hour is late. It is 5:30. But the hour is much later for this country when we see that in 1972 we are being asked to appropriate funds for a war that the President is telling the American people he has stopped and has wound down. There is something very hypocritical and very wrong and very vicious we are doing to the American people if we pass a defense bill without this amendment, because we are participating in a giant fraud on the American people and a great travesty in world history.

This war is going on and this war is not being wound down. The bombing in Indochina is greater today than ever in the history of this war, and we owe it to

the people of this country and the people of Indochina and the people of the world to say to the President of this country, whomever he may be—now and after November—that it is the intention of this body, reflecting the will of the majority of the people, that this war should be ended within 4 months of enactment of this bill and that any moneys herein contained are subject to that war being ended within 4 months. Otherwise not one Member of this House, it seems to me, has the right, whether or not he revises and extends his remarks, to vote for this defense bill.

How in the conscience of the Members of this House, as you are all running for re-election by the people of this country—the people of this country who have begged and pleaded to end this war—can we pass the biggest defense bill in history without saying that this war must be ended within 4 months after enactment, and that no money in this bill can or should in any way be used to continue the killing of the people of Indochina and the killing of the hopes and aspirations of the people in this country?

I ask you all to vote for this amendment.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from New York for having the courage to state once more the case for the end-of-the-war amendment. I do not think that any of our words are going to change any of the actions of any Members of this House. This has been debated, as the Chairman has said, from one end to the other. Nevertheless, it is the principal issue facing this country at this time.

The people of this country bought a pig in a poke. They were fraudulently led to believe in 1968 that the President had a secret plan to end the war. As we all know, it is still secret. They are now being given the false impression that the escalation and bombing and mining is going to end the war, and I am sorry to say that if we go ahead and buy that, they will again have been misled, and I think it is right that the gentlewoman from New York and the sponsor of this bill have so stated.

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

(On request of Mr. YATES, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. ABZUG was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the remark of the gentlewoman on the war being wound down, I am sure she saw in the papers yesterday and today the statement by our Air Force general to the effect that even with the bombing it was likely the war would go on for another 2 or 3 years.

Mrs. ABZUG. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

When I first came to Congress, I vowed that I would not vote for any mil-

itary funds so long as this Nation was involved in making war in Indochina. Although there are supposedly no more of our ground combat troops in Vietnam, we are still wreaking death and destruction upon the North and the South from the air and sea. A Vietnamese man, woman, or child is just as dead, or just as maimed, whether the deed is done by bullets fired by a foot soldier or by napalm dropped from a plane. Those who say that Mr. Nixon has kept his promise somehow manage to overlook this simple and tragic fact.

Yesterday's newspapers did indeed report a new administration study that indicates that even with the present high level of U.S. bombing activity, North Vietnam can hold out for 2 more years. They are no longer even claiming that they can see the light at the end of the tunnel, but admit that it is a good 2 years away. Is Mr. Nixon—if he is returned to office—planning to continue or perhaps even increase the terrible bombing of Vietnam? Maybe he is, and that is even more reason to vote down this bill.

Our continuing involvement in Indochina, then, is sufficient to compel me to vote against this bill. Were Vietnam no longer an issue, I would still have to vote "nay" on the ground that our defense budget is much too large and contains much money that should be in various domestic and social programs. This bill would appropriate the sum of just over \$75 billion, most of it destined for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of weapons designed to kill human beings and to destroy whatever in this world they have created. In a year when our supposed "winding down" of the Vietnam war should be reflected in the defense appropriation, this bill provides \$1.4 billion more than last year's.

Just 1 month ago, President Nixon vetoed the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for 1973, a measure which provided for critical domestic programs such as education, health, and social services an amount equal to 40 percent of what is contained in the bill before us. The President vetoed that bill because it exceeded his budget request by just under \$2 billion and was therefore "a perfect example of that kind of reckless Federal spending that just cannot be done without more taxes or more inflation."

The question here, as with the Labor-HEW bill, is not one of spending per se but one of priorities. The proof that Mr. Nixon knows that as well as I do is found in the fact that he did not cut military spending by that \$1.8 billion in order to balance off the additional amount appropriated for Labor and HEW. The President and most of the Republicans in Congress opposed the Labor-HEW conference report. I assure you that they will flip-flop completely when it comes to this one. The fact is, to put it as plainly and as directly as possible, that they believe that the Wall-eye II glide bomb, the Shrike missile, and some new A-6 fighter planes are more important than health services planning and development, education for the handicapped, and social services for the disadvantaged.

We are today so warped and backward

that we argue in favor of increased production of weapons because it will create jobs, when there is no reason why we cannot create as many jobs for the construction of housing, or the construction and operation of child care facilities, or the building of new and better mass transit systems.

This \$75 billion is being voted, we are told, so that our national security can be assured. I say that what is endangering our national security is not a lack of weapons, but a lack of jobs, a lack of decent housing, a lack of sufficient food, a lack of good health care, and a lack of proper educational facilities. That is what is jeopardizing this Nation, and that is where we really should be spending most of this \$75 billion.

I cannot support this bill, and I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired again.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, it is true, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said, this matter has been dealt with in this precise language several times before in this Congress, and I am convinced that the day will come when the Congress will catch up with the American people. An act to bring down the curtain on this ghastly, wasteful, and futile war. A war that has produced nothing but bloodshed and tragedy abroad, alienation and bitterness at home, and which has confounded and disillusioned our friends around the world.

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. ADDABBO, my distinguished colleague from New York. The amendment calls for an end to all American military activities in Indochina within 4 months, explicitly prohibiting the use of any money raised in this bill for any mission in that tormented land save withdrawal. The provisions of the amendment, of course, are contingent upon the releases of all American POW's and an accounting for all American MIA's within the same 4-month period.

For some of us—indeed, for most of us—the debate over this amendment is a wearing process: year after year, month after month, we have skirmished in this Chamber over what are now routinely termed “end the war amendments.” Still, Mr. Chairman, the horror in Southeast Asia wholly warrants this renewed effort today. Pursuing a cause long since proved futile, Americans are still shedding their blood on Vietnam's battlefields and falling captive to our adversaries there. The wholesale destruction of Vietnam itself continues unslackened, terrorizing its people and pummeling its terrain beyond recognition.

I will be brief today, Mr. Chairman, and to the point.

All the statistics have already been marshaled, all the arguments drawn, all the protests uttered.

We know that military escalation—each new step, the Pentagon had assured us, would beat North Vietnam into humble capitulation—has merely steeled the enemy's resolve to fight on. We know that the Paris peace talks, little more than a show of mummery and mockery ever since they opened, have yielded virtually nothing in the way of a political settlement. We know that the administration, loftily aloof to the Congress and to the American people at large, continues to press for something akin to “victory”—a goal as illusory now as it was a decade ago.

Our young men are still dying, meanwhile, and our resources are still being scattered to the wind.

I say it is long past the time to get out—time to end the bloodshed.

Long shunned by the executive branch the Congress must reassert its legitimate constitutional role in shaping this country's war policies.

I urge—just as strongly as I can—the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Addabbo amendment which would cut off further funding for the war in Southeast Asia 4 months after enactment of the bill, conditioned on the release of all prisoners of war and an accounting of all men missing in action.

The words have all been spoken before. The horror, the futility, and the inhumanity of continuing to destroy lives and property halfway across the world in order to prop up a corrupt undemocratic regime—it has all been laid before this House time and time again.

The White House and the Department of Defense continue to wage war vigorously in Southeast Asia, and the most recent intelligence estimates admit that no end is in sight for at least 2 years more. But the war cannot continue without congressional complicity. Congress appropriates the funds to buy the planes and the bombs and pay the pilots. Members of Congress vote those funds. The buck stops here. I urge the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) be adopted. We must end the war now.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

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

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers MESSRS. ADDABBO, MINSHALL, YATES, and HEBERT.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 160, noes 208, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]
[Recorded Teller Vote]
AYES—160

Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo

Barrett
Begich
Bergland
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Carey, N.Y.

Celler
Chisholm
Clay
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Curlin
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson

Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Drinan
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Fraser
Frenzel
Gaydos
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Harrington
Harvey
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs

Karsh
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McKinney
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Melcher
Metcalfe
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Ark.
Minish
Mink
Mitchell
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Pryor, Ark.
Rangel

NOES—208

Abbott
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Byrne, Pa.
Byron
Cabell
Camp
Carlson
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conable
Conover
Crane
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Downing
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn

Eshleman
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gettys
Goldwater
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hastings
Hays
Hebert
Henderson
Hillis
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
King
Kyl
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lent
Lloyd
Lujan
McClory
McCollister

Reid
Reuss
Riegle
Rodino
Roe
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Ruppe
St Germain
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Schwengel
Seiberling
Shipley
Slack
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Staggers
Stanton
James V.
Steele
Stokes
Sullivan
Symington
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deulin
Vanik
Whalen
White
Widnall
Wolf
Yates

McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKevitt
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallory
Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Michel
Mills, Md.
Minshall
Mizell
Monagan
Montgomery
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Peyser
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rarick
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Sebellius
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Spence
Stanton
J. William
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton

Stubblefield	Wampler	Wright
Stuckey	Ware	Wyatt
Taylor	Whalley	Wylder
Teague, Calif.	Whitehurst	Wyllie
Thompson, Ga.	Whitten	Wyman
Thomson, Wis.	Wiggins	Young, Fla.
Thone	Wilson	Young, Tex.
Veysey	Charles H.	Zablocki
Waggonner	Winn	Zion

NOT VOTING—64

Abernethy	Fulton	Rees
Baker	Galifianakis	Robison, N.Y.
Baring	Gallagher	Roncalio
Bell	Hammer-	Rooney, N.Y.
Bevill	schmidt	Rousselot
Blaggi	Hansen, Wash.	Runnels
Blackburn	Hawkins	Ryan
Blanton	Kuykendall	Scherle
Brotzman	Link	Schmitz
Byrnes, Wis.	Long, La.	Shoup
Caffery	McClure	Springer
Carney	McMillan	Talcott
Clancy	Meeds	Teague, Tex.
Clark	Mikva	Terry
Delaney	Miller, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Dowdy	Mollohan	Vigorito
Eckhardt	Murphy, N.Y.	Waldie
Edmondson	Nichols	Williams
Evins, Tenn.	O'Neill	Wilson, Bob
Ford	Pettis	Yatron
William D.	Poage	Zwach
Forsythe	Pucinski	

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOLDWATER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOLDWATER: On page 52, after line 8, insert the following: "Sec. 745. No part of the funds appropriated under title IV or V of the Act shall be made available in regard to contracts awarded or negotiated after the enactment of this act unless the Secretary of Defense shall first find that all persons employed under such contract or subcontract thereunder, are covered by a vested retirement pension program approved under such standards as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in that it requires additional duties on the part of the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois if he would reserve his point of order.

Mr. YATES. I said that the amendment itself requires the Secretary of Defense to proclaim additional standards.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the gentleman from Illinois would reserve his point of order.

Mr. YATES. I will reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves his point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the defense appropriations bill, which would direct the Secretary of Defense to insure that all employees working on a defense contract are covered by a vested retirement pension program.

This amendment would give the Secretary the discretion to issue standards for these retirement plans. I strongly believe that all pension plans should be vested within 5 years, and that an employee should be able to transfer his pension between contractors.

To illustrate the necessity for this amendment, I would like to introduce my colleagues to a "composite defense worker" from my 27th Congressional District in California; he does not actually exist, but represents a cross-section of many defense workers in my district. He is 54 years old; married, and the father of three children, two of whom are still at home. He has held seven jobs in the defense field in the last 16 years. He is a skilled technician, with an excellent work record; he was laid off from six jobs due to defense cutbacks, through no fault of his own. Now his present job is in jeopardy. He has looked for more permanent employment for almost a year, but no one will hire him.

He is not old enough for social security, and since he did not work at any one defense contractor's for more than a few years, he has no pension plan to help him. Six months ago, his wife took a job as saleswoman to supplement the family income. Then too, there is no one home when his two young daughters arrive home from school.

This may sound like a likely plot for a soap opera, but I assure you that I receive mail every day that reflects this problem.

With an adequate, equitable pension plan, these loyal Americans would not have their lives shattered during what should be the very best time of life for them. A pension plan is not a cure-all for financial ills, but it certainly would be a healthy step in the right direction. Some will contend that this is only a part of the solution—I agree and add it is also a beginning. The Federal Government can prescribe how and under what conditions Federal moneys can be spent. And it is not unreasonable for the Department of Defense to take a leadership role in correcting a great injustice and its work may very well serve as a model for greater effort in protecting the pension expectation of many workers in this country.

I urge you to support this amendment, which would give our defense workers some measure of security that is rightfully due them, and personal dignity as well.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) insist on the point of order?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I insist. I think this matter should go to the legislative committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the language of the amendment. The language does place additional duties on the Secretary and, therefore, holds that the amendment is legislation and sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JACOBS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: On page 52, after line 8, insert:

"Sec. 745. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to furnish

Government-purchased or -leased limousines or luxury sedans or civilian chauffeurs for any employee of the United States other than those defined in 5 U.S.C. 5312."

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, those described in the citation just mentioned are Cabinet members. And, Mr. Chairman, I might point out when I offered this amendment a few weeks ago to the appropriation bill which included the Executive Office of the President, the amendment clearly excluded the Executive Office of the President.

Nonetheless, when the teller vote was taken, I am sure with good intentions various Members who arrived on the floor were told that this amendment I had offered was to take the limousines away from the President. That, the record will show, was untrue.

I say that merely to point out in the case of this amendment to eliminate the luxury sedans and the limousines from this appropriation, it does not cover military personnel who may drive officers in other than luxury sedans or in other than limousines.

I would like that to be clearly understood.

The chairman of the committee during his remarks regarding the KP controversy of 1972, suggested that the time might come when golf carts would be supplied to privates to ride between the barracks and the mess hall. I am suggesting that to use luxury sedans and to use limousines for anyone other than Cabinet members or for the President to the extent that he might require such automobiles in his own judgment—or the Vice President or the Speaker of the House—makes excessive demands upon the hard-pressed taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, although I regard this as a very serious subject beyond merely the dollars involved—the millions of dollars involved—across the whole of the Federal Establishment, I would like to point out a cartoon that was sent to me a few weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, may I have order. This is a joke and I think I am entitled to attention when I tell a joke.

The cartoon showed a big shining limousine going by with a big sign on it, and the sign read, "Not in politics—just rich."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACOBS), there were—ayes 40, noes 90.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIEGLE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIEGLE: On page 52, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 745. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, only to the extent that the expenditure thereof shall not

result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1973 as adjusted by budget amendment."

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much indebted to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) for this amendment, because historically, as most people here know, this amendment has been known as the Bow expenditure limitation amendment. This amendment has a very special quality to it in that it applies directly to the actual spending contemplated by the Department of Defense for this fiscal year and as such in a significant way goes beyond the amount of money contained in the appropriation bill which is before the committee today.

The Members will be interested to know, for example, that nearly \$20 billion of new obligatory authority in this appropriation bill that is before us represents funds which will not be spent this year and in fact will be spent in some future year.

Mr. Chairman, what I am concerned about and what this specific amendment goes to is the actual amount of the dollars spent by the Defense Department in this fiscal year. The revised budget estimate at this time is approximately \$79.5 billion of spending that will occur within the fiscal year 1973, with some \$50 billion of that representing new money in this appropriation bill and the remaining \$29 billion or so being carryover funds from previous years' appropriations. This amendment would require the Department of Defense to restrict its actual spending this year to 95 percent of the \$79.5 billion that it anticipates spending in fiscal year 1973, which means it would have to absorb across the board in a way of its own choosing that kind of expenditure reduction, 5 percent, but it would create a substantial dollar saving, a dollar saving in an amount of some \$4 billion.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, how much money will that make available to the Defense Department? What is 95 percent of the \$79 billion; does the gentleman have that figure?

Mr. RIEGLE. I do, but let me get to it later in my presentation, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a significant dollar saving that we can ask the Defense Department to absorb in this fiscal year.

Since 1964, including planned expenditures for this year, we will have spent on defense in this country almost \$700 billion. Think about that. Almost \$700 billion. Anyone who wants to suggest we have been stingy with the Department of Defense should look at that. The facts just do not bear that out.

Some object to the Bow amendment because they say it does not cut the budget line item by line item. I must say I would prefer line item cuts, but as a practical matter we do not get that job done. The Members know as well as I do, whether it is in the subcommittee or in the full committee or on this floor,

we just are not able to make the kinds of specific cuts that I think perhaps the majority of us would like to make if we were in better possession of the facts and were able to do so, but when we are dealing with \$79 billion in an appropriation bill it is virtually impossible with the way we do business in the Congress today.

So, in the bill before us which comes from the Appropriations Committee, it plans to reduce the expenditures by about \$2 billion in terms of dollar impact in this fiscal year.

This amendment which I am offering would incorporate that \$2 billion reduction and add to it another \$2 billion reduction. In other words we would be saving actually \$4 billion in this fiscal year.

Take the fiscal situation. Last year the budget deficit was \$29 billion. The best estimate for this year is something like \$40 billion. If we are going to talk about saving any money in terms of the actual budget deficit, we have to turn to an amendment of this kind. I would say from my experience outside of the Congress in private industry that there is not an organization in America that cannot absorb a 5-percent cut.

Mr. Chairman, if I may refer the members of the committee to page 52 of the report, you will find that if we approve this appropriation today without this amendment, at the end of this fiscal year the Defense Department will have \$42 billion unexpended. Just think about that. It is going up by almost \$8 billion this year, based on this appropriation. That is \$42 billion that nobody is ready to spend.

I think we can ask the Defense Department to absorb a 5-percent reduction at this time, and it is not the kind of cut that is going to wreak havoc on the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask support for this amendment. I think it is reasonable, and I think in light of the fiscal crisis facing our country it is the least we can do.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has explained the amendment in a very clear way. Let me explain the situation further. The estimate of the President is that the Defense Department this year will spend \$77.7 billion. In this bill we have cut in appropriations, not spending, \$4.3 billion. That will result in a cut in expenditures, as pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan, of about \$2 billion from the \$77.7 billion budget estimate.

The gentleman proposes to cut spending by an additional \$2 billion. In other words, he would double the expenditure reduction made in the bill. The cuts made in the bill have been pinpointed and applied where it was thought they could best be applied. This amendment would be a meat ax reduction in expenditures for the fiscal year 1973.

We have been up this road and down this road before.

I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The reason I asked the gentleman from Michigan to yield was that the gentleman from Michigan predicated his amendment on what he said was the Bow amendment. I want to set the record clear that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), who is inadvertently off the floor now, but I think that the record will show that he never offered such an amendment on a defense appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. I can confirm what the gentleman said.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will agree with the gentleman. In fact Mr. Bow, to my knowledge, never did offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

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

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. RIEGLE, JONAS, SIKES, and ROUSH.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 256, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—98

Abourezk	Esch	Mitchell
Abzug	Fraser	Moorhead
Adams	Frenzel	Mosher
Addabbo	Gaydos	Moss
Anderson,	Green, Oreg.	Obey
Calif.	Green, Pa.	O'Konski
Ashbrook	Griffiths	Podell
Ashley	Gross	Pryor, Ark.
Aspin	Halpern	Railsback
Badillo	Hamilton	Reld
Begich	Hanley	Reuss
Bergland	Hanna	Riegle
Bieber	Harrington	Rodino
Bingham	Hathaway	Roe
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Rooney, Pa.
Burke, Fla.	Heinz	Rosenthal
Burton	Helstoski	Roush
Chisholm	Hungate	Roybal
Clay	Jacobs	Sarbanes
Collins, Ill.	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Conyers	Kemp	Selberling
Corman	Koch	Skubitz
Culver	Kyros	Stokes
Danielson	Leggett	Thompson, N.J.
Dellenback	McClory	Tieman
Dellums	McCloskey	Udall
Denholm	McCormack	Van Deelen
Diggs	McKinney	Vanik
Donohue	Macdonald,	Wampler
Dow	Mass.	Whalen
Drinan	Madden	Wolff
du Pont	Melcher	Yates
Edwards, Calif.	Minish	
Ellenberg	Mink	

NOES—256

Abbutt	Boggs	Byron
Alexander	Boland	Cabell
Anderson, Ill.	Bolling	Camp
Anderson,	Bow	Carey, N.Y.
Tenn.	Bray	Carlson
Andrews, Ala.	Brinkley	Carter
Andrews,	Brooks	Casey, Tex.
N. Dak.	Broomfield	Cederberg
Annuizio	Brown, Mich.	Chamberlain
Archer	Brown, Ohio	Chappell
Arends	Broyhill, N.C.	Clausen
Aspinall	Broyhill, Va.	Don H.
Baring	Buchanan	Clawson, Del.
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Cleveland
Belcher	Burleson, Tex.	Collier
Bennett	Burlison, Mo.	Collins, Tex.
Betts	Byrne, Pa.	Colmer

Conable	Hagan	Mailliard	Roy	Staggers	Veysey
Conover	Haley	Mallory	Ruppe	Stanton	Waggonner
Conte	Hall	Mann	Ruth	J. William	Ware
Cotter	Hammer-	Martin	St Germain	Stanton,	Whalley
Coughlin	schmidt	Mathias, Calif.	Sandman	James V.	Whitehurst
Crane	Hansen, Idaho	Mathis, Ga.	Satterfield	Steed	Whitten
Curlin	Harsha	Matsunaga	Saylor	Steele	Widnall
Daniel, Va.	Harvey	Mayne	Schneebeli	Steiger, Ariz.	Wiggins
Daniels, N.J.	Hastings	Mazzoli	Schwengel	Steiger, Wis.	Wilson,
Davis, Ga.	Hays	Michel	Scott	Stephens	Charles H.
Davis, S.C.	Hébert	Miller, Ohio	Shipley	Stratton	Winn
Davis, Wis.	Henderson	Mills, Ark.	Shriver	Stubblefield	Wright
de la Garza	Hicks, Mass.	Mills, Md.	Sikes	Stuckey	Wyatt
Dennis	Hicks, Wash.	Minshall	Sisk	Sullivan	Wydler
Dent	Hillis	Mizell	Slack	Taylor	Wylie
Derwinski	Hogan	Mollohan	Smith, Calif.	Teague, Calif.	Wyman
Devine	Hollfield	Monagan	Smith, Iowa	Thompson, Ga.	Young, Fla.
Dickinson	Horton	Montgomery	Smith, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Tex.
Dingell	Hosmer	Morgan	Snyder	Thone	Zablocki
Dorn	Howard	Murphy, Ill.	Spence	Ullman	Zion
Downing	Hull	Myers			
Dulski	Hunt	Natcher			
Duncan	Hutchinson	Nedzi	Abernethy	Fulton	Poage
Dwyer	Jarman	Nelsen	Baker	Galifianakis	Pucinski
Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Calif.	Nix	Bell	Gallagher	Rangel
Erlenborn	Johnson, Pa.	Passman	Bevill	Galmoe	Rees
Eshleman	Jonas	Patman	Blaggi	Hansen, Wash.	Robison, N.Y.
Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.	Patten	Blackburn	Hawkins	Roncallo
Fascell	Jones, Tenn.	Pelly	Blanton	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.
Fish	Kazen	Pepper	Blatnik	Ichord	Runnels
Fisher	Keating	Perkins	Brasco	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Flood	Kee	Pettis	Brozman	Karth	Scherle
Flowers	Keith	Peyser	Byrnes, Wis.	Kluczynski	Schmitz
Flynt	Kling	Pickle	Caffery	Lent	Sebellus
Foley	Kuykendall	Pike	Carney	Link	Shoup
Ford, Gerald R.	Kyl	Pirnie	Celler	Long, La.	Springer
Fountain	Landgrebe	Powell	Clancy	Lujan	Symington
Frelinghuysen	Landrum	Preyer, N.C.	Clark	McClure	Talcott
Fuqua	Latta	Price, Ill.	Delaney	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Garmatz	Lennon	Price, Tex.	Dowdy	McMillan	Terry
Gettys	Lloyd	Purcell	Eckhardt	Meeds	Vander Jagt
Gibbons	Long, Md.	Quie	Edmondson	Metcalfe	Vigorito
Goldwater	McCollister	Quillen	Evins, Tenn.	Mikva	Waldie
Gonzalez	McDade	Randall	Findley	Miller, Calif.	White
Goodling	McDonald,	Rarick	Ford,	Murphy, N.Y.	Williams
Grasso	Mich.	Rhodes	William D.	Nichols	Wilson, Bob
Gray	McEwen	Roberts	Forsythe	O'Hara	Yatron
Griffin	McFall	Robinson, Va.	Frei	O'Neill	Zwach
Grover	McKay	Rogers			
Gubser	McKevitt	Rostenkowski			
Gude	Mahon	Rousselot			

NOT VOTING—78

So the amendment was rejected.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the 11th regular appropriation bill considered so far by this body for fiscal 1973. While it is under the budget request for the Department of Defense, it nevertheless contains a considerable amount of red ink.

This is so because the aggregate budget requests for fiscal 1973 for the Federal Government exceed revenue forecasts by \$25 billion.

The budget request for this appropriation was \$79,594,184,000. The committee recommendation was \$75,227,048,000. This was a cut of 5.5 percent or \$4,367,136,000.

To bring the appropriation bill in line with anticipated revenue for fiscal 1973 would have required a 14-percent cut below the budget request, or a cut of \$11,143,185,760. Making adjustment for the 5.5-percent cut actually made by the Appropriations Committee, the red ink still in the bill amounts to 8.5 percent or \$6,776,049,760.

Assuming that the House eventually approves this bill without amendment, the House will have approved spending for the fiscal year 1973 in the amount of \$163,134,223,714. The budget request for the same purposes totaled \$166,994,584,504.

The amounts I have referred to are summarized in a table which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point under permission which will be granted when the committee rises.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Appropriation bill	Budget request	Balanced budget, 14 percent cut	Amount approved by House	"Red ink" approved by House
Legislative.....	\$433,627,004	\$372,919,224	\$427,604,764	\$54,685,540
State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary, related agencies.....	4,687,988,600	4,031,670,196	4,587,104,350	555,434,154
HUD, Space, Science, Veterans, independent agencies.....	20,173,185,000	17,348,939,100	19,718,490,000	2,369,550,900
Transportation and related agencies.....	8,426,792,000	7,247,041,120	8,316,950,000	1,069,908,880
District of Columbia.....	343,306,000	295,243,160	332,306,000	37,062,840
Interior and related agencies.....	2,520,340,000	2,167,492,400	2,529,558,200	362,065,800
Labor, HEW, and related agencies.....	27,327,323,500	23,501,498,210	28,603,179,500	5,101,681,290
Treasury, Postal Service, and general government.....	5,066,603,000	4,357,278,580	5,057,145,000	699,866,420
Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission.....	5,489,058,000	4,720,589,880	5,437,727,000	717,137,120
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection.....	12,952,177,400	11,138,872,564	12,897,010,900	1,758,138,336
Total.....	87,400,400,504	75,594,184,000	87,907,175,714	12,725,531,280
Defense.....	79,594,184,000	68,450,998,240	75,227,048,000	6,776,049,760
Total.....	166,994,584,504	144,045,182,240	163,134,223,714	19,501,581,040

¹ Recommended by committee.

² If committee recommendation approved.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Chairman, ever since Pearl Harbor, Americans have been nervous about being caught militarily unprepared. Since 1946, we have spent more than a trillion dollars on the military, at the expense of many neglected needs at home.

Everyone wants America to be strong. But in the debate over national priorities—that is, how much money should be spent on domestic programs versus the military—the point has not always been made that more money for the military does not necessarily mean more strength.

Budget fat in the military, like budget fat everywhere else, does not buy added benefits; it buys added inefficiency. An expensive weapons system which does not work does not help our boys if it backfires on the battlefield.

Today we are discussing the largest peacetime defense budget in our his-

tory. I know that the Appropriations Committee has worked hard on this bill and I would commend them for their efforts which resulted in a reduction of \$5 billion from the administration's budget request. Nonetheless, the fact remains that we are looking at a figure of nearly \$74.6 billion, up \$1.7 billion from last year.

There are many aspects of this bill which I support. I certainly believe in pay raises and other benefits which will help us move in the direction of a voluntary army. I believe in funds to harden our missile silos. Certainly we must do more to help our retired military personnel just as we must do more to help all of our citizens on retirement income who have been so cruelly harmed by inflation. Inflation, incidentally, which is caused in no small part by spending such as that found in this budget.

Despite these aspects, I feel that I

must oppose this bill unless it can be cut further. It is up to Congress and the people to decide the priorities, to police waste and inefficiency and to decide how many dollars are best spent on the military stance and how many on making America strong from within by building houses, hospitals, roads, schools, and the health of the populace.

We live in a time when American troop levels are being reduced as our Vietnam involvement, all too slowly, winds down. We live in a time when world tensions show promise of being reduced as the SALT agreements make a step in holding the line on the spiraling military arms race. Yet, despite this, the military budget is still going up. As military manpower levels drop below the 3 million mark, we still have as many or more generals and admirals as we had during World War II when force levels were closer to 12 million men.

We simply must find a way to put a handle on military spending or South Dakota and all our other States will not be able to achieve that quality of life which should be the American dream. Schools, hospitals, roads, homes—all these are part of our national strength, too.

Patriotism has many parts. One of them is to be willing to risk political attack by questioning "conventional wisdom." We have a duty to keep our country strong. But an overblown, wasteful Defense budget is not the best road to strength.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, during debate we heard some wise and penetrating commentary on this year's authorization and appropriations request for expenditures by the Department of Defense. These comments, some favorable and some critical of Defense programs, have focused on the appropriateness of particular weapon systems as well as the total level of the Defense budget. I would like to expand on one element of that dialog—specifically, a discussion of the development process of the Air Force's F-15 air superiority fighter—and to urge your support to include the full amount of funds requested to continue the planned development of the F-15. I will limit my discussion to what I consider to be the pertinent aspects of this program in the context of the total Defense budget for the coming fiscal year.

First, the need for the F-15 must be related to our national commitments and our ability to maintain adequate forces to support those commitments. The United States has adopted a policy of collective security, in conjunction with its allies throughout the world. Tactical air forces are an essential element of the general-purpose forces which the United States maintains in support of these collective security commitments.

Attaining and maintaining air superiority—that is, eliminating effective interference by opposing air forces—is fundamental to the success of all tactical air missions. Without air superiority, friendly forces—ground, sea, and air—and their logistic support, would be subject to severe attrition by hostile air forces, while engaged enemy forces could operate without such attrition, and would be assured of timely reinforcements and support. Without air superiority, our efforts to prevent such circumstances through effective close air support to friendly ground forces and interdiction of enemy logistics and reinforcements would be frustrated further through heavy attrition of our own air resources engaged in combat air support operations. Prevention of hostile air attacks on U.S. and friendly forces, installations, and lines of communications is basic to success in conflict by our combined arms.

Thus, attainment of air superiority is critical to the missions of tactical air warfare and the operations which it supports. Theaterwide or even local control of the air permits better use of U.S. and friendly tactical air forces, while denying the enemy the opportunity to use his air forces effectively.

In its report on the defense appropriation bill, the Committee on Appropriations

expressed support for the F-15 program. At the same time, the committee recommended a reduction of \$101,000,000 for fiscal year 1973—not because of any lack of confidence in the F-15 program, but out of an abundance of caution based on experience with other military hardware programs. The committee also reported, in error, that the 15 production F-15 aircraft deleted from the fiscal year 1973 budget can be added to the fiscal year 1974 procurement program without any appreciable increase in the overall cost of the F-15 program.

I must emphasize that the committee based its decision to delete 15 F-15 aircraft in fiscal year 1973 on an overabundance of caution and on inaccurate information. For example, a reduction of \$101.0 million and 15 aircraft in fiscal year 1973 will have a severe cost and schedule impact on the F-15 program. Execution of the lower contract options with McDonnell Douglas and Pratt-Whitney will result in a \$75 million total program cost increase. Research and development costs will also increase because the prime and subcontractors will use higher overhead rates due to the lower business base in fiscal year 1973. Other programs, now contracted with McDonnell Douglas and Pratt-Whitney, would be impacted by the reduced business base as well. Adding the 15 aircraft to the fiscal year 1974 buy of 77 aircraft would result in a less than optimum production rate buildup through fiscal year 1974.

In addition to these cost considerations, the committee also expressed caution about the overall F-15 development program. However, the development process of the F-15 has been thorough and there is high confidence in its success.

Test data indicates static thrust of the F-15's series 2 engine is actually higher than required by the contract specifications. Moreover, even though the current weight of the engine is only slightly higher than the specification, the engine currently has an 8.2 to 1 thrust-to-weight ratio, which is a major improvement over current engines. Further, a weight reduction program is being pursued to obtain an 8.6 to 1 ratio.

The structure of the F-15 program is such that the program must be reviewed at the Secretary of Defense level in February 1973 prior to release of full procurement funds for the first production aircraft. If it is apparent at that program decision point that the F-15 system cannot achieve its performance requirements, the decision to produce the aircraft will be held in abeyance until further testing provides assurance that the F-15 will meet its performance goals.

I think these comments serve to illustrate that the committee's decision to delete \$101,000,000 and 15 aircraft from the fiscal year 1973 F-15 program is based on an unnecessarily overcautious estimate of the F-15 development process and on an inaccurate analysis of the fiscal impact of such a reduction in funding. Moreover, this reduction in fiscal year 1973 funding will delay the overall development of the F-15—and perhaps jeopardize our capability to pro-

vide air superiority in the late 1970's and 1980's.

Accordingly, I urge your support for the continued orderly progress of the F-15 development program—specifically for the restoration of the \$101,000,000 and 15 aircraft in the fiscal year 1973 request.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by our colleague, Mr. SIKES.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I have had innumerable opportunities to talk with military personnel, both at the lowest and highest levels. I can state categorically that they feel that utilization of military personnel as kitchen police is one of the most serious irritants within the present military system.

Lower ranking personnel are irritated because, in their words, they did not join the Army to wash dishes. More senior sergeants are irritated because, in their opinion, the civilian replacements hired specifically for food preparation and dishwashing do a better job than enlisted men who do not want to be there. And senior officers are irritated because they see so many man-hours being wasted at these menial tasks at the expense of invaluable training time.

This is not a new irritant. Many of us can remember KP from our service days. Others can remember Bill Mauldin's cartoons depicting the drudgery of peeling potatoes and washing dishes. And a case can be made that such activities are character building.

But I contend that these are very different times and present-day soldiers are in a very different situation.

In those days it was believed that the best way to make a young man a soldier was to break him down, decivilianize him, and then build a fighting man from scratch. Today, the idea seems to be to start with the young man as he is and build from there. There is no longer any need or desire to break him first. And, in this regard, there seems to be no need for menial tasks that are unrelated to his professional advancement.

In addition, the young men of this day are not interested in joining the Army to become dishwashers and spud peelers. They want to be electronic technicians, mechanics, ordnancemen, and so forth—technical skill areas requiring long, hard hours of study. KP does not assist them in achieving this goal. In fact, both in mental attitude and physical demands, it hinders their ability to concentrate on their primary functions.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment makes it possible for the services to make their own judgments as to the value of this civilianization of the kitchen police force. It does not increase the cost of this bill. It merely authorizes the Department of Defense to utilize its discretion and reprogram funds from other areas which, in the services' opinions, are of a lower priority than this morale factor.

Finally, I want to add this thought. While I personally believe that it is still too early to tell whether or not the all-volunteer force can or should become a reality, Presidential statements to the contrary notwithstanding, I do believe

that the premeditated action of the Appropriations Committee in continuing a long-standing irritant will greatly degrade the validity of the present all-volunteer force trial period.

I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Chairman, today, we are asked to consider a bill appropriating funds for fiscal year 1973 for the Defense Department. We are being asked to approve the largest defense budget since World War II, this, at a time when our President has stated that he wants to stop excessive governmental spending in all areas.

We are asked to approve the appropriation of funds which will enable the Defense Department to continue its military commitments at home and abroad. We are being asked, for example, to commit \$299 million to start a third *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier which will cost over one billion dollars when it is finished. This, at a time when some military men question the utility of an aircraft carrier. Another interesting item is the request by the Marine Corps Reserve for increased funding so that it could send its 10 Reserve generals on 100 tours instead of 15. The committee, noting that the tours were used for the accumulation of retirement points, did not see the need for any additional tours and, yet, granted money to raise the number of tours to 50. This is an added cost of some \$37,856. At the same time, the administration has vetoed the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation and at that time stated that we did not have the resources, for example, to put \$2 million into the physician shortage area scholarship program. There are some 140 counties in this country without doctors.

We are also being asked to approve the purchase of 23 S-3A antisubmarine warfare patrol aircraft. The cost for this minimum purchase is \$378.8 million; this is so that the contract will not be broken. According to the committee report, 92-1389—

The Department of Defense has already displayed a great deal of skepticism over this program when it refused to permit the Navy to exercise the Lot III (FY 1972) production option on April 1, 1972. These funds were later released on April 28, 1972, after three . . . meetings on the program.

The report also states that the Navy estimates that it would cost "between \$75 to \$125 million" to terminate the contract. The committee sees—

The storm warning of experiencing cost increases significantly in excess of those amounts.

The committee further states that—

It is questionable, therefore, whether or not the S-3A can even be justified at its tremendous cost.

Why, pray tell, would one want to continue such a program, then?

We are also being asked to buy 60 A-37 attack aircraft to help sustain the losses suffered by the South Vietnamese Air Force. This is an appropriation of \$32 million. We are also being asked to give the South Vietnamese 180 UH-1H helicopters, \$53.3 million. This last part is somewhat curious because, according to

reports, the South Vietnamese cannot protect some helicopters on the ground. Seventy were recently reported to have been lost on the ground.

Today, we are asked to approve expenditures of some \$75 billion to take care of our Armed Forces while we have venereal disease at an epidemic level, a health manpower shortage, a doubling in the number of our children, ages 10 to 14, in our State mental hospitals during the past decade and no room for the thousands more needing care, an extremely high rate of alcohol abuse, too few job training centers for the unskilled and unemployed, no nutrition programs for the elderly. These latter conditions exist because the President vetoed the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare bill which would have remedied, or set up remedies, for these societal ills. Instead, the executive branch is asking us to buy planes that are, at best, unsound; a vessel, the use of which is questionable; and more nuclear warheads so that our overkill ratio can climb.

We need doctors and nurses, not touring reservist generals, nor do we need a National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. We need more hospitals and job training centers, not B-1 bombers, S-3A aircraft, and CVN-70 carriers. I ask this body to act with reason, not ideological rhetoric. The President's veto of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare bill (H.R. 15417) and his support of this piece of legislation are inconsistent. With reason we can have both bills, this one with less money than requested, and be much better off for it. It is such a sad time when the people, those who give us the confidence and spirit to function as a government, should be placed so far down on the list of national priorities. How much longer must we suffer?

We must reorder our priorities. And this is an appropriate place to start. This administration has vetoed the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare bill because money in that bill was in excess of what this administration thought should be spent to meet the human needs of our citizens and to improve the quality of life for all. And then it has the audacity to request approval of a budget for the Department of Defense which would be the highest since the end of World War II. I suppose there is logic here somewhere, but if so, it is only comprehensible to the executive branch.

For the reasons I have just enumerated, I intend to vote against this bill.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to eliminate section 743 of the defense appropriation bill. Section 743 of the bill could have the effect of practically mandating the closure of two naval shipyards over the next year and jeopardizes every single naval shipyard in the country. It has been estimated that section 743 would this fiscal year strip almost \$110 million away from the navy yards. It also would cause layoff of no fewer than 10,000 skilled navy yard employees if layoffs started immediately, and as many as 12,000 men if they do not start until January 1. The result would be either existing navy yards operating at grossly inefficient personnel

levels or two of them closed on a crash basis. By arbitrarily requiring 35 percent of ship repairs, alterations, and overhaul to private shipyards irrespective of the dollar value of the item, and ship conversion to private shipyards notwithstanding the fact that private yards get almost all of new Navy construction dollars, section 743 will cause dire economical consequences.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the hour is growing late, but I ask for this time to read one paragraph from a letter written by a serviceman, a constituent of mine, who is stationed in Saigon. The dateline was August 31, 1972.

The letter follows:

EXCERPT FROM LETTER OF SERVICEMAN IN SAIGON, VIETNAM

We have gone through some bad times here in Vietnam the last few months, and face some more bleak months. But the South Vietnamese, if bloodied, are unbowed. I wish to express my appreciation of your support of the President's policy in Viet Nam, because it coincides with the interests of the people of Viet Nam as well as of the U.S. We're going to win (we have no choice), and history will justify what the U.S. has done here.

Yours,

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the passage of the Department of Defense appropriations bill because it provides further moneys for the tragic and senseless war in Southeast Asia.

Indeed, several U.S. courts have now ruled that congressional support of these Department of Defense appropriations bills is, in fact, the equivalent of a declaration of war by the Congress. As one Member of Congress, I do not want to declare or validate this undeclared war; I want to declare peace.

I will support amendments to this bill to set a specific date for the termination of our involvement in Indochina. Only if such an amendment is accepted, can I support the bill.

We entered the Vietnam conflict with ideals of helping and even "saving" the South Vietnamese—but we are destroying them. Over the last year and a half our level of casualties has dropped dramatically. This is good—though the casualty reports still come in as more and more of our airmen are killed or captured. Yet the move to Vietnamization—the reduction of the American role to air and artillery support raises the deepest moral questions. Vietnamization has meant the limitation of Vietnamese civilians through the intensified bombardment of Indochina.

From the estimates available, it appears that more South Vietnamese civilians have been killed and wounded in the first half of 1972 than in either 1971 or 1970. The cost of the Vietnam war to people of Indochina has been stated many times. The death, the pain, the suffering created by this war is so huge as to really be beyond human understanding—yet the war continues—as if it had not only killed so many of our men but has also killed our sensitivities and brutalized our minds.

Several studies, such as the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, have estimated the cost of the war to civilians as of August 1971.

THE ONGOING CIVILIAN TOLL (AS OF AUGUST 1971)

	South Vietnam	Laos	Cambodia	Total
Killed.....	335,000	100,000	(1)	450,000+
Wounded.....	740,000	250,000	(1)	1,000,000+
Refugees.....	5,695,300	1,000,000	1,600,000	8,295,300+
Total.....	6,770,300	1,350,000	1,600,000+	9,755,300+

1 Tens of thousands.

These figures do not include estimates for North Vietnam or for military personnel. Total U.S. deaths in the war from hostile action were, as of September 2, 1972, 45,856. An additional 10,265 Americans died in Indochina from causes other than hostile action—mostly in airplane crashes. Some 180,450 South Vietnamese forces have been killed while 5,172 other Allies have been killed. The Defense Department states that some 885,380 of the enemy have been killed—though it is hard to say how many of these dead were actually innocent civilians.

Indochina is a small area of the world—much too small to survive the continued loss of life, this much economic destruction. The figures show all too clearly that we are not saving South Vietnam—we are only assisting in its destruction.

The termination of our commitment in Indochina, which is not vital to the security of the United States, is clearly in the national interest of the United States. Our resources are needed elsewhere; our dollars and defense posture should be more wisely committed. But most of all, it has become our moral duty to end this bloodshed and achieve a political peace in Southeast Asia—a peace that can help ease tensions all over the world.

Not only do I oppose this bill because it continues the Vietnam war, but I oppose the unnecessary expenditure of billions of dollars on unnecessary and, in some cases, already obsolete military weapons systems.

While the Appropriations Committee is to be commended for reducing the administration's request from \$79.6 billion to \$74.6 billion, the fact remains that there are still a number of questionable programs being funded—and that as we profess to wind down the Vietnam war, the Department of Defense budget—which this year is larger than last year's—continues to "windup."

I also find it ironic that during the past several years attempts to cut certain weapons systems or to delay their acquisition until technical problems could be resolved were always opposed on the grounds that a reduction would hurt our bargaining position with the Soviets during the SALT talks. But now that the first phase of the SALT talks are completed and a dramatic arms limitation agreement reached, we are asked to provide even more money. We are told by many that if these increased expenditures are not made, then we should withdraw from the SALT agreements. While the President comes before the Congress urging us to act on these great peace initiatives, the Secretary of Defense comes before us asking for new weapons of war. The two propositions are irreconcilable. If we are to

really have peace, these new weapons systems cannot be justified.

Some say that these weapons are needed for superiority. Yet it is uncontested that the United States has the capability of destroying the Soviet Union many times over—and the Soviet Union can do the same to us. There are no new weapons systems on the immediate horizon that can change this balance of terror. If the Soviets begin new weapons activity, we will be able to determine that through satellite reconnaissance and act accordingly. The fact remains that we and the Soviets are, as President Kennedy once said, two scorpions in a bottle—poised to sting each other. It is time that we acted to get along with each other—not to destroy each other.

I would like to take a few more minutes to briefly mention several of the weapons systems which I do not feel that I can support.

A classic case of mismanaged weapons procurement involves the F-14 jet fighter program. This bill includes \$732 million for the development and procurement of additional F-14's. Yet time delays, possibly unresolved safety questions, and escalating costs are the hallmark of this contract. Last year, a single F-14 was estimated to cost \$16.8 million. That cost may now rise to \$18.2 million or \$18.6 million per plane. In addition, the Department of Defense entered into this program to obtain a few F-14A's and a large number of F-14B's—planes which were planned to have engines with 30 percent better performance. Yet because of problems with the F-14B engine, the Department is settling on a much larger number of F-14A's; in fact, the entire contract may settle on this model of aircraft—thus providing the Department with much less than was planned for. The fantastic cost of each one of these planes limits the number which can be procured. The military result is that, in a major conflict, these sophisticated aircraft could be overwhelmed by large numbers of much simpler aircraft which have been developed by the Soviets. It is time that we developed an efficient, dependable aircraft that can be produced in quantity—rather than a few flying Cadillacs which may in fact be flying Edsels.

Other staggeringly expensive weapons systems which are funded by this bill include the B-1 advanced manned strategic aircraft bomber. In an age of increasing missile accuracy, the development of this manned bomber—at a cost of billions of dollars—is highly questionable. It may not be able to survive a first strike by enemy forces on our country and it is questionable whether it could penetrate the air defenses of a major foreign power.

This bill also includes nearly \$300 million for further work on a new nuclear aircraft carrier—a type of ship which is increasingly vulnerable to missiles now in place on Soviet submarines. Again, we seem to be spending enormous sums of money to build the weapons which worked in the last war, but which would probably be useless in a major war in the decades ahead.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I feel I must oppose this legislation.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, the total

Defense appropriation recommended by the committee is a post World War II record expense of over \$74 billion, but it is \$5 billion—more than 6 percent—under the budget request. On balance, the committee has done a conscientious job of expense reduction, because much of the increase is expense over last year occurs in personnel cost areas—payroll, pensions, and so forth.

I would still prefer military spending at a lower level and will support amendments to reduce spending to last year's amount or less. Many times I have stated that I feel we have too many active duty military personnel. Personnel expense now accounts for more than half of our total military spending.

We need up-to-date weapons. Our new systems have been held back long enough by excess spending in Indochina and for more personnel than is needed to maintain the Nixon Guam doctrine and provide for national security.

Our enormous deficits, our urgent domestic needs, our persistent inflation, and our difficulty in expanding sales abroad, are all persuasive arguments for reduced military spending. I do not advocate deep cuts which might imperil our security. I do not pretend to know all about all defense systems. I do feel strongly that we have too many men-at-arms now, and I suggest that defense expenditures can, and should be held to last year's figures of just under \$73 billion. I will support the so-called "Bow Amendment" to reduce this bill. Nevertheless, I again congratulate the committee for its work in expense reduction and will support this bill even if the amendments I favor fail.

Finally, we will again face the "end-the-war" amendment. I have regularly supported set-the-date proposals, contingent on POW-MIA release, and expect to do so today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the defense appropriations bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee for our consideration contains what I believe is an unfortunate assessment. At a time when the Air Force is about to acquire its first air superiority aircraft in 15 years, the Appropriations Committee is recommending that we approve only half of the 30 aircraft which the Air Force had requested for fiscal year 1973.

Although this may appear to be sound economics, it is not. It is unsound. The committee report states in part that the 15 aircraft which had been deleted can be added to the fiscal year 1974 procurement program without "any appreciable increase" in the overall cost of the F-15 program. But when I checked with the Air Force on what the cost increase might be I was informed that even though the present contract would remain in effect, a repricing clause would come into effect which will add over \$75 million to the overall program, an increase of over \$100,000 per aircraft for the entire projected budget. How can this be said not to be an "appreciable increase"? Seventy-five million dollars is an appreciable sum.

The committee report also hinted at the possibility of excessive concurrency in the F-15 program. But the record shows that the entire F-15 development and procurement program has been one

of utmost conservatism. Even before contract award, the Air Force required the most extensive wind tunnel tests ever conducted for this type aircraft. Similarly, the engine contract was awarded only after actual test engines from two competing contractors were tested and evaluated. The radar program was subcontracted to a single contractor only after a competitive flyoff with equipment from two competing contractors. Considering that the sophistication of this type of aircraft makes the cost of flying competitive prototypes impractical, it would seem that the fly-before-buy concept was followed to the fullest extent.

Let us also remember that although we are talking about aircraft funding now—the Air Force will not make a production commitment until February 1973, that is 5 months from now, and then only after the Department of Defense thoroughly reviews the status of the program and agrees that release of production funds is proper. Now what will happen over those 5 months? One aircraft is flying now and in the past 6 weeks has already had over 40 flights. By the end of February four aircraft will be flying, accumulating a total of 20 aircraft-months of flying experience. In addition, the low rate of planned production of the 30 aircraft requested by the Air Force—only three per month—minimizes concurrency and efficiently uses the tooling already procured. Should any problem show up during the flight test program, corrections can be made to the production line before a significant number of aircraft are produced.

To me, the F-15 is as much a fly-before-buy program as is possible with this type of aircraft—and there is little doubt in my mind that the development program was one of unprecedented thoroughness.

Finally, I would like to address the situation of the engine for the F-15. This engine is being manufactured by one of the most reliable and experienced jet engine companies in the entire world. Any of you who have ridden in a Boeing 707, Douglas DC-8, or Boeing 747 are trusting your lives to Pratt & Whitney engines. I believe in advertising it is called "A Name You Can Trust." There is no doubt that Pratt & Whitney is advancing the state of the art in developing this engine for the F-15. Current jet engines provide a thrust to weight ratio of about 5 to 1. This new engine in its developmental stage is right now giving 8.2 to 1—and as the test program refines the product even further, the company expects to provide a phenomenal 8.6 to 1.

It is true that the currently flying F-15 is flying with an early prototype engine which is not up to final performance specifications in all areas. However, this was not unexpected, and using this engine allowed testing of the airframe in those areas where maximum performance is not required. The fully rated engine will be delivered in November 1972, flying in December 1972 and complete military qualification testing in February 1973. This is before a final decision is made on the production option and 21 months before delivery of the first production aircraft. I cannot see where

there is a great degree of risk anywhere in this program.

The point at issue here is not whether we want the F-15. That is a foregone conclusion. The House Armed Services Committee supports it overwhelmingly. Our colleagues in the Senate have also given full support. The Appropriations Committee has also acknowledged the importance of this program but took this action, and I quote, "out of an abundance of caution."

Gentlemen, I believe this cut to be out of an overabundance of caution. McDonnell Douglas, the prime contractor, has kept the program on schedule. Why do we not? I suggest that we do our part to keep the program on schedule as it has been, and give our pilots the world's finest fighter with the least delay and at the least cost to the American public. As the report states:

The Committee is pleased with the progress made thus far in this important program and supports this new fighter for the Air Force.

I hope and trust the House will have further opportunity to underscore this observation by restoring the cut funds.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, for the fourth consecutive year I rise in opposition to the Department of Defense Appropriations bill. For the fourth consecutive year, the Pentagon's oversized budget is characterized by waste and war, and a complete distortion of what should be our spending priorities in a time of serious domestic needs.

The Defense Establishment has produced another record high defense appropriations bill totaling \$74.6 billion—the highest price tag for national defense since World War II. This is nothing short of outrageous in light of the winding down of our ground troop commitment in Southeast Asia, the recent arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union, and the promises from the administration about conversion to a peacetime economy.

The amount of wasted spending in this bill is less than the Pentagon would like, due in part to the refusal of the House to authorize several programs requested by the Defense Department in legislation passed earlier this year. But H.R. 16593 would still pour millions down the drain for the discredited F-14 aircraft, the Trident submarine, the ABM system, the virtually obsolete B-1 manned bomber, and the C-5 transport which was recently the subject of a scathing audit by the General Accounting Office.

I share the Pentagon's concern for our national security, but America's defense capabilities are hardly advanced by the military's childlike fetish for extravagant hardware which is of dubious military or cost effectiveness.

Only last month President Nixon, in a display of unparalleled cynicism, vetoed the HEW appropriations bill which was half the size of the bill before the House today and called it "a big-spending measure that impairs the Nation's economic health—a perfect example of that kind of reckless Federal spending that just cannot be done without more taxes or more inflation." Where is the White House today, when the House is asked to appropriate nearly \$75 billion for weap-

ons of death and destruction? What kind of national leadership finds it prudent to spend billions for bombs but reckless to spend half that amount for schools and hospitals?

Mr. Chairman, I would be prepared to countenance the waste and distorted priorities this bill represents if the House added an amendment offered by my colleague from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) cutting off funds for continuation of the war in Southeast Asia. But without such an amendment, H.R. 16593 includes nearly \$2.25 billion for the war. Those of us in Congress who are opposed to U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia cannot vote for these funds without sharing the responsibility for the continued loss of civilian lives and the mounting toll of American pilots missing in action and captured. I will not vote to continue to pour the taxpayers' money down the sinkhole of Southeast Asia. I must oppose H.R. 16593 and urge its defeat.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise once more to speak in favor of an end-the-war amendment. I compliment my colleague from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) for putting forward this amendment, both in committee and on this floor.

Other speakers have stressed the horrible and wasteful cost of this continuing war in Southeast Asia, as I have done in the past. I will not take the time of the House to go over this ground again, especially as I feel all Members have already made up their minds how they are going to vote on this amendment.

What I do want to stress is the same point I made the last time I spoke on this floor on the subject of Vietnam, and that is the increasingly clear conclusion that what separates the President and his followers from those who really want to bring this war to an end is this issue: Do we or do we not want to continue American involvement in this war, with all that it costs us in human and material terms, and in terms of our own self-respect and our reputation in the world, in order to preserve in power the Thieu regime in Saigon?

The issue is stated this way: Nixon insists that the Communists' price for peace is an interim government that would install the Communists in power in Saigon; the other side says no, all we ask is that there be a tripartite coalition government, consisting of people friendly to the present regime, people friendly to the Vietcong, and those who are against the war but are independent of both factions.

You can argue all night about the significance of these differences, but both sides would have to admit that in the end either course would mean the departure of Thieu and his cronies and the possibility that ultimately this might lead to a pro-Communist government assuming power. By his formula Nixon cannot guarantee against that, and certainly neither can his opponents.

What Nixon is trying to do, it seems clear to me, is to frame the issue in such a way that the American people react against the idea of turning over South Vietnam to the Communists and in framing his terms for settlement in such a way that he knows the other side cannot accept them. This rigamarole is fol-

lowed because he thinks the overthrow of Thieu would be regarded as a defeat for the United States, and wants at all costs to avoid being responsible as President for such a defeat.

The latest piece of evidence that the survival of the Thieu regime is a must so far as Nixon's thinking is concerned—at least the apparent survival—comes from the President's daughter, Julie Eisenhower. She was quoted today in an AP dispatch from Columbia as saying, in answer to a direct question, "yes," she would be willing to die for the survival of the Thieu regime.

One must respect the young lady's courage, even though one feels that courage to be seriously misguided. So far as I know no polls have been taken on this precise question, but I would venture an opinion that the overwhelming majority of the American people would not be willing to die for the Thieu regime.

But the most interesting point is this: Where did Julie get the notion that saving the Thieu regime was so important? She has proven many times that she is a loyal and ardent supporter of her father. She would surely not knowingly express a point of view different from his. And indeed the fact is that President Nixon regards the preservation of the Thieu regime as worth the loss of American lives, even if he has not said that he would be willing to give his own.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, this Congress, and I think the people of my district know of my past strong support of this Nation's military efforts in Southeast Asia. I am still convinced that we were not wrong to come to the aid of South Vietnam. It was necessary because this country must meet its treaty obligations and must be ready to stop aggression.

We have, however, deeply involved ourselves in Vietnam for over a decade. We have made our commitments and I believe we have carried them out. We have paid dearly in the lives of many thousands and in terms of billions of dollars in cost. We have made this sacrifice because we felt that as leader of the free world, we must do our part to help bring peace in the world.

After a decade of conflict, I think the American people have fulfilled their obligation and I believe the American people want the war to end, our POW's to come home, and our MIA's accounted for. Conditioned on these factors, I think we can support a vote now to "end the war." We are not deserting Vietnam. I believe Vietnam is ready and prepared to handle the job from now on.

I would like to make it plain, however, that I do not like the use of the word "Indochina" in the pending Addabbo amendment. The term "Indochina" is too broad, too indefinite. We should limit the resolution to Vietnam alone. I do not think we should tie the President's hands, for the President alone knows best where our troops should be sent in case of emergencies, and when.

There may be good and necessary reasons why we should have troops or forces in Laos or Thailand or naval forces off the shores of Southeast Asia countries or the "Indochina" area as a whole.

This administration has made a val-

iant effort to give us full peace in Southeast Asia, as did President Johnson in his administration. We have given this administration 4 full years and they promised to bring the conflict to a halt. I think they have tried. I have supported them for 4 years. I believe the time has now arrived, however, to turn the active fighting and administration of government over to South Vietnam. We must and should continue to help South Vietnam but our combat forces could be removed 4 months from now if we have the guarantee of the return of our POW's and our MIA's.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Davis amendment limiting the operations of our naval shipyards by favoring the private companies in ship repairs, alterations, and overhauls.

I opposed section 743 of H.R. 16593 as reported by the committee and am pleased it was ruled out of order as legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House of Representatives.

The Davis amendment will have the effect of drastically curtailing employment in our 10 navy shipyards, either by shutting down two of the shipyards or reducing employment at each by a significant amount. At a time when our civilian naval shipyard workforce is already experiencing cutbacks and other difficulties, it is not justified that a further loss be sustained.

Under present directions from the Congress, the Navy Department allocates a total of 35 percent of all its ship repair, ship alteration and overhaul, and ship conversion work already to private yards. Most of the private work is in conversions because of high navy shipyard competence in the other categories. In addition, shifting a high proportion of ship conversion work to private yards permits Navy personnel to be near their families.

The ships remain manned while repair, alteration and overhaul work is conducted at Navy shipyards, but they are unmanned during conversion work.

Since virtually all of the Navy's new ship construction funds are spent at private yards, the proportion of other types of work going to these yards under the existing congressional mandate seems reasonable under existing employment conditions. The Davis amendment would require that no matter how much conversion work is done by the private yards, 35 percent of ship repair, alteration, and overhaul work would have to go to them as well.

The result of the Davis amendment is estimated to be that the private yards will still get only 35 percent of the total work, but it might be distributed differently since the various yards have differing capabilities. It would be quite harmful to tamper with the morale of our service members just to favor one private shipyard over another. During extended repairs and overhauls, personnel would have to stay with the ships at the private yards and away from their home ports and home Navy yards where their families are.

I have received numerous inquiries from employees at Pearl Harbor Naval

Shipyard, Honolulu, Hawaii, about the Davis amendment and agree that it is harmful. It must be defeated. I ask the House to vote it down.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I have remained on hand to cast my vote on the Sikes amendment, because I believe it is a significant improvement in this bill. Beyond that, while I am not completely pleased with the measure, believing in general that \$75 billion and more is too much of a Defense Department budget, I appreciate the work done by the committee in reviewing the Executive's requests and paring the expenditures provided for in this legislation. Were I able to remain, I would cast my vote in favor of the bill. However, I have important business pending at home with regard to the future of the proposed Polcat Bench reclamation project—an item of great importance to my constituency. So rather than remain in Washington to add one more vote to the hundreds which I know will be cast in favor of this bill later tonight, Mr. Chairman, I am returning to my district.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the time has long since passed for this House to see the President's policy in Indochina for what it is, and to bring American involvement in that ghastly conflict to an immediate end.

Behind the facade of such terms as "Vietnamization" and "protective reaction" the facts of Vietnam remain as cold, brutal, and ugly as ever. The President's much vaunted Vietnamization program has not only been a failure; it has been a fraud. While the administration has attempted to reassure the American people with a scene of a war dwindling away, the tragic truth is that the President is engaged in a massive escalation of the conflict. The war is not winding down, it is raining down—raining down ton after ton of devastation dropped from American war planes. No amount of Presidential rhetoric can mask the fact that this policy is not one of peace but of continued death and destruction.

We have not prevented a bloodbath in Southeast Asia; we have created one.

This dreadful war has drained our resources and stained our conscience. It has taken the lives of tens of thousands of our most precious possession—our young men. Countless others will bear the scars of this immoral conflict for the remainder of their lives.

This dreadful war has warped our priorities. It has brought the twin plagues of inflation and unemployment to our economy. It has brought alienation, division, bitterness, and despair to our people.

Yet, as each day goes by, the war drags on.

As we meet here today, American bombers are ravaging the Vietnamese countryside.

The people of this Nation have made their position clear; they have demonstrated their steadfast opposition to this war in the public opinion polls, in the voting booth, and in the streets. They want peace. And they want it now.

Yet the President—as deaf as his so-called majority is silent—continues to fuel the fires of war, involving us ever

deeper in the devastation of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Such callous disregard for the will of the people, and, indeed, the law of the land, cannot be countenanced.

As I have pointed out time and time again since I stood on this floor and cast my vote against the very first appropriation bill to support American military intervention in Indochina in May 1965, it is the Congress—and only the Congress—which has the constitutional responsibility over war and peace. And the Congress must exercise that responsibility—now.

This House cannot close its eyes to the desires of the American people any longer.

This House cannot turn its back on the horrors of war any longer.

This House cannot shirk its responsibilities any longer.

Today we can begin to live up to our obligations to our people, to our Nation, to ourselves. We can do it by passing the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. ADDABO). Not only can we do it, we must do it. And finally give peace a chance.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which would permit continuation of the program which is now civilianizing non-military jobs within the Armed Forces.

When we, the Congress, gave our assent to the concept of an all-volunteer military, we emphasized that the primary way to achieve our goal was by creating incentives which would make a career in the Armed Forces attractive to young American men and women. One incentive is higher pay—pay more in line with that offered by civilian employers—and we have provided that. A second incentive is more challenging jobs—and the military is currently developing them.

These two inducements are tremendously important if we are to make our Armed Forces all-volunteer. Even together, though, they cannot bring success if we do not also try to insure that working conditions within the military are improved. This is especially important with regard to our lowest-ranking enlisted men, for whom, to be candid, we cannot always provide challenging types of work.

In its present form, H.R. 16593 would terminate civilianization of some of the nonmilitary jobs—such as kitchen police—which in the past have been performed by members of the Armed Forces. If we were to enact the bill with this provision, we would, in effect, be telling those young men and women who are thinking about careers as noncommissioned officers that if they joined the military, they would be required to do many menial, unpleasant jobs which would have no connection whatsoever with their role as military personnel. We would be going far to destroy the positive inducements toward creating an all-volunteer force which have already been established.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Congress remain firm to its commitment to an all-volunteer military and adopt the

Sikes amendment, which would strike this provision from the bill.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this appropriations bill.

This bill represents a reduction of \$4.3 billion of the amounts requested by the President. I wish that the reduction might have been greater and I still believe that this area provides fruitful ground for further investigation to obtain meaningful reductions. When the authorization bill was before us I voted for some of these reductions, but it is not easy to isolate these items.

We have taken a marked step forward with the SALT talks and with the interim agreement which we passed in the House and which I supported. At the moment we must keep our defenses adequate even though the same dollar today pays less in salaries and buys less in materiel.

It is with the hope that the next phase of the SALT talks will bring us to a reduction of armaments rather than a continuation of the status quo that I vote in favor of this appropriation today.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the members of the committee for the splendid job they have done in preparing this measure. It is obvious that this is a defense budget which combines strong programs for national security with a commendable desire for cautious frugality.

There is, however, one section of the bill which has given me some cause for concern as regards both our national security and our continued advances in science and technology.

Under "Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy," on page 21, line 15 of the bill, the committee deleted all funds for the procurement of five LC-130 aircraft to be used in support of the National Science Foundation's Project Deep Freeze in Antarctica.

According to the committee report—

The Committee considers the funding of these aircraft in the Navy budget on a non-reimbursable basis, aircraft that are not directly related to Navy objectives and requirements at a time when the Navy claims it cannot afford the appropriate numbers of combat aircraft it requires, to be inconsistent with national defense priorities.

I believe this omission to be most serious. It is one which will adversely affect both the international posture of the United States and American scientific efforts.

I would like to refer my colleagues to the Office of Management and Budget circular A-51, which implemented a national security decision memorandum promulgated in July 1970. That circular directed the National Science Foundation to assume funding for the annual logistic cost of the Antarctic program—which was formerly borne by the Department of Defense—but also specifically directed by the Department of Defense to:

(1) Plan and carry out logistic support requested by the National Science Foundation, and such other programs and functions as may be requested by the Foundation or the Antarctic Policy Group, and in this connection assure the continuing availability, on a mutually acceptable reimbursement or

non-reimbursement basis, of essential logistic support components.

(2) Fund and procure all aircraft required to provide the logistic support or perform other programs or functions requested pursuant to paragraph c.(1).

(3) Procure other essential logistic support components for the U.S. program for Antarctica, on a mutually acceptable reimbursement or non-reimbursement basis, as requested by the National Science Foundation."

The five LC-130 ski-equipped aircraft requested in the Navy budget were pursuant to this order. In placing them in the Navy budget, the Secretary of Defense was carrying out a DOD responsibility in the national interest. It was not intended that these planes should compete for scarce Navy funds needed for combat aircraft procurement. They were intended to be an "add-on" pursuant to the OMB's instructions and those of a national security decision memorandum.

These aircraft are considered vital to this Nation's continued presence in Antarctica. They were requested by the Department of Defense to replace three aircraft which have been lost, and three that, because of their heavy use and advancing age, have been or will be removed from Antarctic service.

HISTORY OF ANTARCTIC AIRCRAFT INVENTORY 1966-72

Season 1966-67—nine total: 2, C-121 J; 1, LC-47; 2, LC-117D; 4, LC-130F.

Season 1967-68—seven total: 2, C-121J; 1, LC-117D; 4, LC-130F.

Season 1968-69—seven total: 2, C-121J; 4, LC-130F; 1, LC-130R.

Season 1969-70—seven total: 2, C-121J; 4, LC-130F; 1, LC-130R.

Season 1970-71—seven total: 2, C-121J; 4, LC-130F; 1, LC-130R.

Season 1971-72—four total: 3, LC-130F; 1, LC-130R.

Season 1972-73—three total: 2, LC-130F; 1, LC-130R.

The impact of failure to procure the replacement aircraft requested by DOD will mean a drastic curtailment in the level of our effort in Antarctica and a dramatic change in this country's posture on the continent including abandonment of inland stations at South Pole and Siple.

For example, without replacement aircraft, the loss of an additional LC-130 will mean: First, deferral of construction at South Pole and Siple stations for an indefinite period; second, the diversion of remaining aircraft to replenishment of life support systems at inland stations; third, limiting capability for the emergency recovery of scientific field parties; fourth, closing and evacuation of historic Byrd Camp; and fifth, the beginnings of evacuation of service and construction workers.

In other words, the failure to procure additional aircraft for the support of Project Deep Freeze will be the beginnings of a diminished American presence in a most strategic quarter of the world. This could only lead to speculation in the international community regarding American intentions in that sector. Other exploratory powers will have to adjust to a new situation in which

*10 years old—more hours on airframes than any C-130's ever built.

the United States has yielded its position of dominance in the Antarctic to the Soviet Union. This would, in all likelihood, and presumably over a short period of time, render the current Antarctic Treaty obsolete in the eyes of the Soviets, with the resultant renewal of political rivalry and competition to the detriment of scientific cooperation and peaceful research, and eventual dissolution of the Antarctic Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, American political and scientific leadership in the Antarctic stems from our unique mobility on the continent which offsets the influence of strategically located Soviet stations. This capability is totally dependent on the availability of long-range, ski-equipped transport aircraft.

The President of the United States has promulgated the following U.S. policy objectives for Antarctica:

First. To maintain the viability of the Antarctic Treaty.

Second. To foster extension of cooperative scientific research.

Third. To insure wise and equitable use of Antarctic resources.

Fourth. To protect American rights in the area.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear in my mind that those objectives cannot be maintained without adequate logistical support for Project Deep Freeze in the nature of long-range, ski-equipped transport aircraft. I also know that there is an understandable desire for the House Appropriations Committee to take this bill to conference with the Senate having as lean and demonstrably functional a defense budget as possible. However, I understand that considerable sentiment is building in the Senate at this moment to restore these vital aircraft to the defense appropriation for fiscal year 1973. I cannot stress strongly enough how crucial I feel these few aircraft are to the future of American scientific efforts and our national security. In the instance that the Senate sees fit to include these five aircraft in the defense appropriation, I would hope that the House conferees would deem it in the national interest to recede on this point.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 16593 which would appropriate funds for the Defense Department for the next fiscal year.

This bill is yet another attempt to saddle the American taxpayer with unneeded armaments and war machines which would boost our overkill potential to astronomical proportions. The administration in one breath tells us that we are on the way to a detente with Russia and China and that our involvement in Vietnam is on the wane. But in the next it asks us to vote approval of a defense budget which is \$1.72 billion above last year's already exorbitant expenditure.

This bill contains \$444 million for the development of the B-1 bomber, \$311 million for the Trident submarine, and \$935.6 million for the ABM. All of these programs represent an escalation in the arms race at a time when the President assures us that we are on the threshold of a new era of peace. In each of these programs Congress is being asked to appropriate millions of dollars for programs which have not been fully test-

ed or researched and which are likely to result in substantial cost overruns.

This bill also appropriates \$2.5 billion for the Vietnam war. We are told that this represents only a part of the amount that will be expended for the war. At this late date—after America has already wasted so many American lives and money—it is time for Congress to tell the President that we will not supply further funds to prop up the corrupt Thieu regime. A dictatorship which has abolished all popular elections in the 10,775 hamlets that make up the country. We should not reward that country's leaders by now passing a bill which will finance further U.S. involvement in the war.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16593) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 322, nays 41, answered "present" 1, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

YEAS—322

Abbt	Bennett	Byrne, Pa.
Adams	Bergland	Byron
Addabbo	Betts	Cabell
Alexander	Biester	Camp
Anderson,	Boggs	Carey, N.Y.
Calif.	Boland	Carlson
Anderson, Ill.	Bolling	Carter
Anderson,	Bow	Casey, Tex.
Tenn.	Brademas	Cederberg
Andrews, Ala.	Bray	Chamberlain
Andrews,	Brinkley	Chappell
N. Dak.	Brooks	Clausen,
Annunzio	Broomfield	Don H.
Archer	Brown, Mich.	Clawson, Del.
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cleveland
Ashbrook	Broyhill, N.C.	Collier
Ashley	Broyhill, Va.	Collins, Tex.
Aspinall	Buchanan	Colmer
Baring	Burke, Fla.	Conable
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Conover
Begich	Burleson, Tex.	Conte
Belcher	Burlison, Mo.	Corman

Cotter	Hosmer	Preyer, N.C.
Coughlin	Howard	Price, Ill.
Crane	Hull	Price, Tex.
Culver	Hunt	Pryor, Ark.
Curlin	Hutchinson	Purcell
Daniel, Va.	Ichord	Quile
Daniels, N.J.	Jacobs	Quillen
Danielson	Jarman	Railsback
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Davis, S.C.	Johnson, Pa.	Rarick
Davis, Wis.	Jonas	Reld
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Dellenback	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
Denholm	Jones, Tenn.	Robinson, Va.
Dennis	Kazen	Rodino
Dent	Keating	Roe
Derwinski	Kee	Rogers
Devine	Keith	Rooney, Pa.
Dickinson	Kemp	Rostenkowski
Dingell	King	Roush
Donohue	Kuykendall	Rousselot
Dorn	Kyl	Roy
Downing	Kyros	Ruppe
Dulski	Landgrebe	Ruth
Duncan	Landrum	St Germain
du Pont	Latta	Sandman
Dwyer	Leggett	Sarbanes
Edwards, Ala.	Lennon	Satterfield
Ellberg	Lent	Saylor
Erlenborn	Lloyd	Schneebeli
Esch	Long, Md.	Schwengel
Eshleman	McClary	Scott
Evans, Colo.	McCloskey	Shipley
Fascell	McCollister	Shriver
Fish	McCormack	Sikes
Fisher	McGulloch	Sisk
Flood	McDade	Skubitz
Flowers	McDonald,	Slack
Flynt	Mich.	Smith, Calif.
Foley	McEwen	Smith, Iowa
Ford, Gerald R.	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Ford,	McKay	Snyder
William D.	McKevitt	Spence
Fountain	McKinney	Staggers
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald,	Stanton,
Frenzel	Mass.	J. William
Fuqua	Madden	Stanton,
Garmatz	Mahon	James V.
Gaydos	Mailhard	Steed
Gettys	Mallory	Steele
Gialmo	Mann	Steiger, Ariz.
Gibbons	Martin	Steiger, Wis.
Goldwater	Mathias, Calif.	Stephens
Gonzalez	Mathis, Ga.	Stratton
Goodling	Matsunaga	Stubblefield
Grasso	Mayne	Stuckey
Gray	Mazzoli	Sullivan
Green, Oreg.	Melcher	Symington
Griffin	Michel	Taylor
Griffiths	Miller, Ohio	Teague, Calif.
Gross	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Grover	Mills, Md.	Thompson, Ga.
Gubser	Minish	Thomson, Wis.
Gude	Mink	Thone
Hagan	Minshall	Tiernan
Haley	Mizell	Udall
Hall	Mollohan	Ullman
Halpern	Monagan	Van Deulin
Hamilton	Montgomery	Veysey
Hammer-	Moorhead	Waggonner
schmidt	Morgan	Wampler
Hanley	Murphy, Ill.	Ware
Hanna	Myers	Whalley
Hansen, Idaho	Natcher	Whitehurst
Harsha	Nelsen	Whitten
Harvey	Nix	Wildnall
Hastings	O'Konski	Wiggins
Hathaway	Passman	Wilson,
Hays	Patman	Charles H.
Hébert	Patten	Winn
Heckler, Mass.	Felly	Wright
Heinz	Pepper	Wyatt
Henderson	Perkins	Wyder
Hicks, Mass.	Pettis	Wyllie
Hicks, Wash.	Peyser	Wyman
Hillis	Pickle	Young, Fla.
Hogan	Pike	Young, Tex.
Holifield	Pirnie	Zablocki
Horton	Powell	Zion

NAYS—41

Abourezk	Edwards, Calif.	Obey
Abzug	Fraser	Podell
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Reuss
Badillo	Harrington	Rosenthal
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Roybal
Blatnik	Helstoski	Scheuer
Burton	Hungate	Seiberling
Chisholm	Karth	Stokes
Clay	Kastenmeier	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Koch	Vanik
Dellums	Mitchell	Whalen
Diggs	Mosher	Wolf
Dow	Moss	Yates
Drinan	Nedzi	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Riegle

NOT VOTING—67

Abernethy	Frey	Rees
Baker	Fulton	Robison, N.Y.
Bell	Gallifanakis	Roncallo
Bevill	Gallagher	Rooney, N.Y.
Biaggi	Hansen, Wash.	Runnels
Blackburn	Hawkins	Ryan
Blanton	Kluczynski	Scherle
Brasco	Link	Schmitz
Brotzman	Long, La.	Sebelius
Byrnes, Wis.	Lujan	Shoup
Caffery	McClure	Springer
Carney	McMillan	Talcott
Celler	Meeds	Terry
Clancy	Metcalfe	Vander Jagt
Clark	Mikva	Vigorito
Collins, Ill.	Miller, Calif.	Waldie
Delaney	Murphy, N.Y.	White
Dowdy	Nichols	Williams
Eckhardt	O'Hara	Wilson, Bob
Edmondson	O'Neill	Yatron
Evins, Tenn.	Poage	Zwach
Findley	Pucinski	
Forsythe	Rangel	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
 Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Waldie against.
 Mr. Meeds for, with Mr. Ryan against.
 Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Mikva against.
 Mr. Carney for, with Mr. Metcalfe against.
 Mr. White for, with Mr. Rees against.
 Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Rangel against.
 Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Collins of Illinois against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Robison of New York.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Terry.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Forsythe.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. McClure.
 Mr. Roncallo with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Bevill with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Zwach.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Fulton with Mr. Schmitz.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Sebelius.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Shoup.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Link with Mr. Scherle.
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. Williams.
 Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Brotzman.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Gallifanakis.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished whip on the majority side, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. The business of the week is concluded today.

At the conclusion of my listing of the program for next week, I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

On Monday there is scheduled the call of the Consent Calendar, but that will be all of the business for Monday. There will be no bills considered under suspensions because of the religious holiday.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week there will be the following:

Tuesday will be the call of the Private Calendar.

Thereafter there will be consideration of:

H.R. 16654, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973:

H.R. 15003, the consumer product safety bill under an open rule with 2 hours of debate;

The move to go to conference on H.R. 7130, the Fair Labor Standards Act amendments. This will be brought up on Wednesday.

H.R. 10295, cargo security, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 15859, emergency medical services, also subject to a rule being granted;

The foreign assistance appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973, subject to a rule being granted; and, lastly;

H.R. 16645, the Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in looking over this program, particularly with no business except the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday, it would appear there is a high likelihood of a session on Friday. Is that a fair observation?

Mr. McFALL. I would reply to the distinguished minority leader that this is a matter on which we will have to see what happens. As the former Speaker, Mr. McCormack, would say, "We will play this one by ear."

It is entirely possible we may be able to do the program very rapidly. In fact, as the gentleman knows, the program is announced in this way so that it is possible we might bring up the foreign assistance legislation on Wednesday, if that is possible, so that on Thursday there would not be much business and the Members might be able to get out earlier and go about whatever they might have to do on the weekend.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1972

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if my friend from California could, on behalf of the majority leadership give us any indication as to when this session of Congress

might be expected to end, either by adjournment sine die or by virtue of a recess or something of that nature.

Mr. McFALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McFALL. I can give the gentleman from Iowa such information as I have. At the whip meeting today the Speaker indicated that we might adjourn October 14. Earlier last week he thought that we might finish our business by October 6. As you know, the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, is aiming for an October 1 deadline. That is the only information I have available to me at this time.

The gentleman from Iowa has been here many, many years longer than I, and he knows this is perhaps an educated guess. The leadership hopes that we get out of here as soon as we can.

Mr. GROSS. Well, could that be classified as an educated guess: "Get out of here as soon as we can"?

Mr. McFALL. The educated guess referred to was the date of October 14.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman thinks we will be out as late as October 14?

Mr. McFALL. I would certainly hope we would be able to get out of here by October 6. I think the leadership on the majority side also hopes that this is possible. I think the leadership on the minority side would also like to get out sooner than October 14. Perhaps the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) might have some comment on that.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if there are rules required on four of these bills and no rules are granted on those bills, then, according to this schedule, we have only one bill or two bills certain to be considered next week, that is, the Labor-HEW bill and the consumer product safety bill.

Mr. McFALL. Also we have the sending of the minimum wage bill to conference.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that would require a minimum of 2 or 3 minutes, I assume.

Mr. McFALL. I would hope that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I hope and trust that the majority leader of the other body—I hope and trust that his schedule for getting out of here October 1 will prevail.

Mr. McFALL. I would agree with the gentleman. I hope that, too.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that the House would not provide any deterrent if the other body is that ambitious and willing to get out of Washington. I would hope that the House would provide no impediment to that, because it seems to me at this stage we are well ahead of the other body in the consideration of legislation.

Mr. McFALL. Well, I would agree with the gentleman from Iowa. I think we both have the same high expectations, and I hope they are not dashed by future events.

Mr. GROSS. It just seems to me it is incredible that the House would even entertain the idea in a presidential election year and with every Member of the House subject to election this fall—it is incredible that it would even entertain

the idea of adjourning this House on October 14. This to me is utterly incredible.

I thank the gentleman for what information he has given us.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just simply rise to a point of information.

I notice that we are going to have the Consent Calendar on Monday, but no suspensions or other bills, because it is a religious holiday. I fancy myself to be a most religious man, and I respect the planning, but what is so irreligious about the Consent Calendar that does not carry over and pervade to the other bill? This defeats me as chairman of the Consent Calendar for the minority side.

Mr. McFALL. As the gentleman knows, this is Yom Kippur coming on Monday. I am advised by the Speaker that it is the tradition that we not have votes on Jewish holidays. We have not met on Christmas; we have not met on Good Friday; so that we observe the tradition of not having votes on Monday. Ordinarily, the Consent Calendar, there are no votes. It is handled efficiently by the gentleman from Missouri Mr. HALL, and the other Members on the Consent Calendar Committee so that there are no votes. For this reason, the Consent Calendar was left on for Monday.

Mr. HALL. As great a respect as I have for Yom Kippur and the feelings of my colleagues, if possibly they care to make preparations more heartily than I do, they might be prepared for a surprise as we call the Consent Calendar on that day.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservations.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ON RECOMPUTATION OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY

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

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the military procurement authorization bill which passed the House yesterday did not include the so-called Hartke amendment on military retired pay. Admittedly a compromise measure, that amendment at least offered an opportunity for the

Congress to restore a portion of the pension plan which military personnel have long been led to expect. Indeed, for most of the present retirees, it would have returned to them a major part of the retirement system which was in effect for most of their military careers. Until 1958 all increases in active duty military pay scales brought about the automatic adjustment—recomputation—of retired pay scales.

While I regret that it was not possible to pass that amendment, I can appreciate the reasons for such a decision. I compliment the House conferees for not yielding to the incredible pressures which must have been brought to bear and for maintaining the position that, without full and accurate knowledge of the costs associated with a particular measure, that measure should not be enacted. This is basic fiscal responsibility and deserves commendation.

I also want to express my sincere delight to learn that the recomputation principle is alive and well in the 92d Congress. The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, has announced that a special Subcommittee on Retired Pay Revisions has been appointed and will hold hearings in the very near future—before the end of this Congress.

Here, at last, is the opportunity to give this subject the in-depth study it deserves. And, provided that ways can be found to fund it, restitution of the recomputation principle may become a reality in the next session of Congress. It will not be an easy victory, however. No matter which cost estimates one accepts, and there are many versions, recomputation is a very expensive proposition. Nonetheless it is essential, in my view, that the Congress recognize the inequities which the 1958 Military Pay Act created for retired military personnel.

I look forward to the hearings on military retired pay revisions and, if granted the opportunity, I intend to appear as a witness at these hearings to present to the committee the views of the many military retirees who reside in my district.

SOVIET JEWRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), who was suddenly called back to New York, I have taken this time to address the House on a subject which has startled many of us in recent weeks.

I want to thank my colleagues for coming here this afternoon, or this evening, rather, to participate in this special order. In addition to the colleagues who are here, I have some 50 statements of Members of this House who have joined with us in supporting our position, which is critical of the Soviet Union for its recent position on the charging of exit visas, ransom visas, for Soviet Jewry.

I want to thank my colleagues for coming here to explore today Soviet-Ameri-

can trade relations in terms of the problem of Soviet Jewry.

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

Mr. PODELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman that I have asked for a special order on the same subject, and my remarks will be in the Record along with the gentleman's remarks.

I would like to express to the gentleman the grave concern that I share along with I think the other Members of this body on the action, or the contemplated action of the Soviet Government in imposing a confiscatory head tax upon the members of the Jewish faith for leaving the Soviet Union. I think this is a disgraceful act. I have been very closely associated with the efforts of promoting of Soviet Union trade, and in my judgment this action very seriously jeopardizes the amity which is required to bring that about.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman on making his statement.

Mr. PODELL. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his remarks, and am happy in the expression of support from the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for taking this special order to call attention to the plight of those who are seeking freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in appealing for suspension of U.S. trade with the Soviet Union until the question of the treatment of Soviet Jews is resolved.

I want to pause in this discussion to present the case of one Soviet Jew who next week faces final action on his appeal to avoid being sentenced to a concentration camp in Russia. This was brought to my attention by Mark Katz, a young community leader in the 27th Congressional District of California.

It all began for Vladimir Markman when he presented papers for exit visas to Israel in 1971. For almost a year and a half he was fighting with Soviet officials for his rights and the rights of other persons for free departure. On April 29, 1972, he was arrested. He was tried in a courthouse and found guilty of anti-Soviet activity and slander of the Soviet state. On August 9, 1972, he was sentenced to 3 years in the notorious Potma Labor camps. During his trial, he was unable to secure an attorney and the only evidence submitted was a satirical book on life in the Soviet Union which was written in 1929.

Markman is now being held in a cell in Sverdlovsk. If his appeal is denied and he goes to the Potma Labor camp—he will never survive. He has a very bad respiratory disease and is severely crippled.

I have made urgent pleas to both Secretary of State William P. Rogers and

Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin to do everything they can to make sure this man is given every possible consideration by the Soviet Government.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this appeal.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to submit their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VANIK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of Soviet Jews by Moscow is well known and well documented to all of us. Recent reports make it clear that the situation is even more grave than anyone thought. Following on the heels of the ransoms are mass arrests and show trials. Telephones are disconnected and radios are jammed.

Jews in the Soviet Union connect these pressures and new harassments directly with President Nixon's efforts to push detente.

They say that the Soviet Government apparently thinks that the U.S. Government will ignore even severe repression and outrageous ransoms all in the cause of detente.

I stand here today, as a Congressman, and as an American, and as a Jew, to say that the United States cannot afford to ignore Russian antisemitism. We must not trade Jews for trucks or computers or technology or gas with these modern Nazis.

I, for one, will vote against any trade concessions for the Russians until they let the Jews go—without huge ransom fees.

I urge the Ways and Means Committee not to pass any legislation to give the Soviets the most favored nation status they want so much until the Russians rescind the exit fee schedule and let the Jews go.

I urge the Appropriations Committee to scrutinize all appropriations legislation for research grants and credits to the Soviet Union and as a condition of any such funding the removal of the exit fees.

I urge the Banking and Currency Committee, in their deliberation on foreign investment and trade to carefully consider whether their actions would encourage Russian persecution of Jews. I urge them to condition expansion of American-Russian trade on the rescinding of the exit fees.

I urge the Agriculture Committee to consider the plight of Russian Jews and this latest barbaric fee schedule when they look into the wheat deal and into the favors our country is granting the Soviet Union.

Most of all, I urge the Russian Government to heed the warnings delivered in this Chamber today by more than

50 Members of the House of Representatives.

The Congress of the United States will carefully consider new trade initiatives in conjunction with the situation of Soviet Jews.

The day has past when the world and the United States averts its attention when Jews are persecuted. It is Washington 1972, not Munich 1938.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, shall we be silent when the Soviet Union boldly and without shame demands a ransom for each person of the Jewish faith who wishes to emigrate to Israel? A schedule of fees is placed upon a human life ranging anywhere from \$5,000 to \$37,000. Next Tuesday the Supreme Soviet meets to ratify the schedule of fees. The transparent excuse is given that the fees are based upon the educational cost. Yet we know that the educated Jew is not permitted to put his talents to use. Should he attempt to adhere to Jewish religious and cultural life, he is faced with the loss of his job, forced enlistment in the army, and forms of harassment designed to compel Jews to deny their heritage.

So coldblooded is this schedule of fees that it is arrived at with a precision of a measuring cup. For example: 4,500 rubles for a teacher's degree; 5,400 rubles for high school graduates; 5,500 rubles for a holder of a BA degree; postdoctoral science degree, 12,200 rubles.

Keep in mind that these fees are to be culminative. Thus each educational attainment carries with it an additional fee in accordance with the schedule set for each advanced degree.

Are we helpless in the face of such inhumanity? Cannot the Congress assert itself by demanding through its trade or other treaties with the Communist countries that the international community recognizes a basic principle of what we term civilized behavior and that is, that human freedom is not for sale.

There are those here tonight on the floor of the House who wish to be heard. The rising voice of the United States Congress will let the Soviet Union know that its official bigotry and tyranny are not "internal" matters.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) and Mr. PODELL for arranging this most significant and urgently needed special order.

I think we all should know that on next Tuesday, September 19, the Supreme Legislative Body of the U.S.S.R. will give final ratification to these outrageous fees that are to be charged to Soviet Jews who desire to go to Israel.

I was in Israel 2 months ago and I met with dozens, even hundreds of Jews who have left the Soviet Union, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that the essential thing for us to say tonight and proclaim it to the entire world is that the new fees to be ratified, and hopefully not on next Tuesday—these new fees are designed to bring millions of dollars in foreign currency to the Russian nation—

as much as a half-billion dollars will come in according to some estimates.

We must be very blunt and say that the Soviets are now contriving to finance their international trade agreements with the export of educated Jews.

I agree thoroughly with Congressman PODELL and with the more than 50 Members of this House who will participate in this special order, and I urge every committee and every Member of Congress not to give the grant of the most-favored-nation trading status that is desired by the Soviet Union until Soviet Jews are allowed to go to Israel.

I will vote against any extension of Commodity Credit Corporation loans necessary to complete the wheat deal until Soviet Jews are allowed to go to Israel.

I will vote against any extension of Export-Import Bank credits and modifications by overseas private investment corporation regulations.

I will not in good conscience support—and I am sure that many of the people in this House, and hopefully most of the people in this House, will not support the new Soviet-American trade initiatives until and unless the current Soviet visa fee schedule policy is reversed.

Mr. Speaker, with a bipartisan group of our colleagues, I have sought this special order to indicate the utter seriousness of our concern about recent Soviet policy developments toward Soviet Jews, and to demonstrate that our concern has deep implications with respect to Soviet-American trade relations.

So far this year approximately 20,000 Soviet Jews have received permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union, and until recently it was estimated that 30,000 or more—more than twice the figure for 1971—would leave Russia during 1972. In the month of June alone nearly 3,100 Soviet Jews left for Israel.

In a desperate attempt to halt this long overdue emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel, on August 3 the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union adopted a series of regulations governing emigration procedures and establishing new exit fees. On August 14 these new fees were put into effect, to the astonishment and dismay of Soviet Jews and concerned individuals throughout the world.

Prior to enactment of these new laws, every Soviet citizen wishing to emigrate had been forced to pay fees amounting to 900 rubles, or approximately \$1,080. The old laws were unjust and repressive in their own right. But the required payment of 900 rubles is dwarfed by the savage and utterly outrageous new laws. These laws, which allegedly require prospective emigrants to "reimburse" the Soviet state for the cost of their education, have resulted in an astonishing escalation of the costs of emigration, an escalation that singles out educated Jews, and in effect commits them to a modern form of slavery.

This is really slavery upon slavery, since Soviet policy regarding emigration of Jews has for years been in literal violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which the Soviet Union is a party. That international

agreement guarantees the right of every citizen to emigrate.

According to the schedule of fees established, the cost of emigration can range from 5,500 rubles—\$6,600—for those who have only finished high school, to 31,000 rubles—\$37,000—for those who hold a doctor of science degree. The fees are incremental. Thus, a holder of the initial Soviet higher education degree, equivalent to the American baccalaureate, is assessed a fee of 5,500 rubles in addition to the 5,500 rubles for his high school education. A graduate of Moscow University who held the equivalent of the American Ph. D. would be required to pay 12,000 rubles—\$14,200—in addition to the 11,000 rubles—\$12,800—required for his earlier education. Other fees are imposed to frustrate emigration, including a 40-percent penalty on those who pay in foreign currency—as all must, since fees invariably exceed savings and average 5 to 8 years' total earnings.

There is no doubt that these oppressive new laws are specifically directed against Soviet Jews, and particularly against educated Jews. Jews constitute the largest group wishing to emigrate from the Soviet Union. They are the most highly educated of the ethnic minorities in Russia. Eighty-five percent of adult Jews in the Soviet Union have received at least a high school education, and current official figures show that 3.15 percent of the Jewish population are university students compared with 1.82 percent of the total population.

What is more, even Soviet officials admit that few, if any, of the Jewish individuals and families wishing to emigrate will be able to pay these fees. According to one published report, 65 Jewish families were stranded in the Soviet Union during the first 6 days in which the new laws were in effect. The total amount of exit fees owed by these families alone—the ransom for their release—is approximately one-half million dollars. To expect that these Russian families could raise this sum from their own savings is ludicrous: the average monthly income in the Soviet Union is approximately \$153, and although professionals and scientists are somewhat better paid, their average monthly income is only \$240. Moreover, Soviet officials have made it clear that only cash is accepted, not personal property.

But unless these 65 families, only the initial group to suffer this great injustice, are able to pay their ransom they will be left in a hellish no-man's land—stranded in Moscow with no money, no homes, no places to go, no papers, and no prospects.

Soviet officials have advised American Jews that they can pay the costs imposed on their Russian brethren. All that is necessary, Soviet officials have told American Jews, is to "transfer through your American bank the necessary amount, and they—the Soviet Jews—will leave."

In essence the Soviet Union is attempting to blackmail the world Jewish community into paying the ransom of each educated Jew. The action of the Soviet Union is simply extortion, for the laimest of reasons and the flimsiest of pretenses.

The Soviet Union claims that these fees are justified because of the State's investment in the education of each of the emigrants, an investment which, we are told, is wholly in forfeit if the educated person leaves. The truth is different. In a letter to the New York Times of September 11, Zev Katz, of the MIT Center for International Studies, thoroughly refuted these Soviet claims. He noted that according to Soviet sources the cost of education for a full-time university graduate is 1,000 rubles for 4 years of precollege education, plus 4,500 rubles for an average of 4½ years of higher education, a total of 5,500 rubles. However, the Soviet exit fees require a university graduate to pay 12,500 rubles—more than twice as much as his education cost. "There is obviously no correlation between the actual costs of education and the payments sought," concluded Mr. Katz.

The Soviet claim that their action is to end a "brain drain" is also transparently false. Time and time again, even before the harsh new fees, Soviet scientists and other highly educated persons have been fired, demoted, and silenced simply for making an application to emigrate. Dramatic evidence of this repression was recently supplied by Prof. Benjamin Levich, an eminent Soviet Jewish physicist, and a member of the prestigious Soviet Academy of the Sciences, who has applied to emigrate. In a letter to the International Biophysical Congress, Professor Levich told of what happens to those scientists who wish to emigrate:

The scientists who apply to the authorities for the permission to leave for Israel are magically transformed into outcasts who are deprived of any right of continuing a scientific activity: publications forbidden, even being cited forbidden.

A person is immediately expelled from any kind of scientific council, editorial boards, demoted and often fully discharged.

A person is constantly living under the conditions of permanent pressure and anguish for the fate of his family and himself.

Given conditions such as these, the Soviet claim that high exit fees will stop a "brain drain" is clearly a sham, for the actions routinely taken against Jewish scientists deprive the Soviet Union of the talents of any Jewish scientist who indicates a desire to emigrate to Israel.

Under such circumstances, the work of all Soviet Jews is hindered by fear—all consideration of emigration aside. In his letter Professor Levich made the following profound observation:

The violation of the civil rights of scientists as compared to other people and the transformation of scientists into the property of the Government is a dangerous precedent.

Today it is the fate of perhaps a small group of scientists at a certain place of the world. Tomorrow it may happen to anybody and anywhere. The brains as well as the hands of any human being are his personal property. I believe as well that the persecution of scientists and the prohibition of their scientific activity as a punishment for their moral and conscience convictions is inhuman, immoral and disgraceful.

Soviet law already requires that every

Soviet citizen who has received a higher education is obliged to spend 3 years in service of the government at an assigned ministry or educational post. Thus, required "reimbursement" payments for exit visas constitute a form of double jeopardy in violation of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights—article 13(1).

In view of these facts, the true motives of the Soviet Union are clear. The new fees are yet another example of the Soviet Union's official policy of harassing Jewish citizens—a policy that has long been demonstrated and which is surely not in the process of decline, as some might have us believe.

These new fees divide and panic the Soviet Jewish community. Educated Jews are divided from their uneducated brethren through the discrimination of the education fees. Jews who wish to remain in the Soviet Union become resentful of those who desire to leave, fearing that the troubles of the latter group will reflect on the already victimized Jews who plan to continue their lives in the Soviet Union. Finally, these fees force a cruel choice upon younger Soviet Jews. They can either choose to continue their education, knowing that as a result they may never be able to leave the country, or they can forgo their education, still without any assurance that they will be able to leave should they wish to. It should be noted that young Soviet Jews who do not go on to universities are obligated to spend at least 2 years in the military service—and for those 2 years, and 5 years thereafter, neither they nor their family are allowed to leave the Soviet Union.

In my view, there is something even more foul than antisemitism implicit in these exit fees. The Soviet need for foreign currency is well known, and this need is especially critical now, in view of the recently negotiated foreign trade agreements, particularly the \$900 million wheat deal with the United States, with the prospect of multibillion dollar agreements in the near future.

It has been estimated that 150,000 emigration requests have been received from Soviet Jewish families. Thus, as many as 400,000 Soviet Jews wish to leave Russia, and recent trends indicate that an increasing percentage of those desiring to leave will be those Jews with the higher education that these new fees penalize. Jewish spokesmen have indicated that 40 percent of those Soviet Jews living in Moscow, and one-quarter of all Jews throughout the Soviet Union, will be affected. Even if emigration were to remain at the current rate of 30,000 per year, these new fees are designed to bring in millions of dollars in foreign currency—as much as one-half billion dollars, according to some estimates. In this light the reasoning behind the Soviet Union's decision to apply a 40-percent surcharge is revealed as another cruel device to extort more hard currency—currency that could be used to pay for American wheat, for example. Thus the Soviets contrive to finance their international trade agreements with the export of a most unusual quantity—educated Jews.

The lessening of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union is a vitally important goal, and of course I applaud all actions which seek to promote international understanding and harmony. But the desire of our country for international peace must not blind us to injustice where it exists and should not inhibit us from acting to eliminate this injustice. We must remember that there can be no real peace when nations flout international agreements—the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in this case—or when nations barter the freedom of human beings in return for some perceived economic advantage.

It is my belief that the continuation of the Soviet Union's exit visa fees policies depends to a measurable degree on whether the United States takes firm action to demonstrate its outrage. Soviet trade policy has historically been intimately connected with political considerations that depart from the actual substance of the agreements enacted. It is a moral imperative that the United States make its condemnation of the education visa fees known to the Soviet Union in the strongest possible way.

Therefore it is appropriate for the Government of the United States to make it absolutely clear to the Soviet Union that the successful conclusion of the recently negotiated trade agreements, and other upcoming Soviet-American trade developments, is dependent on whether the Soviet Union acts to repeal these education exit visa fees.

There are a number of issues that Congress can deal with which directly affect American economic relations with the Soviet Union. Among these are the granting of the most-favored-nation trading status desired by the Soviet Union, the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation loans necessary to complete the wheat deal, extension of Export-Import Bank credits and modifications in the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—OPIC—regulations which would permit insured American private investment in the Soviet Union.

I cannot in good conscience support new Soviet-American trade initiatives until and unless the current Soviet visa fee schedule policy is reversed.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his excellent statement and his wonderful support.

I yield now to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the repression of Jews within the Soviet Union appears to be growing still. Repeatedly, we in the United States have expressed our great concern over the actions by the Soviet Government against its Jewish citizens.

Recently, we were deeply shocked by an even greater harassment in the form of higher fees for those seeking to emigrate.

Shortly after these new fees were initiated, my colleague from New York (Mr. Dow) and I met with an official of the Soviet Embassy here in Washington to express our concern and that of many

other Members of the Congress over the treatment of Soviet Jews.

We carried with us a letter from nearly 100 Members of this body to Communist Party leader Brezhnev expressing our concern that relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. might be hampered by the Soviet Union's policy toward its Jewish citizens.

We were told at that time that the problems of Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union were an internal problem and of no concern to the people of the United States. Our response at that time, and it is the same today, is that Americans are concerned about human rights everywhere.

In my judgment, it would be totally unrealistic for the Soviet Government to think these actions will not be an issue as we in the Congress and in the Nation are confronted with Soviet desires for trade arrangements with and concessions from the United States.

The repressions of which I speak, Mr. Speaker, are manifold. They include prohibitions against the practice of religion and the banning of books in Hebrew. They include job discrimination, discrimination in educational opportunities, and, of course, discrimination in emigration policies.

But they also include harassment and arrests of those who seek to leave the Soviet Union or to acknowledge their Jewishness, induction into the military, job loss, intensive questioning, disconnection of phone lines, and travel restrictions.

These higher fees represent a further attempt to stifle the individual freedoms and human rights of a large group of Soviet citizens.

Because these actions are so repugnant to our American concept of the inalienable rights of man and the limited rights of government and to our way of life in this free society, they cannot be ignored by the American people and will not be ignored by the Congress as it considers the role of future relations with the Soviet Union.

This treatment of Soviet Jews also gives rise to a great question of credibility on the part of the Soviet Government. The Soviet Union has signed the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, but refuses to live up to that declaration. At the same time that government expects the United States to believe that it will live up to any agreements signed between the two governments.

To the leaders of the Soviet Union, I would say, we in the United States are waiting for an answer, just as thousands of Jews within the Soviet Union are waiting for freedom and an end to the Soviet policy of ethnic and religious repression which hangs as a cloud over better relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his comments.

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

Mr. PODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with the President's recent trip to Moscow—a trip

hailed as both necessary and welcome—the United States has entered a new period of detente with the Soviet Union. But while America is busy selling grain to the Soviets, the Soviets are busy selling bodies. What should have produced a new high in human relations has seemingly contributed directly to further destroying the rights of millions of Jews living in the Soviet Union.

Before the President's arrival in Moscow, the situation of Soviet Jews was bad—emigration from the U.S.S.R. was a long and difficult process; Jews were unable to study their history; practice their religion; or read their Hebrew books. The Soviet state was continuing its longstanding efforts to destroy Jewish culture. Many of us here tonight wrote the President and later telegraphed him in Moscow urging that he raise the question of human rights—both of Soviet Jews and Lithuanian Catholics—with the Soviet leadership. But after the President's visit, the situation further deteriorated.

As early as the fall of 1970 reports indicated that a new and heavy tax would be imposed on those Soviets wishing to emigrate and that the amount of tax would vary in accordance with the amount of education that person had received. After the President's visit, and after major trade agreements were signed, the "ransom" would range from 2,000 rubles to 25,000 rubles or even as high as 87,000 rubles and would be further computed according to the country to which an individual—a Jewish individual—desired to go. There is no guarantee that these ransom rates will not rise even higher.

With an average income of 140 rubles per month, it would take most Soviet citizens 10 years or so to be able to save the necessary funds. The Soviet Government says that this "exit fee" is repayment for the education received from the Soviet Government.

For many people who had been expecting to leave—for many who have gone through the entire, complicated exit permit process and were simply waiting for their appointed departure date to arrive and upon whom this new tax was imposed—hope turned to desperation. In some cases, raising this amount of money may violate economic laws selectively enforced by the Soviet Government. Students have begun withdrawing from the universities or not enrolling at all—because the more education one has received, the higher the ransom. But young males not continuing a course in higher learning are subject to Soviet military service and upon completing military service are prevented from leaving the Soviet Union for a period of up to 5 years—and many of the families of these servicemen also come under this restriction. Scientists and those with highly sensitive or security jobs may be prevented from leaving under any circumstances.

Not only are Jews being prevented from leaving the Soviet Union, but they are also being systematically prevented from living any kind of "normal" life within the Soviet Union. Just prior to the President's visit, and still in effect at

the present time, all radio communication from foreign countries was cut off. Soviet "citizens" were not allowed to enter the American Embassy for information they desired. Telephone service to important Jewish leaders was cut off. Jewish people have been subject to widespread interrogation by the KGB. During the President's visit, Jews were not only subject to house or city arrests, but Jewish leaders in Moscow were actually incarcerated and thrown in jails several miles from Moscow—where there would be no chance of their presenting a protest petition to our President. Upon being released, the prisoners were told outright that their arrests were because of the President's visit.

Since the President's trip, arrests have been accelerated—especially under "Article 70," a catch-all subversion clause that would indict anyone wanting to leave the country.

These anti-Semitic actions have not been committed only against Soviet Jews—which is outrageous enough—but against foreigners as well. Americans were shocked at learning that car windshields were broken and tires were slashed on cars belonging to American officials in our Embassy, but few people were aware of the fact that these officials all happened to be Jewish.

The United States must act now to stop this harassment and enslavement of Soviet Jews. I was pleased to join with a large number of my colleagues earlier this week in sponsoring the following resolution:

Whereas the Soviet Union has refused to permit Jewish citizens to emigrate from a land where they are forced to live with bigotry and repression to Israel, which is offering them a home; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has been confiscating almost all of the possessions of those Jews who are permitted to go to Israel; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has begun demanding a ransom of up to \$25,000 for Jews who have an advanced education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Government and leaders of the Soviet Union should be condemned for creating a class of slaves in the twentieth century by forcing thousands of people to live and work in a country which they want to leave, because they do not have the money to ransom themselves into freedom.

But resolutions and verbal condemnations are not enough in this situation. It appears that the Soviets have waited to take this action until certain trade agreements with the United States had been completed. It is obvious that the Soviet economy is desperately in a need of a larger quantity of consumer and industrial goods. It is even more obvious that the Soviets face a constant problem with the agricultural sector of their economy. Over the years, they have had repeated shortages and they have been unable to develop the feed grain supplies they need to increase their meat consumption.

Therefore, it is time that we act to limit these trade agreements—until the Soviets agree to religious freedom and to the freedom of emigration of all citizens.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdic-

tion over most trade matters, I have been active in trade legislation. It has been my hope over the years that trade could help the American economy and contribute to a lessening of world tensions. As a result, in the past, I have sponsored legislation to provide for increased East-West trade and to extend most-favored-nation trading status to some Eastern bloc countries.

A nation which demands ransom for human beings must not be rewarded with a favored nation or preferred trading status.

I would like to announce here and now, that, though I am cosponsor of this type of legislation, I will oppose it in the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the Congress unless the Soviets cease this harassment and eliminate this ransom requirement—a requirement that is reminiscent of the Egyptian pharaohs' edicts of 3,500 years ago, or—more recently—Hitler's plan of trading human beings for trucks. Basic human rights transcend any economic considerations.

It is time now, as trade breakthroughs are announced with the Soviet Union, that we draw the line. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I shall introduce legislation next week to preclude any further consummation of trade agreements unless and until the Soviet Union ceases the harassment of its Jewish citizens and recognizes the full meaning of its own constitution on freedom of emigration and expression. This ransom must stop and our trade advances must be suspended until this goal is achieved.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose legislation to extend credit and trade and investment insurance to the Soviets until this harassment is terminated.

The Soviets have recently completed the purchase of some 800 million bushels of wheat—the most massive wheat purchases ever made. They may still be purchasing additional supplies at this time. I have previously criticized these sales on a number of grounds. There is the strong possibility that there was "insider" trading information between certain Department of Agriculture officials and the major wheat exporting companies. But, principally, this wheat sale, is the equivalent of a "Russian bread tax" on the American consumer. When one counts all the costs to the American taxpayer of supporting the wheat subsidy and export programs and higher prices which made this sale possible, it appears that the cost of this wheat sale to the American public will exceed \$1.5 billion. Now that the price of wheat has risen 50 cents a bushel and there are shortages in our remaining wheat reserves, I believe that we should limit any further sales of wheat. In particular, we should prohibit the shipment of any more wheat to the Soviet Union which is, in part, purchasing this wheat with the ransom currency extorted from its own citizens. It is incredible, but it appears that the Soviet Union is expecting compassionate Americans to pay the ransoms for their captive families and friends in the Soviet Union to generate

cash to purchase American wheat. This is not trade—it is extortion.

I would like to remind the House that the Export Control Act provides that the Secretary of Commerce can limit the export of commodities if it effects the welfare of the domestic economy.

The act states that it is the policy of the United States to use export controls to the extent necessary to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand.

It is time that the Secretary of Commerce exercise this authority. If he does not, then we should legislate export controls for wheat immediately—to prevent a Soviet bread tax on Americans—to prevent trade with an extortionist nation.

It is our moral duty to use all the power at our command to influence the Soviet Government to stop this policy of harassment and persecution. We must always remember that all men and women are members of the same family—and that the denial of liberty of any person is a danger to us all.

At this time, these moral considerations of freedom and human rights of the Jews and others living in the Soviet Union have particular importance as we approach the highest of the holy days—Yom Kippur. The hatred and contempt represented by these actions of the Soviet Union against its own citizens must be decried, vigorously opposed, and halted if our beliefs in these basic freedoms for all mankind are to be realized. We cannot, in good conscience, allow economic consideration to override these basic human rights. It is time for the United States to draw the line.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) and congratulate him on his excellent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to yield to BELLA ABZUG, my colleague from New York, at this time. However, Mrs. ABZUG's aged mother fell last night and broke her hip, a very serious matter for an elderly individual, and the gentlewoman left for New York as soon as she cast her vote on the defense appropriations bill.

Congresswoman ABZUG had prepared a statement for this special order, and I hand it in for inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN ABZUG

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished dean of the House and chairman of the New York delegation, Mr. Celler, for taking this special order.

As we celebrate the new Jewish year of 5733 we must again reflect on the conditions of Jews in the Soviet Union. We have recently learned that the Soviet Union is going to require all those who wish to emigrate to pay retroactively for the cost of their education. At an estimated cost of between \$5,000 and \$25,000, this is nothing more or less than ransom.

The right to emigrate is one of the basic freedoms guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The Soviet Constitution, as well, provides for a free education for all of its citizens.

I have written to the United Nations Hu-

man Rights Commission to protest this new attack on basic human freedoms. The issue of Soviet Jewry has been raised in the court of world opinion and we must do all that we can to keep it before that body.

There is a considerable amount of economic intercourse going on between the Soviet Union and the United States these days, and the Russian government is obviously anxious to increase it even more. I would have serious reservations about granting them special trade treatment and providing the \$5 billion in investment guarantees that American corporations are seeking through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for investment in the Soviet Union if they are going to attempt to extort money from Jews who desire to emigrate. I very much favor increased trade with the Soviet Union. I think that it is an important way of increasing our understanding of one another, but such antics as seeking to ransom Jews give me pause. I do hope that the Soviet government will reconsider this ill-advised policy and agree to abide by the guarantees of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and the Soviet Constitution by permitting emigration by those who desire to leave.

We must remember that in addition to those Jews who wish to emigrate there are many who wish to identify as Jews but remain in the Soviet Union. However, free access to Jewish language, cultural, religious and educational institutions and publications, which flourished during the early years of the Soviet government, barely exist today.

The practice of religious freedom is supposedly allowed under Soviet law, but in actuality, unlike other recognized religious groups, Judaism is not permitted any central or coordinating structure in the USSR, and publication of prayer books is severely limited.

As we approach the highest Jewish Holy Day, Yom Kippur, I urge all people, Jew and non-Jew alike, to make the plight of Soviet Jewry part of their prayers.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow).

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOW. First I should like to commend the gentlemen from New York (Mr. Celler and Mr. PODELL) my colleagues from New York, for arranging time so that we may express ourselves on the great problem of the treatment of the Soviet Jews by a tyrannical Russian Government.

Often when we discuss the persecution of our fellow man we can only relate to unfortunate events from newspaper articles or third-person accounts. When stories of repression and persecution come to us through the printed word or from a reporter on television, it is difficult to gain a sense of empathy—which, of course, is essential if we are to feel compassion for the suffering of others.

Tuesday the pain of religious persecution in the Soviet Union was brought right into my office. I had a 7-minute conversation with a woman in Moscow who has seen unending harassment since she, her husband and her two daughters applied for visas for Israel. It required 37 calls before the authorities finally put the call through.

Mrs. Lydia Korenfeld was an interpreter. Her husband was a mechanical engineer. They had a car and a nice apartment. Yet when they asked the So-

viet Government if they could leave, the answer was an emphatic "No." Furthermore, both Mr. and Mrs. Korenfeld subsequently lost their jobs. Neither has worked for a year.

I would like to submit a transcript of my conversation with Mrs. Korenfeld. She must be a very courageous woman, since she may suffer further reprisals after speaking to a U.S. Congressman. I would not have called her, but that her friends in the United States urged me to do so.

Her story is probably not far different from those of hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who have risked all their material possessions—and even arrest—in the hope of gaining their freedom.

The transcript of our phone conversation follows below:

TRANSCRIPT OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVE JOHN G. DOW AND LYDIA KORENFELD IN USSR

JGD: Is this Mrs. Korenfeld?

LK: Yes.

JGD: Congressman John Dow from Washington.

LK: Oh! Hello. So nice to talk to you.

JGD: This is the first time I'm glad to talk to you. Now, tell me, how did you celebrate the Rosh Ha-shanah holiday?

LK: Well, the Rosh Ha-shanah holiday was not very merry here. Mostly because we could not go to the synagogue.

JGD: You couldn't go to the synagogue.

LK: No. The street was cleared of everybody starting at seven o'clock in the evening and everybody who went to the street to go to the synagogue was thrown away. There was a lot of police. They didn't permit people to go to the street.

JGD: The policemen turned you away?

LK: What?

JGD: I say the policemen turned you away?

LK: Yes they did.

JGD: That's to bad.

LK: I explained to them that it's a religious holiday and everybody is entitled to go to their church. They said . . . "No, you won't."

JGD: I'm sorry to hear that.

LK: It was very bad.

JGD: How are you living now? Do you have any money to live on?

LK: Well, I don't work for a year and a half and my husband doesn't work for more than a year. We can't find any kind of work anywhere, nobody . . .

JGD: Well, then how do you get along?

LK: Another person in my family is working—my daughter, Ludmilla. She was thrown out of college when she applied for a visa for Israel. Now she is working as a typist.

JGD: Your daughter is working?

LK: Yes. She's the only one in the family working. She is working as a typist. She supports her father, mother and sister.

JGD: She must be your daughter Ludmilla—she's working.

LK: Yes.

JGD: She was studying electronics. Is that it?

LK: I see you know about all our family. It's very good.

JGD: Yes, I heard about your family. Well, I hope you have better luck. Now, do you have any message to tell me?

LK: Well, you know our position. You know our new financial decrease and you understand that.

JGD: Yes I do.

LK: It puts us in a very difficult position.

JGD: Pardon?

LK: I say that all these new events puts us in a very difficult position . . . with our lives.

JGD: Well, there are many people in America that are concerned about you. And about other Jewish people that are having difficulty

and being persecuted. We think of you and we don't know exactly what we can do, but many of the Congressmen are concerned about it.

LK: It's very nice that ordinary people are concerned and even more nice than congressmen who are politicians. It's very important that you think about us.

JGD: What would you want the congressmen to do to help you?

LK: I'm definitely sure you know much better what to do. I just want to tell you and all your friends that you're friends of ours . . . families here in Moscow . . .

JGD: Well you tell your friends that I called.

LK: Yes I shall and please tell your friends that we hope they will work hard. And do something to help us! Otherwise our situation is very desperate.

JGD: Yes, well, don't lose your spirit.

LK: We try not to.

JGD: Don't do that, because I think the Russian government does listen to the views that are expressed around the world.

LK: We hope so because now the attitude of the authorities over Jews who want to go to Israel is very severe.

JGD: Perhaps I better say good-bye to you and I'll call again sometime.

LK: Good. Very good.

JGD: You know they were going to arrange for me to call you tomorrow, but apparently they got the call sooner so if you get word that I'm going to call tomorrow, you tell them that I did call today and that I'll call some other day.

LK: O.K.

JGD: Well, give my respects to Mr. Korenfeld and to your two daughters.

LK: Thank you very much and my respects to your family.

JGD: I will do that. I hope we can talk again sometime.

LK: I hope so.

JGD: Yes. Well, good fortune.

LK: Thank you. Good luck.

JGD: Shalom.

LK: Shalom.

JGD: Bye.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and thank him for his excellent statement. I should like to state at this time that during a recent visit I had made to the Soviet Union, during the dead of night I met with Mrs. Korenfeld and heard her story firsthand in the same manner as the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow) heard it when he spoke with Mrs. Korenfeld by telephone. It is truly a tragic situation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and for taking the time to give the Members of this body the opportunity to express themselves on several matters of serious concern: Moral, economic, personal, and otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I seriously question whether the agreement for grain and other commodities with the Soviet Government should be consummated as long as the ransom for Jews is being demanded. The ransom which the Soviet Union is demanding will, in my judgment, be used to pay for a good portion of the grain which the Soviets will be buying from the United States.

The grain agreement announced July 8 calls for the United States to sell \$750 million of grain to the Soviet Union.

With serious wheat shortages there this year, that amount could go as high as \$900 million or even \$1 billion.

Since the ruble is not an international currency, the grain will have to be paid for with dollars or some other hard currency.

On August 3, the Soviet Union imposed an "education tax" ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000 on each Jew granted a visa to leave that country. The "tax" is based on the degree of education attained by the individual. In addition, there is a 40-percent surcharge for paying the "tax" in foreign currency. Since it is virtually impossible for a Soviet citizen to save such large amounts of money, the "tax" or ransom, as it is in reality, will have to be paid by outside sources.

Prior to August 3, the Soviet Union maintained a \$1,000 fee for emigration permits for Jews wishing to leave the Soviet Union.

The vast majority of the ransom which will be paid for the release of the Soviet Jews will probably come from Americans. Estimates as to how much money this will entail range from \$85 to \$340 million.

Thus, nearly half of the grain purchased by the Soviets could be purchased with money provided to the Russians by Americans. This, in effect, puts Americans in the position of buying the grain for the Soviets.

This may have been a good financial move on the part of the Soviets, but one that is unconscionable for the United States to be a part of.

I have written to the President urging him to take positive action in protest of the Soviet demands for ransom for Jews who wish to emigrate. Specifically, I urged him to instruct the Secretary of State to issue a formal protest to the Soviet Government expressing the deep concern of the American people and urging that the "tax" be rescinded immediately, and to instruct our permanent Representative to the United Nations to bring this situation before the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly.

I feel strongly that the United States should seek the elimination of the ransom on Soviet Jews prior to beginning deliveries of wheat and other commodities to the Soviet Union.

Mr. PODELL. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his excellent statement. I should like to add that I share his views, and certainly appreciate the wonderful statement he has made.

I now yield, Mr. Speaker, to each of the individuals who has requested time here.

I should like to state this further thought, that the Soviet Union must be made aware. These statements were gathered within the past 48 hours. The individuals who spoke here did so within 48 hours. More than 50 Members of the Congress have expressed their thinking here today.

We would like the Soviet Union to know if they expect to continue free and open trade with this country they are going to have to let the Jews leave without trying to sell their bodies, because otherwise this country is not going to trade with them.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the terrorist activities of last week have shaken the conscience of the entire world. Lives were unjustly taken, families were severed, and great suffering has taken place. Yet, we all recognize that terrorism can show its face in many different forms. Existence can be stifled, families can be unfairly separated, and men can live in fear and anguish without the direct use of an assassin's bullet.

The recent educational ransom which has been demanded of Soviet Jews wishing to immigrate to Israel represents the most cruel and most oppressive form of persecution yet to be inflicted upon these innocent people. In a discussion early this morning on this crucial situation with Mr. Leonard M. Schroeter, the principal legal assistant to Israel's attorney general, attention was focused on the scope as well as the deep psychological effect of this horrid "brain tax."

To begin, 150,000 visa applications have been sent out to Soviet Jewish families, implying that approximately 400,000 individuals are presently involved in some area of the immigration process. Judging by the educational level of those who have already immigrated to Israel, about 40 percent of those applying from Moscow, about 35 percent of those from Leningrad and in general about 25 percent of all those who have made visa applications will be subject to this ransom fee. Thus the sum demanded by the Soviet Government is an amount exceeding \$0.5 billion.

Second, a university graduate earns approximately 128 rubles per month. By an average estimate, 15,000 rubles are now needed to complete the requirements of this exit fee. It would involve an individual's gross income of between 10 and 12 years to achieve this end, and in a country where every penny must be used toward food and other vital necessities, this demand is virtually impossible to answer. An individual is placed in a complete state of helplessness. As a result, families may panic and try to sell their belongings through the black market—an act which constitutes an economic crime in the Soviet Union and which will lead to immediate arrest. Jewish youth have responded by withdrawing from the universities. However, withdrawal implies immediate induction into the army or navy. A Jew is therefore forced to fight and to swear by an oath which places him on the other side of the Suez, making him a direct enemy of his own people. In addition, after a 2- or 3-year term of service, one must remain in Russia for an additional 5 years, thereby freezing one's possibilities of immigrating for 8 full years.

It must be stated again and again that we in the United States do not accept the idea of human bodies for sale. Under no circumstances should money be raised to pay this ransom fee. The Soviet appetite will only increase to levy additional fees from those who have graduated from secondary and from technical school as well, and who knows what other demands will be formulated. Just as we cannot give in to the demands of

terrorist assassins we cannot give in to the demands imposed at this time.

As Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, I have introduced a bill calling on the President to take all possible steps to help persuade the Soviet Union to rescind the recent discriminatory schedule of exit fees. Although the decree applies to anyone emigrating from the Soviet Union to a non-Communist country, obviously it is geared specifically toward further harassment of Soviet Jews. I stressed in this bill:

The United States has traditionally upheld the free movement of all peoples as a basic human right, and the imposition of this brain tax is in effect an outright case of criminal blackmail. It is unconscionable to keep men, women and children in a country against their will by this sinister device, and Russia must be made aware that civilized nations throughout the world will not allow this blackmail attempt to go unchallenged.

On previous occasions, I have urged the President to aid Soviet Jewry, speaking in the name of all humanity. On May 9, the State Department reported that the United States would make \$2 million available to assist Soviet Jews who desired to immigrate to Israel. This announcement came only 3 weeks after I had called on the President to take such action.

In the present session of this Congress, I urged the Attorney General to permit certain defined refugee groups to enter the United States and on August 1971, responding to my continued efforts. Attorney General Mitchell used his authority to parole all Soviet Jews who were able to leave the Soviet Union and who desired entry into the United States.

This year, I had the honor of being elected chairman of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration—an organization which has, since the close of World War II, assisted in reuniting dispersed and separated families and in giving them the strength and the hope to rebuild their lives.

I am, therefore, acutely aware of the needs and rights which have been so unjustly taken away from Soviet Jews. It is my fervent hope that this horrid tax will soon be lifted and that the Soviet Union will realize that such action, severely condemned by all those in this Chamber tonight, simply cannot continue.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice in condemnation of the Soviet Union for its establishment of a schedule of exorbitant visa fees for educated Jews who wish to emigrate. This policy can only be called a reprehensible form of extortion.

For those Soviet Jews who have been engaged in a constant and continual struggle to emigrate to Israel, sustained for such long periods only by the hope that the visas would be granted, this new policy means the end of hope.

The ransoming of human beings is one policy all decent men must absolutely refuse to accept. Indeed, the response of the Jewish leadership in the Soviet Union has been that under no circumstances is the ransom to be paid. In their

view, according to Mr. Leonard W. Schroeter who just returned from visiting Soviet Jewish leaders:

The Soviet appetite with respect to this matter is unlimited, and if ransom is paid it will only encourage further imposition (already threatened) with respect to technical schools and even secondary schools.

Another distressing feature of this policy is that it may have been instituted at this time in order to obtain much-needed hard currency with which to purchase Western goods. The Soviets may be acting on the premise that the world Jewish community will pay the ransom fee to help its brethren emigrate to Israel.

If economic gain is indeed one motive for the further Soviet harassment of Jews, then it is appropriate that the United States link the moral issues involved with United States-Soviet trade relations.

Congress has the constitutional responsibility for the establishment of trade relations with other nations. Most-favored nation and other forms of tariff treatment, Ex-Im Bank credits, and OPIC guarantees are all legislative matters which the Congress will consider.

The Soviets have already made it known that they are seeking MFN treatment as an important priority in any future negotiations. Legislation granting such authority must be approved by the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in putting the Soviet Government on notice that if it persists in this ransom declaration, we may take appropriate action to revise our trade arrangements with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the prospect of a denial of the trade terms which the Soviet Union desires would demonstrate far more clearly than any political pronouncement that the imposition of extortionist visa fees can prove to be economically counterproductive for the Soviet economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join the efforts to insure that the spiritual and cultural—and now economic—rights of Soviet Jews are not extinguished and that those who wish to emigrate are given a chance to do so.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Presidential Adviser Henry Kissinger will leave Moscow tomorrow after the completion of talks which have accomplished significant Soviet-American trade agreements. Three days after his departure, the Supreme Soviet will meet to ratify the schedule of fees which are to be imposed on educated Soviet Jews who are seeking to emigrate from the Soviet Union. I thoroughly condemn these extortionist Soviet visa fees and I believe that it is essential that we link the issue of increased trade with the imposition of these oppressive ransoms.

In Moscow alone, 40 percent of the applicants for visas will be affected by the new tax requirement. The average amount per application is estimated at 15,000 rubles, a sum that is roughly equivalent to 10 years of gross income. The aggregate amount over the next year or two would be 675 million rubles, or

upwards of three-quarters of a billion dollars.

The Soviet Union's placing of price tags on state-supplied education is a reprehensible form of extortion. The transparency of the Soviet argument that they are trying to recoup educational expenses is evident: All Soviet citizens produce far more than they consume. The argument that the Russian Government is acting to end the brain drain is equally fallacious, because once a Soviet citizen announces his determination to emigrate to Israel, he is fired from his job and must find menial tasks to earn his livelihood. Many distinguished Soviet scientists, including members of the Soviet Academy of Science, have been forced into unemployment or have only been permitted to work at menial jobs simply as a result of their having applied for an exit permit.

There can be no justification for the posting of a price list on human beings. If this is an attempt to limit the number of Soviet Jews who seek higher education, it is indefensibly repressive. If this reflects despair on the part of Soviet officials that their efforts to intimidate the Jews have not worked, then it is an obscene and inhumane desperation. If this is an attempt to obtain much needed foreign currency by blackmailing the world Jewish community into ransoming its brethren, then Soviet officials have made the unforgivable decision to ransom Soviet citizens for foreign exchange.

We cannot allow ourselves at this critical juncture to commence a "business as usual" approach in the granting of trade concessions to the Soviet Union in the face of its blatant disregard for human decency. We must absolutely refuse to accept the Russian's repression by extortion.

Our Government must bring all possible pressure to bear on the Soviet Government for an immediate cessation of its unjust and immoral strictures against Soviet Jews. We cannot be a party to a trade of lives for profits.

Mr. Speaker, on August 14, the free world was shocked and dismayed to learn of the Soviet Union's enactment of legislation requiring huge and unrealistic sums of money to be paid in order for Jews to receive permission to emigrate to freedom.

Yesterday our colleague, Mr. RIBICOFF, urged us to condemn this "extortionist Soviet visa fees."

Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday morning at 11 a.m. there will be a large demonstration protesting this Soviet blackmail held on the Ellipse. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush; Mr. Sargent Shriver; and Mrs. Charlotte Jacobson, Director of the American Section of the World Zionist Organization will participate in the program. I would like to take this opportunity to encourage every Member of Congress to join in this protest against this most recent and vicious Soviet anti-Jewish attack.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, it is expected that the Soviet Union will officially ratify its outrageous and inhuman policy of charging exit fees to those wishing to emigrate from

the Soviet Union. The amount of the fee will depend on the education of those leaving and these fees may range from \$2,000 to \$5,000. This policy is clearly aimed at Soviet Jews who have found it necessary to flee their country in order to freely practice their religion.

This is just one more obstacle in a series of barriers which have been raised against Soviet Jews wishing to leave their country. They have been fired from their jobs, drafted into the army, and even committed to mental institutions. Now they are being even further harassed simply because they desperately want the right to be Jews.

The Government of the Soviet Union, of course, claims that all Soviet citizens are affected equally by the exit fees and that these fees are consistent with the policy of paying the government back for an education which the Soviet people financed. This is an obvious shame.

Mr. Speaker, there are no other religions or national minorities except the Jews in the Soviet Union which have been applying in great numbers for exit visas. In practice, and clearly in its intent, this policy is aimed at Soviet Jewry. Regarding the cost of receiving a public education, all Soviet citizens are already required to repay the Government by working for an appropriate ministry or by serving in a Government-sponsored agency for up to 3 years. This policy was seen as adequate by Soviet officials until a growing number of Soviet Jews realized that only by leaving their country could they find religious freedom.

Soviet Jews have been courageous in their opposition to these repressive measures. More than 70,000 affidavits have been sent from Israel to Soviet Jews seeking exit permits—and the number of Soviet Jews who are willing to risk confrontation with the Soviet Government is growing steadily.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of Soviet Jewry is the cause of humanity. Soviet Jews have received the support of people of all religions—Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic, and it is now a most favorable moment for this administration to show its support for the cause of Soviet Jewry. The Soviet Union wants something from the United States. At this time the Soviet Government wants trade advantages from us. They are urgently in need of trade concessions for the importation of agricultural commodities, computers, and other products which they can now only buy in this country. This is a most appropriate time, to review thoroughly our pending trade agreements with the Soviet Union to make sure our Nation shows its support of basic human rights. The Soviet Union is violating its pledged word in the Covenant on Human Rights, and its own Constitution, for that matter. Both these instruments proclaim the right of the citizens of the Soviet Union to freedom of emigration to another land.

The use of international trade agreements for eliciting concessions from a trading partner is not new. The administration has already made it clear that the granting of most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union is contingent upon their repayment of the lend-lease loans

which were made during the Second World War. To require other concessions, particularly when they involve basic human rights, is entirely appropriate and should be fully explored.

The Soviet Government is looking forward to the lowering of tariff barriers and the extension of credit so that trade between our countries may be increased. While I certainly welcome increased trade in the hope that it will lead to the relaxation of international tension, I do not think that we should grant any trade concessions until the Soviet Government complies with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Soviet Constitution itself. I think that it is entirely appropriate to use our leverage in the pending trade agreements to encourage the Soviet Government to end its official discrimination against religious minorities.

In the debate on the extension of the Export Control Act a few weeks ago, I stated to the House there was precedent, ample precedent for considering human rights in connection with trade relations with another nation. That consideration makes perfectly appropriate and discussion in the pending trade negotiations the inhuman and discriminatory treatment of its Jewish citizens by the Soviet Union.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just when a degree of normalcy was returning to the lives of Jews in the Soviet Union, the latest move to strip them of all freedom was announced. A nation of the world has joined the ranks of kidnapers and terrorists currently demanding ransoms for the safety of hostages. Soviet citizens desiring to emigrate to Israel must now pay a fee of many thousands of dollars before permission to leave can be granted.

The Soviet Government knows these fees, ranging from \$5,000 to almost \$40,000, are beyond the means of those desiring to leave. And the Government, not wanting any Jew to escape, made this policy retroactive to include those whose exit visas are already under consideration.

The more educated you are, the more you pay. The Soviet explanation is that the money must be exacted in payment for the years of schooling. The world will not accept this thinly veiled excuse from the Soviets nor will it fail to react to the insidiousness of it all.

The Soviets know where the sympathies of so many Americans lie. Rather than watch friends and relatives languish in a country not of their choosing, Americans would pay the price for the freedom of those being held. But I for one do not want the United States to become a party to this international auction of human flesh to the highest bidder.

In the past I have joined my colleagues in the House in appealing to the Soviets to permit Jews to emigrate freely. Letters and congressional resolutions have in large part been ignored. Perhaps it is time to exercise economic leverage in our trade arrangements with the Soviets rather than continue to waste our words and our energies.

Time is fast running out for the Soviet Jews. Each day of harassment and abuse further erodes their hope. The point is daily driven home to them that the coun-

tries of the world would rather stand by helplessly than risk any sort of confrontation. We must assure them that America is willing to risk reprisals rather than condone by silence such inhuman treatment.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, as a nation we have strongly supported the right of all persons to emigrate from any country and are committed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. Repeatedly during this Congress we have protested the barriers against the emigration of Soviet Jews maintained and now worsened by the Soviet Government.

Now, at a time when it appeared the Soviet prohibition against emigration had begun to relax, the Soviet Union has imposed exorbitant and arbitrary fees on those seeking to emigrate from the U.S.S.R.—fees that cannot possibly be met.

This new policy which will shortly be ratified by the Supreme Soviet must receive our strongest condemnation. Moreover, we should make it clear to the Soviet Union that Congress' attitude toward further improvements in our relations with the U.S.S.R. will be strongly influenced by continued Soviet violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues here in condemnation of the incredible policy of the Soviet Union which puts a price tag on human beings. There is a situation that is wrapped in historical irony. A couple of generations back, a strong-willed group of men in Russia, who claimed to be idealists, started a revolution proclaiming they would create a paradise on earth. Today, Mr. Speaker, we can see what has happened. Their paradise has become a prison. Jewish citizens of that nation are trying to get out, but they are trapped. Now we hear that many of them might be able to get a parole, so to speak, but if they want it, they will have to buy it. I cannot say too much in abhorrence of public policy of that type. I would hope that the President of the United States would use whatever influence he might have, in an attempt to induce the Soviet leaders to treat their citizens, whatever their religion and nationality background, not as chattel, but as human beings.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in vigorously protesting the action taken last month by the Soviet Union against all potential emigrants. The imposition of a head tax based on education has created a de facto class of slaves—people who must scrape up an enormous ransom to leave a country which they do not want and which does not want them.

Despite its application to all citizens, this latest Russian ukase is directed almost exclusively against Soviet Jews—a portion of the Soviet populace that has consistently tried to exercise the right of emigration. This unending harassment of Soviet Jews must be opposed by all people who deplore man's inhumanity to his fellow man. For years Soviet Jews have pleaded for their basic rights of religion and culture. For years these rights,

so eloquently guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution, have been subverted and denied.

The Soviet leaders know that citizens cannot afford the \$5,000 to \$30,000 exit fee demanded by the new decree, and that the funds must come from outside the Soviet Union. Consequently, this latest decree is nothing less than a disgraceful attempt by the Soviet Government to accumulate foreign currency through blackmailing Jewish people around the world. We have not seen such attempts at international extortion since Adolph Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, this restrictive emigration policy could not have been promulgated at a worse time for the Soviet leaders. It proves again the Janus-faced intentions of the Russian leaders. On the one hand, they indicate a desire to ease tensions and improve relations with the United States. On the other hand, they have created a situation which is inimical to our basic values of freedom and personal liberty.

The Soviet Union must be made to understand that decisions affecting economic and commercial credits will be in jeopardy if this cruel and inhumane policy is continued. The determined voice of Congress and the Executive must insist that this immoral and inhumane blackmail is repugnant to everyone who respects the dignity of man and the value of the individual.

At this season throughout the world, Jews are observing the high holy days. It is a fitting time, indeed, to ponder in depth whether a policy of trading in human lives should be rewarded by desired concessions.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in vociferously objecting to the inhumane and degrading practice of charging exorbitant emigration fees of Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel.

It has been reported that the Soviet Union requires a ransom of from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for each Jewish person who wishes to emigrate to Israel. This ransom is piled upon the other indignities Jewish people in the Soviet Union must suffer.

On September 19, the Supreme Soviet meets to ratify a schedule of fees for emigration. The reason for this special order is to demonstrate, forcefully, to the Soviet Union that the Congress of the United States will not sit idly by while this inhumane practice continues.

The Soviet Union is now seeking wider trade relations with the United States. The Congress plays a role in this new international trade question.

To give the Soviet Union the "most favored nation" status it would require an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Further, if the Soviets need credit from the Commodity Credit Corporation or Export-Import Bank credits, these, too, would require affirmative congressional action.

Thus, the purpose of this colloquy is not simply an expression of congressional support for Jewish persons wishing to emigrate to Israel from the Soviet Union, but a warning to the Soviet Union that unless this inhumane practice ends, the

Congress will be unwilling to legislate trade legislation that will help the Soviet Union gain access to U.S. goods.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Soviet Union will reconsider this ill-advised practice and that people from all over the world will be able to emigrate freely to countries that welcome them.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my duty to rise in protest of Soviet repression of minority peoples—be they Jews, Ukrainians, citizens of the Captive Nations on the Baltic Coast, or any of the other similarly oppressed ethnic groups in Soviet Union.

Today, I think it is entirely proper that we here in Congress bring the attention of the Nation and the world to the Soviet policy of forbidding Jews desirous of emigrating to Israel that right until a fee, in effect a ransom, is paid to the Soviet authorities.

The idea of depriving human beings of the right to leave one nation for another—leaving one they have come to hate for one that welcomes them with open arms—is especially distasteful to me. However, the idea of depriving these individuals of this right pending the payment of a ransom, which I understand can approach \$37,000 per person depending on educational achievement, is outlandish, barbaric, and inhuman.

There are an estimated 400,000 Jews wishing to leave the Soviet Union, and the collective ransoms for their exits could come to over \$5 billion. This system of personal freedom for a payment or fee is morally indefensible, and we here in Congress must explore every possible means of persuading the Soviets to change their policy. I, for one, pledge to devote my efforts to that objective.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of concern and personal outrage that I join my colleagues today in strong protest of the Soviet Government's recently announced policy demanding a ransom from each Jewish person with a higher education wishing to leave the country for Israel. This ransom, ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000 depending on level of education attained, will, if approved by the Supreme Soviet, be in addition to the now "usual" fee of \$1,000 for emigration permits—not to mention the loss of jobs, forced enlistment in the Army, and even imprisonment of Jews wishing to emigrate, which have become common practices of harassment in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel that the persecution of Russian Jewry by the Soviet Government—culminating in their restrictive emigration policy with outrageous ransom demands—cannot help but have an adverse effect on important policy decisions facing the U.S. Congress vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. While all of us desire improved relations with our Soviet neighbors, we in the Congress, as representatives of the American people, will hardly give our favorable consideration to such proposals as the granting of most favored nation status, Commodity Credit Corporation loans, and Export-Import Bank credits to a country whose practices are in such flagrant violation not only of

their own constitution, but of any moral code of civilized men.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Supreme Soviet, at its meeting on September 19, will reconsider this immoral and inhumane ransom proposal, and withhold its ratification. Such ratification could only, in my opinion, do serious harm to Soviet-American relations and the cause of peace and harmony throughout the world.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I proudly join our colleagues in this bipartisan expression of our protest of the inhumane ransom of human beings conducted by the Soviet Union. The placing of ransoms ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000 on Jewish citizens wishing to emigrate to Israel defies the common humanity of man.

The Soviet Union must be made fully aware of the fact that these deplorable actions threaten the trade favors they are seeking. There is little doubt in my mind that this Congress will hardly look with good will toward legislation that would give the Soviet Union the status of a most-favored nation, or to extend to the Soviet Union the credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation that they seek. I hope that these protests in the House today will be read and reasoned over by the Soviet leaders responsible for these actions, and that the ransom demands placed upon emigrating Soviet Jews are removed.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, Soviet authorities have instituted a new system of heavy exit fees ranging from \$5,000 to \$25,000 for educated Jews who wish to emigrate. Technically, the regulation applies to anyone seeking to emigrate to a non-Communist country—Armenians trying to get to America, Ukrainians wishing to go to Canada, ethnic Germans seeking to reach West Germany. But in practice, by far the largest group to be affected are Soviet Jews.

The new, steeply graduated fees represent a drastic increase from the old general fee of about \$1,000 per emigrant. The greater the level of education, the higher the fee: \$5,400 for a graduate of a teacher's institute; \$10,800 for an applied arts degree; \$13,200 for a university degree; up to \$26,400 for the Soviet equivalent of a Ph. D. In some cases the new fees are applied ex post facto. At least 20 families who had already been granted exit visas were told by officials to produce large sums to "pay back the working class" for their State-financed education.

Not only is this newly instituted system unfair and disingenuous in itself; its effects are far more important than a mere restriction of the emigration process.

Whether or not he pays, by the mere act of asking permission to leave the Soviet Union, the Russian Jew signs his own political and economic death warrant.

Every Jew who asks to go is immediately fired from his job. He is blamed and ostracized by his colleagues at meetings called especially for this purpose.

The system is remarkably cruel. The Soviets are trying to keep the Jews from emigrating and yet the Jews are perse-

cuted for remaining. Theoretically they have the right to leave the country, but the authorities are actively suppressing this movement.

By demanding this dishonorable ransom, the Soviet Union accepts the right of the Jew to emigrate. The Soviet authorities do not tell him that he cannot go, but his position is, in practice, that of a prisoner because these conditions cannot be met.

In mid-19th century pre-Soviet Russia, the buying and selling of human beings was a normal phenomenon. Like slaves, the serfs were considered commodities, the property of their owners. Now this practice is being revived and Soviet citizens are once again serfs whose liberty can be—in theory at least—bought for prices that rise with the educational attainments of the individuals involved.

For years the Soviet Union indignantly denounced "lying bourgeois propagandists" who depicted Soviet citizens as slaves of the state. Now the Kremlin itself has confirmed what it used to denounce as slander.

These ruthless measures have shocked free people the world over. This venture into the slave trade harms not only the objects of its persecution. It also is a great hindrance to Moscow's attempt to achieve a more favored place in international life—in trade and diplomacy—that the Soviet Government seems to have been actively seeking in recent months.

I would like to take this occasion to ask my colleagues and the American people to condemn the barbarous actions of the Soviet Government toward the Soviet Jewish minority. World opinion is a powerful instrument of change. We must do all in our power to right this miserable situation.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in condemning the heinous discrimination by the Soviet Union of educated Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel. The proposal of a king's ransom of from \$5,000 to \$37,000 in addition to the considerable costs—the \$1,000 fee, renunciation of citizenship, loss of job—already extracted by the U.S.S.R. from these maligned people, is another black chapter in the continuing persecution of the Soviet Jews. Already schools, synagogues, and cultural centers are closed to them; if prevented from returning to their homeland, they will be denied yet another basic human right.

The Soviets' defense for their actions is purportedly to prevent a "brain drain" and to compensate the Government for their education. Why then are educated Jews applying for visas summarily dismissed or demoted from their jobs? Why this reasoning when the Soviet Union has already received repayment from its graduates in the form of required Government service? Certainly, the Government knows that families cannot possibly afford these outside fees—which, at a minimum, total at least double one's annual salary—without help from abroad. Thus, this policy is completely cynical and calculated.

In the wake of the Munich massacre and in the midst of the Jewish high holy

days, the plight of the Russian Jewry is evermore poignant and deplorable. For in this case thousands of people, longing for the milk and honey promise of life in Israel, are hostages of an inhuman bureaucratic policy which is incompatible with the principles of human decency.

I know that the Soviet Union is not insensitive to world opinion; and, with their Government anxious to receive favored trade status from the United States, it is the responsibility of Congress to raise its voice at full volume in repudiating the Soviet emigration policies. We must remind Russia that if such prejudicial actions are implemented, they will not be forgotten when it is time for Congress to consider those trade policies in which the Soviet Union has a vital stake.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, few issues could be more timely than the subject of today's special order. We meet here today at a time when the systematic persecution of Soviet Jews reaches new levels of barbarism and ironically, at a time when our own Government appears on the brink of concluding a massive new trade agreement with the Soviets.

We are all familiar with the policy of cultural genocide which has characterized the Kremlin's attitude toward Soviet Jews for decades. In the past year or so, we believed that indications of an end to that particular barbarism were appearing with greater frequency, perhaps as part of the overall mood of conciliation between the United States and the Soviet Union. But this latest assault on basic human freedom leaves no doubt that the basic inhuman, cynical policy regarding Soviet Jewry remains unchanged.

How tragic it is that just as the dreams of thousands seemed about to be realized—just as the mere trickle of immigrants to Israel was about to become a flood—the Soviet leaders began to demand arbitrary, exorbitant fees for permission to leave.

These ransoms—no other term would be adequate—range from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for each Jew with a higher education. That is in addition to the usual \$1,000 fee for emigration permits.

According to expert sources within the Soviet Union, there are presently about 150,000 Jews seeking to emigrate. Across the country, some 25 percent of them are affected by the educational ransoms and the percentages in the cities run even higher, with 40 percent of the would-be emigrants in Moscow affected. If these ransoms were to be collected in full, they would total about half a billion dollars.

We now have a situation in the Soviet Union comparable to conditions in Nazi Germany during the late 1930's and early 1940's, when human beings were offered for sale or for exchange for military hardware. Thousands of Soviet Jews are being held hostage just as surely as were those Israeli athletes in Munich last week. The fact that the captor now is a government, instead of a band of outlaws, is perhaps more frightening and deplorable.

The United States simply cannot turn away from this denial of essential human

dignity. We cannot adopt a "business as usual" attitude toward the Soviet Union, however desirable the goal of easing tensions and establishing new avenues of communication and commerce.

I have never felt that the United States should base its foreign policy on short-term political goals, but this is not the case here. Freedom for the Soviet Jews must be a continuing, major, long-term goal of our foreign policy, and any proposed trade or cultural agreement should be weighed in the light of recent actions against the Jewish population.

Ideally, this should be a matter for diplomatic representations between the two countries, and I have repeatedly urged the administration to take greater initiatives in behalf of the Soviet Jews. Significantly, it appears that the educational ransom policy went into effect in the wake of President Nixon's trip to the Soviet Union—a development which deserves investigation to determine whether this was mere coincidence or whether some cause and effect was involved.

But if the administration continues to treat the plight of Soviet Jews as a low-priority item, Congress can and must take the initiative. We must, for example, vote on legislation giving the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status by amending the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The Soviets also need credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation, as well as from the Export-Import Bank.

I am all for building bridges between our Nation and the Soviet Union. Our hopes for peace depend largely on easing tensions between East and West and dealing in terms of those goals we hold in common, rather than in terms of our differences. But the lives and hopes of the Soviet Jews simply are not negotiable. I trust the administration realizes this and that after today's discussion, the Soviet leaders will appreciate the depth of congressional concern.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Russia has Jews for sale, if anyone wants to buy them. Garden-variety Jews with minimal educations go for \$5,000. Advanced educations, up to and including doctorates, will cost the purchaser up to \$37,000. Such fees are being charged for those seeking the chance to emigrate to Israel, in addition to the usual \$1,000 fee for emigration permits and renunciation of citizenship.

All this is, of course, in addition to loss of employment, forced military service, imprisonment, and a variety of other forms of harassment, which often includes overt violence and surveillance.

On September 19, the Supreme Soviet meets to ratify this fee schedule. Now the fate of Russia's Jews is sealed. No schools, synagogues, cultural life, or opportunity to emigrate to free land of their choice.

Officially, the Soviet regime says these exorbitant fees are being charged to prevent a drain of trained talent. Yet it is true that any educated Jew seeking a visa is automatically dismissed from his job.

Simultaneously, Russia seeks from us most-favored-nation status. They need Commodity Credit Corporation loans, Export-Import Bank credits, and change in Overseas Private Investment

Corporation legislation to allow Russian credits. Without such favorable trade concessions, the Soviets will be hard pressed to follow through on the massive grain deal they have just consummated with the United States, much less follow through with additional ventures.

This Jews-for-sale syndrome is not a new or unique idea. In 1944, when Nazi Germany saw the handwriting on the wall, Adolph Eichmann arranged a secret series of meetings with Joel Brand, an official of a major Jewish agency. At these meetings he put forward an astonishing proposal. He was willing to sell imprisoned Jews, all slated for the extermination camps, for trucks. Such vehicles, he promised, would not be used against the western allies. Rather, they would be employed solely on the eastern front against the Russians. The price was 1,000 trucks for 100,000 Jews. A total of 1 million Jews were available for trade.

It was a bargain. Brand, convinced of the Nazi's willingness to go through with the arrangement, frantically sought to close the deal, only to be thwarted by the British, who did not want to offend their Russian allies. They kidnaped Brand and held him in Cairo for 3 months, meanwhile refusing to bomb the steadily working gas chambers at Auschwitz for "technical reasons." So the million Jews also perished.

Today, however, the Russians, of all people, are setting up shop at the old stand once occupied by Eichmann. If the Nazis could peddle Jews for trucks, why can not the Russians sell Jews for good, old, hard currency.

In 1944 and 1945, as the world began to understand what was being done to the innocent, helpless Jews of Europe, their dilemma was the same as it is today. Jewish leaders raced frantically from one world capital to another, begging a variety of leaders to do something, anything to save even a small portion of their brethren. The world deplored, shrugged and did nothing. And the hideous work of the extermination camps went forward without a hitch.

Today, the principle is the same, as are the actors. Only the setting differs. If there were Arabs for sale somewhere and oil was involved, no doubt a good number of governments would be eager to do something.

Where are the men of good will? Where is the United Nations, which is so expert at deploring while doing nothing? Where is the conscience of man, while still another generation of these tormented human beings seeks to unbend the will of yet another unyielding pharaoh to let them go in peace?

The world turns its eyes away in shame, because it will do nothing. Here in this Chamber we have the power to do something. Here is the only chance anywhere in the world for a group of people to do the right thing by putting a clamp on the Soviet economic windpipe.

To grant the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status would require an amendment to section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 denying MFN treatment to Communist nations.

It is in our power to show the Russians

and the world that before we will do business, we will take a stand against this treatment of these helpless people. Just for once, would not it be an act of God's justice and mercy for this body to see to it that just one time, at least, a generation of Jews was spared the agony reserved for them by an oppressor?

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, in a time of outrages against humanity, I cannot condemn too strongly the action of the Soviet Government in proposing to establish an official ransom schedule for fees to apply to its Jewish citizens who want to emigrate.

I understand that the Supreme Soviet plans to meet on September 19 to ratify these fees which, in essence, are ransom costs of Jews who want to leave Russia. The list of ransom fees, from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for each Jew with a higher education who wants to go to Israel, is an inhumane and reprehensible blow to the Jewish people who have been persecuted down through the ages.

While the sentiment of distressed officials and citizens throughout the world should be sounded against this grave wrong, I fear that the Soviet Government is immune to appeals for justice. Moscow pursues a cynical course in which the American Government's efforts at a detente are used while the Soviet Government continues its cruel machinations to resolve its "Jewish problem."

The accelerated pace of Russia's official actions comes after a major wheat deal with the United States and talk of a significant trade agreement. It comes during the midst of an American presidential election campaign.

The Soviet strategy is apparent.

I think it is vital, in the name of humanity and Soviet Jews, that we in the U.S. Congress let the Soviet Government know—in no uncertain terms—that we are prepared to deal with them on the only basis they recognize. We will not accept their repugnant policy of "linkage" without subjecting them to "linkage" of our own.

The Congress must let the Soviets know that we do have a role to play in any detente involving trade and commerce, and we fully intend to exercise it. We must meticulously scrutinize trade relations with the Soviet Government, especially where the Congress can exert its rightful role, to call Moscow to account for its latest evil perpetrated against the Jewish people.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to register my protest over the outrageous educational ransom now being imposed by the Soviet Union on Jews who want to emigrate from that country. These levies amount to the worst form of human and economic crime—extortion, using human beings as the pawns.

In May of this year, I was privileged to attend the 41st special session of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration as the representative of the U.S. Congress. At that time, I was greatly encouraged at the high rate of exodus of Soviet Jews from the Soviet Union—approximately 2,500 per month. A corner, it appeared, had been turned.

Then on August 15, it was reported

that the Soviet Union had placed a price on the head of every educated Russian Jew who wants to migrate to Israel. On that day it was first reported that in addition to the now normal \$1,000 fee for emigration permits, the loss of jobs, the threats of forced enlistment in the army, or imprisonment and general harassment that the Russian Government is now demanding a ransom for each Jewish person with a higher education, who wishes to leave the Soviet Union and go to Israel. These persons must pay between \$5,000 and \$25,000, depending on the level of education attained.

These extreme ransoms, it is reported, are being required by the Soviet Government, on the basis that they are necessary fees to repay the Government for the cost of state-financed educations. What the imposition of such staggering fees means is that thousands of Jews will be forced to remain in a country they wish to leave and in which they are deprived of ordinary civil rights, because they do not have the fortune to pay their own ransom. What it also means to these courageous people is the end of hope.

Every one of us who believes in freedom must protest this action by the Soviet Government. Their action is a clear violation of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights which recognizes the basic right of emigration from one's own country. Their tactics, in fact, are in contravention of article 121 of the Soviet Constitution, which grants the right of free education to all Soviet citizens.

But more than protests are necessary—mere protests are not enough. It is clear that this educational levy is part of a conscious Soviet effort to increase the systematized harassment of its Jewish citizens. Consequently, I urge that the U.S. Congress make clear our strong opposition to any trade legislation granting the Soviet Union better trade terms as long as the ransom decree is in effect. Most-favored-nation treatment, Exim-bank credits, and OPIC guarantees are all legislative matters within the province of the Congress.

While I personally have been a strong supporter of the President in his efforts to ease tensions and gain detente with the U.S.S.R., I feel that we still must make it clear that we do not accept that idea that human beings are for sale. If strong economic reprisals are the only means to change this inhumane and unconscionable ransom, then they must be used.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, blackmail, ransom, kidnapping are techniques that have been used throughout the ages by unscrupulous people in trying to extort money from others.

The action of the Soviet Union in demanding a ransom of from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for each Jewish person desiring to leave Russia must be condemned in the strongest possible terms. I do not question the fact that the Jews who desire to emigrate from Russia are highly educated for many Americans who emigrated from Russia have contributed greatly to this country. It is understandable that the Soviet Union would desire to retain in their country people with the intelligence

and background such as the Jews who desire to leave Russia. However, to enslave its citizens of Jewish heritage and place a ransom on their head must be condemned by all civilized countries.

I am personally convinced that world Jewry is not anti-Russian and were the Soviet Union to allow their citizens of Jewish heritage to be treated in a non-discriminatory manner, then there would not be the "brain drain" confronting the Soviet Union due to the desire of the Jewish people to emigrate.

The Soviets in their own Constitution, prohibit what they are doing to the Jews in Russia. Yet the Jews are unable to avail themselves to Soviet courts for redress of their grievances.

There are many personal and family tragedies caused by the official policies of the Soviet Union relating to Jews.

For us to simply decry the action of the Soviet Union is not sufficient. What must be done is that our Government, through the United Nations, exercise every possible avenue in attempting to get the Soviet Union to cease its blackmail and adopt a policy of no discrimination against people of Jewish heritage within the Soviet Union.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to briefly add my personal sentiments today to those of my distinguished colleagues on the question of the repressive financial penalties being imposed upon Jews wishing to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

We are all, quite naturally, anxious to achieve a lessening of cold war tensions, but we cannot turn our backs on our profound moral responsibility to take a stand in the interest of human justice.

Congressional resolutions of condemnation are most certainly appropriate in the face of the Soviet ransom policy, but they are not enough.

Accordingly, I applaud the sponsors of today's special order for directing the attention of Congress and of the Nation toward more concrete actions which might be taken to influence the Soviet Union to rescind their onerous and unjust restrictions against the emigration of Jews.

Once before, the free world hesitated too long before facing up to a similar policy of bigotry. In 1972, the world is a much smaller place. We cannot and must not turn our backs on our own consciences.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to protest the policies of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which further detain humans in violation of a universal declaration of their rights.

I refer, of course, to the imposition of so-called fees on persons of the Jewish faith who desire to leave Russia. The fees are so high that the Russian Jews are unable to depart the country. They range from \$5,000 to \$37,000, far in excess of the earnings and savings of almost all residents in Russia. Because they cannot pay the high cost of emigration, they, in effect, are being held prisoner.

Considering the hue and cry which has gone out this last year—I add proudly that this Congress has added measurably to those complaints—the imposition of these fees is tantamount to Russian de-

manding a ransom for Jews desiring to emigrate. This is strictly contrary to article 13 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights which Russia has agreed to and which would allow people to move to nations of their choice.

There is no wonder that Jews wish to leave Russia because they have been persecuted for years. They have no schools. Their synagogues were closed. They are allowed no cultural life, and now they are forced to stay within the boundaries of the country which imposed these limitations upon them and their beliefs.

We Members of Congress in this land of free men must continue to oppose this oppression. We here can do more than speak out. Our votes can affect trade relations with Russia. They would like to have most favored nation status which would grant preferential tariff rates to Russian goods. We can deny those preferential rates by denying passage to an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The Soviets also need credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance wheat imports. They want credits with the Export-Import Bank. And, they would like large investment guarantees from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The U.S. Congress can and should influence disapproval in these areas. These can be blows for the rights of a people to live where they want and for a culture to survive.

I think it is particularly interesting to note that the new Soviet fee policies are designed to imprison the most educated, the intelligentsia, of the Jewish communities. The more education which a Soviet Jew has, the bigger is the fee which he must pay to get out of the country. It is as if the Soviet Government is selecting and designing a superior race; it is trying to extinguish the Jewish culture but at the same time, it is trying to retain the smartest and most highly trained of the Jews in Russia. Yet, those educated Jews who persist in trying to leave the country are demoted or fired, and their education and training are denied to the Soviet Government—at least for the time being.

No matter how you approach the problem, the American Congress is justified in taking a position arm-in-arm with the Soviet Jews. They are being oppressed. They are being held for ransom. Their culture is being extinguished. Their rights to living as a people are being suffocated.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the efforts of my colleagues in condemning the Soviet Union policy of charging exorbitant fees to Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate.

This policy is repugnant to all who believe in civil liberties and human dignity. The Soviet Union is itself in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which it is a party, and which guarantees the right of every citizen to emigrate freely.

A Soviet Jew who wishes to emigrate is harassed on his job and shunned by his friends. He is demoted and finally fired. If he is unable to obtain employ-

ment, he is considered a parasite on society and subject to arrest and imprisonment. This Orwellian policy is unconscionable and should be condemned for what it really is—blackmail and 20th century slavery.

The Soviet Union is well aware that no Soviet citizen earns enough money to be able to emigrate. If a Soviet Jew were to come up with enough money on his own to be able to emigrate, he would undoubtedly be considered a black marketeer and subject to imprisonment because it would take virtually a lifetime to pay the ransom the Soviets demand for exit visas.

Therefore, the burden of paying this blackmail falls heaviest on the rest of the world Jewish community.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has concluded a trade deal with the Soviets which runs into the billions of dollars. They believe, obviously, that the United States is so anxious to get this trade that they will be accorded most-favored-nation status with accompanying credits at any cost.

If we acquiesce on this trade pact without a protest regarding the Soviet Jews, what is to prevent the Soviet officials from raising the blackmail ante?

Mr. Speaker, the Congress should serve notice on the Soviet Union that we are not so anxious to trade if it is at the expense of comprising our belief in the rights of Soviet Jews and their brethren to emigrate if they so wish. If we start abridging our belief in civil liberties, it will not be long before the rights of mankind everywhere become abridged. The eternal hope for freedom, liberty and human dignity for the oppressed and persecuted will consequently die.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my distinguished colleagues to express my outrage and shock at the latest attempt by the Soviet Union to deny her Jewish citizens their basic human rights. The sliding scale of exit fees ranging in price from \$5,000 to \$37,000 apiece which have been imposed on Jewish emigration permits are nothing less than unconscionable ransom fees.

As such they represent just one more in a series of insults and repressive actions aimed at the Jewish minority within the Soviet Union. It deserves a clear and immediate response by all free men.

Coming on the heels of the Munich tragedy and with the spectacle of the Leningrad show trials still fresh in the memory of world public opinion, this latest form of discrimination is ever more disheartening.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to believe that a strong show of support by the United States for the plight of the Soviet Jewry will result in a removal of these exorbitant fees. We should put the U.S.S.R. on notice that many of the favorable trade and credit policies that she seeks from this country will be impossible so long as this practice continues.

I feel confident that in the face of pressure from world public opinion and in the face of financial pressure from the United States the day will come when all Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate may do so freely.

Those of us who have long shared a concern for the welfare of the Soviet Jewry will recall that at this time last year we witnessed a marked increase in the number of exit permits granted to Jewish citizens. It was generally agreed that this was due mostly to the overwhelming pressure of world public opinion which the Leningrad show trials generated.

At that time, I noted the improvements but stated my suspicions that once the focus of world opinion was removed we might expect even greater reprisals against this religious minority. Unfortunately, the events of the past few months have only proven those suspicions to be well founded.

Therefore, it is time once again for America and the rest of the free world to come to the defense of the Soviet Jewry. While it would be impossible for us to compensate the Soviet Jewry for the years of oppression and penalties that they have suffered at the hands of their government, it is nevertheless our duty and obligation to insure that it does not occur in the future.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of the Jewish people and the Jewish nation continues, sometimes subtle and sometimes tragically blatant, but always designed to break the will of a heroic people.

The deranged attack on the Israeli Olympic team at Munich by radical terrorists hit home with all too obvious clarity that Jews are not safe, wherever they are and wherever they be.

The Jewish people have been confronted by another kind of harassment, unlike the brutality of Munich but carefully designed to obstruct them in their realization of a centuries' old goal.

While freedom and civil rights as we know them are only qualified concepts to the Soviet citizens, they are virtually unknown to the Soviet Jew. Culturally and religiously, he is restricted from expressing his heritage and practicing his beliefs. As a discriminated against and captive part of society, his abilities are used by the Russian government for the furtherance of the state. Should he wish to emigrate to Israel, the political as well as financial price to be paid is such that few are able to leave. Now, the Soviet Government wants to increase the ransom required, making it virtually impossible to emigrate. By discouraging even the application for a visa, the Russians can maintain their exploitation of Soviet Jews. If a visa is requested, the applicant is banned, for all practical purposes, from further participation in Russian society. With options so structured, the blackmail is complete and the Soviet Jew is a prisoner in a land he does not consider home.

In a few days, the Supreme Soviet will meet to confirm a new schedule of emigration fees, a schedule which is clearly meant to prevent Jews from leaving the country. The outrageous fees demanded are tied to educational attainment which, from a legal standpoint, are in violation of Soviet law and, quite possibly, the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Legal provisions such as these, as we have come to learn, can be

overlooked by the Soviet Government as circumstances require.

This attempt at further repression of Soviet Jews is a moral outrage, and I join with my other colleagues in fervently urging the Soviet Union to reconsider its proposed actions.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the harsh plight of all minority groups in the Soviet Union is well known. Yet, the mistreatment of Soviet Jews is particularly severe because they are discriminated against both because of their religion and their cultural heritage. Judaism is not permitted any central or coordinating structure, unlike the other 10 recognized religions in the Soviet Union, and publication of religious literature and the manufacture of religious articles are prohibited. Synagogues have been closed in almost systematic fashion as a result of both direct and indirect governmental action—in 1956, there were 450 synagogues, in April of 1963, 100, and today the figure has dwindled to less than 60. And unlike most other nationalities, the distinctive language, activities and community institutions of Jews have been severely restricted.

This intolerable situation is even more tragic because Soviet Jews are not allowed to emigrate to countries where religious and cultural diversity are tolerated. They are not permitted to exercise their religion and sustain their cultural identity in the Soviet Union, and, at the same time, they are being denied the right to leave the very society that is stifling them.

On April 17 of this year, the House passed a bill, House Concurrent Resolution 461, which was designed to bring to bear the influence of the United States on behalf of the persecuted Jewish minority in the Soviet Union. Specifically, the resolution called on the President to request of the Soviet Government that it allow its citizens the right to emigrate to the countries of their choice, as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

Yet, what has been the response of the Soviet Union to this congressional action? The imposition of exit fees which, in effect, prohibit most Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate from doing so. The schedule of fees is nothing less than exorbitant, for the range is from \$5,000 to \$37,000, depending on the prospective emigrant's level of education. In addition, the fees are incremental, and a holder of several degrees would be obliged to pay a sum of money for each degree. The severity of this situation becomes even more apparent when we look at the average monthly income in the Soviet Union—the equivalent of \$153.

Clearly, Congress must speak out against this deliberate action directed at a group of people who are asking nothing more than to be accorded the basic rights to which all men are entitled. We must make it clear to the Soviets that our concern for freedom and justice does not stop at our borders but extends to people all over the world. And we must make the point that the imposition of these exit fees will negatively affect congressional action on issues which are of vital concern to the Soviet Union—the

Soviets' desire for most-favored-nation status, Commodity Credit Corporation loans, Export-Import Bank credits, and change in Overseas Private Investment Corporation legislation to allow Soviet credits.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sadness that I learned of the new Soviet move to intimidate and persecute some of its Jewish citizens. The headtax on education for Jews trying to immigrate to Israel is a flagrant and malicious violation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Further, it is an uncivilized attack upon the basic human principles which maintain this tenuous international order. Each nation depends upon the others to conduct itself in such a manner that does not violate or circumvent the primary rules of international behavior. Such a rule is the general understanding that the world will not tolerate another systematic discrimination and persecution of a people because of their religion. Indeed, it is time for the Soviet Union, once and for all to set a policy which allows those Jews who wish to stay in their homeland to be free from intimidation and discrimination and a policy of free and uninhibited exit for those who desire to leave.

Surely the Soviet Union does not expect the rest of the world to accept this sham that it is only trying to recover its expenses for the Jews education. One of the primary functions of any government is to provide an education for all its citizens who shall desire it. Indeed, this is a basic right and one of the guiding principles of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

Furthermore, individual worth cannot be measured by the quantity of rubles or dollars that have been expended to educate any given person. Or is the Soviet Union now saying that a scientist is superior to the layman? If so, this must be the most fundamental break with Socialist principles to date. However, we all know this is not the case. What we are witnessing is anti-Semitism in its most cynical form. Also it is an attempt to extort sorely needed capital from the rest of the world to balance its trade deficit with the United States and the rest of the world.

The United States is not embarking on these trade talks with the Soviets under the pressure of an imbalance of trade. It would be my hope that we are pursuing these talks with the objective of a freer more peaceful world. Hence, it would be very difficult for me to support a further relaxation of trade if I thought the Soviet Union was not also moving in this direction. I am not advocating the interference in internal Russian affairs. However, it is plain enough, that the Jewish education trick is an attempt to extort money from Jews and their supporters from around the world.

This caper must surely fail, for it is without a viable purpose. In purely economic terms the most optimal receipts could not propel the Soviet economy beyond its current stage. In terms of ruining the Israeli economy and thus making it unable to defend itself would only precipitate an international crisis with the

United States on one side and the Soviet Union on the other. The only way Soviet interests can be advanced in the Middle East is by the peaceful route. Another war will not serve the best interests of anyone. Too, it is foolhardy for the Russians to believe that there will be any diminution of the Israeli nationalistic spirit. The victory in the 6-day war imparted new awareness and courage into the Jewish people and their supporters. It is only natural that they desire to leave a system that continually oppresses them. I would strongly recommend to the Soviet Union that it rescind its recent imposition of an education tax upon Jews wanting to immigrate to Israel.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the people of the world who are concerned with basic human liberties are deeply concerned over the actions of the Soviet Government with respect to their Jewish residents. The most recent illustration of the oppression of Soviet Jews is the demand that Soviet Jews who wish to go to Israel pay a ransom ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000 over and above the present fee of \$1,000 for immigration permits.

It is important that we in the Congress express our shock and concern over this kind of treatment so that the Soviet officials may not escape the focus of world opinion. The continued harassment and oppression of Soviet Jews is intolerable under principle of international law for it violates basic international rights of unrestricted travel. The ransom demanded by the Soviets is based upon the educational achievement of its citizens and not on income or ability to pay. It represents religious blackmail and must be condemned by the world community.

We, in the House of Representatives, will be called upon to consider legislation beneficial to the Soviet Union in the field of trade, including the granting of most-favored nation status to Russia, Commodity Credit Corporation loans, Export-Import Bank credits, change in Overseas Private Investment Corporation legislation to allow Soviet credits. I will certainly support efforts to impose the condition on any such legislation that ransoms for prospective emigrants be abolished. It is my hope that the Supreme Soviet which meets next week will abolish these practices voluntary and in response to protests from around the world.

The Congress must do more to convince other nations that we will not grant favored legislative treatment to them and then turn our backs on conduct which violates basic international principles. Another example of that kind of conduct is the deliberate failure of some nations to cooperate in cases of international terrorism. The recent killing of innocent Israel Olympic team members by Arab terrorists in Munich, Germany, is the kind of international violence which must be stopped through firm and tough rules of international cooperation. Those nations which decline to cooperate must be punished by the withholding of beneficial treatment in other areas such as world trade or economic assistance.

It is time to make it clear to those nations of the world, particularly those in the Middle East, that decent people

in all parts of the world will no longer tolerate the vicious, destructive acts of international madmen, blackmailers, or skyjackers.

That is why I am asking the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations on which I serve to order an immediate review of all U.S. assistance to nations in the Middle East which harbor or give help of any kind to terrorists. Such a review could lead to legislation requiring that all U.S. economic or military assistance to such nations be terminated immediately upon a determination by the President that a foreign country has failed to cooperate in international efforts to prevent terrorist activities of the type which occurred in Munich.

I hope that by taking this action, we will shock the Arab nations into reality and cause them to enter direct negotiations with Israel to bring about a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis.

The Congress has a moral obligation to speak out against international blackmail or international violence. The ransom demands of the Soviets falls into the category of international blackmail and must be deplored by people who believe in individual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as the people of Jewish faith soon celebrate their holiday of Yon Kippur, I join with them in their prayers for all oppressed, for peace and for the deceased of the massacre at Munich and their families.

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to join with my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to speak out against the injustices of the Soviet Union against her Jewish citizens.

Once again the plight of the Soviet Jews is front page news all across the country. Once again we feel compelled to meet here in the House to bring to light the support of the Congress for efforts to allow the Soviet Jews to elect to leave that country and its oppression behind and seek freedom in a new land.

The Soviet Union has created a system, based on visa fees, conscription and imprisonment, that denies the Soviet Jews any freedom of choice. They are, by the very nature of the actions of the government of the Soviet Union, prisoners.

Our country is seeking to reach new levels of understanding with the Soviet Union. This effort should be applauded.

But it is the responsibility of freedom-loving people around the world to speak out against these injustices and let it be known that we support the efforts of the Soviet Jews to free themselves from bondage.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my support for the efforts of my colleagues in the Congress who continue to bring to light the tyrannical actions of the Soviet Union and the efforts being made by the Jewish leadership around the world to help the people who cannot help themselves and must bear this heavy burden.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from New York for his leadership. I believe I reflect the majority of my colleagues and the people we represent when I say we welcome the

moves to ease the tensions between our country and the Soviet Union.

The SALT treaty we have approved, the pending proposals for Export-Import Bank credits and trade agreements, the cultural exchanges and the healthy competition between the athletes of our two nations, dramatized during the Olympics, are encouraging signs for continued peace and better understanding in our time and in generations to come.

Still, we in the Congress and others in America are being constantly reminded that the Soviet Government is behaving contrary to the spirit of detente and civilized behavior.

The Soviet policy toward the Jews, manifest in daily reports from the Soviet Union to this country, is uncomfortably reminiscent of the Nazi era.

In addition to the \$1,000 which the Soviets impose for an emigration permit, they have recently begun the practice of extorting what can only be described as "ransom," ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000 in exchange for an exit permit for each Jew with a higher education.

Along with the practices of denying employment to those seeking emigration, forcing them into military service, imprisonment, the denial of Jewish religious and cultural education, and other harassment, the Soviet Government's latest retrogressive step is so extreme as to connote an attitude of official despair of previous efforts to intimidate the oppressed Jewish minority.

Mr. Speaker, the right of individuals to emigrate from a country is among one of the oldest and most important human rights known to Man. This right is founded on natural law. The Magna Carta incorporated this right in the year 1215. The International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, ratified by 46 nations, including the Soviet Union, guarantees the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

In short, authoritative world opinion and international law clearly define the rights to leave and return as fundamental rights binding on all governments.

In the face of such opinion and law, the Soviet Government is clearly using members of the Jewish minority as pawns in a sinister game even as that government seeks concessions from the United States.

I believe, that in return for these requested concessions, that we must seek freedom for our fellow human beings from Soviet bondage and oppression.

I believe that the Congress of the United States must put the Soviet Government on notice that if it persists with its uncivilized and oppressive policies, that we must take a new look at their government's requests to enter into favored nation trade agreements.

While we are discussing this cause of human justice, I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we might consider linking a North Vietnamese response to our request for the release of our prisoners and

the identification of our missing to any pending consideration of Soviet requests.

Earlier this year, Mr. Thomas W. Teddy Gleason, the president of the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, informed the administration that American longshoremen will "gladly" work Soviet ships "if for every ship we work, they will release three prisoners of war."

Mr. Gleason said:

We are not going to work those Communist ships unless we can buy something for our people.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gleason represents the kind of standup Americans which we in Congress must applaud and support in attempts to win something for our people.

I also support the ILU's effort to win an agreement to ship surplus commodities overseas on a 50-50 basis, that is 50 percent of the cargo that we ship overseas should be on ships carrying the American flag.

We, as free men, in a democracy which puts a cherished value on human freedom—freedom for the oppressed and suffering Soviet Jews who bravely strive for their God-given freedom, and freedom for our brave servicemen who languish in enemy prison camps—must make our outrage clear to the Soviets and the other nations of the world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am joining this bipartisan group to express my deep and sincere opposition to this intolerable policy that has been instituted by the Soviet Union.

In the American history text by Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager they tell of the indentured servants who sought a better life in the new world by selling themselves to eventual freedom.

These were the main source of labor in the Chesapeake colonies throughout this pioneer period, and an important source in other colonies. Indented servants were mostly lads and lasses in their late teens or early twenties . . . who were looking for a better chance than the overcrowded trades of the old country.

This type of human bondage was not unique to America. In his book, "A Journey From St. Petersburg to Moscow," Aleksandr Radixhech, wrote of the selling of Russian serfs.

There are always a lot of customers for a bargain. The day and hour of the auction have come. Prospective buyers are gathering. In the hall where it is to take place, those who are condemned to be sold stand immovable.

We all thought this was something from past history; but now the Soviet Government has instituted a new form of indentured servitude with fantastically high fees imposed on prospective emigrants. The schedule of fees ranges from \$5,000 to \$35,000. These rates far exceed the total worth of the potential emigrant's property and equal total of earnings over a period of 5 to 8 years. The average monthly income in Russia is approximately \$153 U.S. dollars.

The Congress in the past has protested the persecution of Soviet citizens. For the Soviet Jew this is but another in a

long chain of acts to take away his religious identity. The Soviet Government has stopped Jewish schools, closed synagogues, barred cultural events, and now they are not being allowed to leave the country which has singled them out for special persecution.

The news of Dr. Kissinger's trip to Moscow indicates that the Congress may well be considering new trade agreements in the near future. We must explore the bearing of the restrictive emigration policy along with the other problems that will be included in the debate. Past history tells us that the only position the Soviets understand is one of strength. We, in the Congress, must let them know that we do not expect to have our new policies be like the old where the Russians all too often break their promises.

Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 694 which resolves:

That the Government and leaders of the Soviet Union should be condemned for creating a class of slaves in the twentieth century by forcing thousands of people to live and work in a country which they want to leave, because they do not have the money to ransom themselves into freedom.

Let us pass this resolution and let us make sure that we carefully study any trade agreement with the Soviet Union. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 removed the Soviet Union and all Communist countries from the status of most favored nation. If we are to re-examine our positions on this issue, it should be a long, thoughtful debate and not a rubberstamp decision.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union reminds me of Nazi Germany. Only today one of my staff members told me of reports he had received of how Jews are beaten on the streets in Soviet cities, of how many Soviet Jews have lost all hope and live in constant fear. The report is reliable. It came from a young man who just returned from the Soviet Union and told the story with tears in his eyes. It seems as though history may be on the verge of repeating itself, and once again the Jewish people are the victims.

Also shocking and absolutely despicable is that the U.S.S.R. is demanding a ransom—that is what it is, ransom—of from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for each Jewish person who wants to go to Israel. This is in addition to the now usual ransom fee of \$1,000 for emigration permits, renunciation of citizenship, loss of job, forced enlistment in the army, imprisonment and other forms of harassment.

The Supreme Soviet meets on September 19th to ratify these ransom fees. Does anyone doubt what the action of the Supreme Soviet will be? This will draw the rope around the necks of Soviet Jews even tighter. They have no schools; their synagogues are closed and they have no cultural life. Now they have no opportunity to emigrate to Israel.

The fantastic ransom demands of the Soviet Union—I refuse to call them "fees"—by far exceed the total worth of each Jew's property and total earnings over a period of 5 to 8 years. The average monthly income in the Soviet Union is equivalent to about \$153.

The ransom is also based on one's education. A Soviet Jew with a high school education must pay about \$6,000 to leave the Soviet Union. One with a doctorate must pay thousands of dollars more. I might note here that for the Soviet Jew fortunate enough to have the required ransom funds sent to him by someone outside Russia, a 40 percent surcharge is placed on that money.

Mr. Speaker, every American should be made aware of what is transpiring in the Soviet Union and the oppression of Soviet Jewry. I am fearful that history may be on the verge of repeating itself.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that Members of the House continue to voice their concern over the policies of the Soviet Union which are aimed at interfering with the ability of Russian Jews to emigrate. It is especially necessary that we develop a proper record so that our diplomats can demonstrate to the Soviet Government the strong views of the Congress which must be taken into account if there is to be any legislative action required as the Soviets seek to expand trade and economic contacts with the United States.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD as part of my remarks on this subject the language of House Concurrent Resolution 699, which I introduced on September 12, 1972 and cosponsored by two of my Illinois neighbors, Representatives CRANE and COLLIER:

Whereas, the Soviet Union has refused to permit Jewish citizens to emigrate from a land where they have suffered bigotry and repression to Israel, where they would be welcomed

Whereas, the Soviet Union has been confiscating almost all of the possessions of those Jews who are permitted to go to Israel; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union has begun demanding exorbitant payments from Jews who have special skills and professions; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the government and leaders of the Soviet Union should be condemned for interfering with the desire of Jews to migrate to Israel and for imposing the new financial conditions, which are intended to restrict migration and impose an intolerable burden on Jews throughout the U.S.S.R."

The Government of the Soviet Union has been shown to be sensitive to sustained pressure generated by public opinion outside the Red empire, especially in periods when they are trying to cloak all their actions with respectability. The purpose of this special order, in which so many Members are participating, will not be lost upon Soviet observers.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, this body voted 360 to 2 to ask the President to take specific steps to aid Soviet Jews and to allow their free emigration. That measure, House Concurrent Resolution 471, which I introduced, was passed with the President's pending Soviet visit in mind.

Since that time, the Soviet Union has put a ransom of from \$5,000 to \$37,000 on the head of each educated Jew who wants to emigrate to Israel. This is over and above the previous \$1,000 visa fee, renunciation of citizenship, loss of employment,

forced conscription in the military, imprisonment, and other forms of harassment.

The Supreme Soviet meets next week to ratify the ransom plan. It is vital that this Congress once again show its strong and determined support of Soviet Jews before that date.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, I held extensive hearings on the denial of human rights to Jews in the Soviet Union. These hearings resulted in House Concurrent Resolution 471.

Jews have no schools, their synagogues are closed, they are allowed no cultural life, they have no opportunity to emigrate and be reunited with their families in their homeland.

My resolution calls on the President to:

First. Urge the Soviet Government to permit free expression of ideas and religious exercises by all its citizens;

Second. Use "formal and informal contacts with Soviet officials to help end religious discrimination in the Soviet Union;

Third. Request the Soviet Government that it permit its citizens the right to emigrate;

Fourth. "Raise in the U.N. General Assembly the question of Soviet human rights violations against Jews and other minorities.

It is imperative that the Soviets know the sentiments of the U.S. Congress and the American people and that they understand that restrictive anti-Jewish policies will cause the Congress to extensively scrutinize new trade relations and will be a part of any debate on change in our present policy.

The Soviets' restrictive emigration policy and ransom cannot but have a bearing on issues the Congress will be dealing with—including the Soviets' wish for most-favored-nation status, Commodity Credit Corporation loans, Export-Import Bank credits, and change in Overseas Private Investment Corporation legislation to allow Soviet credits.

It is time to remind the Soviets, and others who may have forgotten, that human lives and human freedoms cannot be bartered for trade or political convenience. Not only is such barter immoral and rightfully repugnant to our country's best traditions but no arrangement—whether economic or political—has any lasting value when so purchased.

The Soviet Union must be brought to realize that our country will not long tolerate such expediency. Congress, as the spokesman of the people, must make that conviction clear before we adjourn for our reelection campaign.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to read in the New York Times of September 14 that the Soviet Union for the first time told its people about the new, high emigration taxes for all of its educated citizens who wish to emigrate to the West. These taxes, ostensibly aimed at all educated Soviet citizens, primarily affect Soviet Jews, who are the most highly educated ethnic group in the Soviet Union, and who account for most of that nation's emigration. This Soviet policy of levying "emigration taxes" on Jews wishing to emi-

grate to Israel is despicable, a flagrant violation of human civil rights, and I will do all I can to have our Government press this issue in an effort to have this persecution halted immediately.

The American Jewish Community is rightly angered, as the Soviets have also increased their use of sudden callups to military duty to discourage young, trained Jews from leaving the country. Older Jews seeking to leave Russia are facing various forms of harassment, including the "head tax," demotions and discharges at their place of employment, and removal of telephone and police surveillance.

On September 11, I was pleased to join a number of my colleagues in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 694, condemning the Soviet Union for forcing thousands of people to live and work in a country which they want to leave, because they do not have the money to ransom themselves into freedom.

I think it is imperative we join together to make it clear that free peoples of the world will not tolerate this 20th century slavery.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to deplore the recent "education fee" placed on those who wish to emigrate from the Soviet Union. The real intent of these fees is not to reimburse the Soviet Government for the cost of education, for the Government can tax for that purpose, but rather it is a ransom for those who somehow can get enough money to pay for their release, and worse, it is a deterrent for those who cannot ever raise the \$5,000 to \$40,000 it would take to leave the Soviet Union. To me, it is purely and simply, a case of selling bodies.

There are several tragic cases where the Soviet Government has refused citizens the right to emigrate. Yesterday, I inserted into the RECORD the transcript of two telephone conversations between Prof. Herman Branover, a world renowned magnetic hydrodynamics specialist from Riga, Latvia and Mr. Herbert Kohn, member of the Minnesota Action Committee for Soviet Jewry. In these conversations it was revealed that the Soviet kidnapers are holding Dr. Branover, against his will, in the Soviet Union until he can raise \$40,000. Dr. Branover has been in bad health for many years and he cannot possibly raise that sum of money.

Unfortunately, the Soviet's treatment of Dr. Branover is becoming the rule rather than the exception. I have personally talked to a person in the Soviet Union who has carefully detailed to me the cases of many who have been denied the right to emigrate. Each is a personal tragedy. It has been brought to my attention that a young theoretical physicist, Victor Yachot, has been a victim of the abuses of the Soviet Government. After Mr. Yachot applied for an exit visa, he lost his job. After going on a hunger strike and attempting to get permission to organize a protest demonstration, he was thrown into a mental hospital for supposed antisocial behavior. Understandably, Victor Yachot was not content in the mental hospital and

escaped, only to be discovered and drafted into the Soviet Army.

If Mr. Yachot was put into a mental hospital for supposed deficiencies, how could possibly he be mentally competent to serve in the Army? However, this is what the Soviet Government did.

Over the past few months, hope rose when more people were allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union. It has been speculated that President Nixon had reached some sort of arrangement with the Soviet authorities on this matter. Although I deplore the setting of a quota on the number of people allowed to leave, it is imperative that an understanding be reached so that all citizens, Jews and non-Jews, be allowed the basic right to live in whatever country they choose to live in. After our hopes were raised so high because of apparent relaxing of emigration requirements during the first half of this year, and speculation over the results of the Moscow summit, it is indeed a tragic turn of events to find that it is now next to impossible to emigrate from the Soviet Union. This includes those people who hold dual American-Soviet citizenship.

The United States must not allow this sort of human tragedy to continue. Action must be taken at the diplomatic level and, if that fails, it is imperative that we use other means, including restrictions on trade, to force the Soviet Government to allow free emigration; both in numbers and in monetary terms. I applaud the recent agreements reached by President Nixon with the Soviet Government and the anticipated settlement of lend-lease agreements made during World War II. However, I still deplore the abuses of the Soviet Government and I question if we can go further toward liberalizing trade, travel, and other forms of cooperation while the Soviet Government continues to hold people, including U.S. citizens, against their will.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD a letter from Dina Podolskaya which gives details about the case of Victor Yachot. This is but one more example of the abuses of the Soviet Government. It should be a top-priority item of the United States to see to it that cases like this become a thing of the past.

The letter follows:

JUNE 1, 1972.

I, Dina Podolskaya, age 19, Jewess, on May 18, 1972, came together with my parents to Israel to establish permanent residence here (before that I lived in Moscow, U.S.S.R.). In Russia I was a 2nd year student at the Art Faculty of the Moscow Polygraphic Institute.

I'm turning to you for help and hope that you will use your influence. The matter is as follows:

The Soviet authorities are not issuing him an emigration permit for Israel for the last 9 months. The Moscow OVIR refuses to give a motive for this behaviour, referring to the fact, that the petition of Victor Yachot is being studied and no decision has yet been made.

Victor Yachot is a theoretical physicist, age 28: he graduated from the Moscow Physics-Engineering Institute; after his graduation he worked with success at the Atomic Physics Institute of the Academy of Science. He published a number of scientific works in the Soviet Union as well as in other countries. At work he never had access

to any secret materials, therefore there is no basis for such a prolonged and painful decision of this question. Apparently that is why OVIR does not give any sensible answer.

Long before Victor Yachot submitted his petition papers to OVIR, he was relieved of his job. By the same token right from the beginning they started to break the law. With great difficulty he managed to get a character resume from his place of work, without which the OVIR does not accept any petitions and documents, that are necessary for an emigration permit.

Victor Yachot has turned to a great many highly placed Soviet organizations with the plea to let him emigrate—but there was no answer. He then turned to the KGB, the offices of the CK (Central Committee) but the endless requests did not bring any answers. To symbolize a protest Victor Yachot announced a hunger-strike and addressed an open letter to the CK—again no answer was forthcoming.

In March 1972 Victor Yachot, together with M. Khlatchkin, L. Tsypin and A. Slepak, submitted a petition to the Minister of the Interior Shchelokov and to the president of the MOSSOVIET Promyslov for a permit to hold a protest demonstration on the Soviet Plaza on May 25, from 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The aim of the demonstration—to achieve permission to emigrate to Israel. When they were received at the office of the vice-president of the MOSSOVIET, they did not get an answer, that made sense. As further developments showed, the Soviet authorities decided to apply policies of threats and repressions.

From the end of the month of April the police started to come to the apartment of Victor Yachot with threats and orders to behave quietly and not to disturb the social order. In what connection and for what reason were such seemingly innocent requests made? But all this was only the beginning of an earlier planned campaign. Psychological pressure, scare tactics, persistent provoking telephone-calls, threats, notices to appear at the police-station. Furthermore, they attempted to charge Victor Yachot with "living as a parasite," even though it was well known, that Yachot gave private lessons in Physics at his home; a fact that was anticipated by the Soviet Legislature and was clearly legalized in the financial Soviet organs. All this time there was also the continual shadowing by the GB workers and constant threats. Accordingly Victor Yachot notified the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet that he decided to give up his Soviet citizenship, at the same time protesting against the arbitrariness and lawlessness. In the first part of May there came a forced drive, that committed him to a psychiatric hospital; again an attempt with methods, forgotten since the Inquisition, to convince the public, that Victor Yachot is an irresponsible individual, that he is a mentally deficient person. A clear case of a policy of venomous threats, provocations and repressions. Victor Yachot managed to leave the mental hospital without a passport. But a person living in the Soviet Union without a passport is a person without rights, without defense.

All this happened only because he actively fought for his rights to emigrate to the State of Israel, where he has close relatives. Does this lawful right of every citizen constitute the breaking of international standards?

The Soviet authorities decided to isolate Victor Yachot. On May 12, 1972, in the apartment of engineer Slepak he was arrested by the GB and sent under guard to the military camp in Volok, district of Saratov. What served as the basis of Victor Yachot's draft into the military service with the aim "to raise his military qualifications"—a person who was suspected of mental deficiency, accused of living as a parasite and disturbing Soviet law and social order? Where is the elementary logic to all that?

In the official statements for Soviet government servants it is stressed, that only persons, who are exposed to government secrets are not allowed now to get permission to go to Israel. How can the actions of the Soviet authorities be explained in this case? Isn't this the most blatant breaking of Soviet Laws, which the authorities are attempting themselves to guard?

My address: Israel, Jerusalem, Mevasseret Zion, Merkaz Klita 60-A. Tel.: 528444, 528910.
DINA PODOLSKAYA.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in an expression of dismay over newly revealed incidents of blatant persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union.

In recent months the Soviet Union has expanded its persecution of Soviet Jewry by demanding what are, in effect, "ransoms" of between \$5,000 and \$37,000 for each Jew with a higher education desiring to go to Israel. These incredibly fantastic fees represent another escalation in the continual harassment of Russian Jews desiring to leave the Soviet Union.

In the past, Jews applying to emigrate have lost their jobs, been forced to enlist in the Soviet army, and have even been imprisoned.

This latest form of persecution dashes the hopes of the Soviet Jews who have been systematically cut off from their heritage. Their synagogues have been closed, religious articles and even matzos have been taken from them, they are deprived of a cultural life, and now they are being denied an opportunity to be reunited with their families and to emigrate to their homeland.

The Soviet Union has tried to justify these exorbitant fees by claiming that the fees were instituted to prevent a "brain drain." But this claim is clearly fallacious. Educated Jews who apply to emigrate are either demoted or fired, and thus their talents are clearly not being used.

Already the effects of this harsh policy can be seen. These excessive fees far exceed the earnings of most of those who seek to emigrate. In the first 6 days that this law was in effect, beginning in August, at least 65 Soviet Jewish families, ready to emigrate, were stranded. Six Jewish families were stopped at the Moscow Airport and are now totally stranded, without either money or a home.

The Soviet Union's actions must not go on unheeded. Not only must all nations of the world who concern themselves with human justice and rights for individuals cry out at this policy of discrimination, but in addition, both nations and individuals must consider concrete actions. This may well be the time for the U.S. Congress to explore our trade policy with the Soviet Union, and perhaps to reevaluate it in terms of these unreasonable harassments and ransom demands, should they continue.

As a Member of Congress and a concerned citizen I must thoroughly condemn this unconscionable treatment of Russian Jewry, and only hope that on September 19 the Supreme Soviet will vote not to continue this reprehensible practice of massive exit fees, but rather will vote to uphold what should be the right of all humans, regardless of their religion, to live their life where they want and in a manner consistent with their beliefs.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues for bringing the attention of Congress to the persecution of Soviet Jews.

The Soviet Union today is an example of dictatorship by a bureaucracy. Such dictatorships often have little regard for human dignity and personal liberties when such freedoms interfere with the supposed goals of the State.

These recent increases in fees for Jews with higher education to leave the Soviet Union for Israel is an example of political repression in its lowest form. This latest action is another chapter in the tragic history of repression against Jews.

Can we as a nation condone this action of holding back Soviet Jewry from emigrating to Israel? I think not. My colleagues have noted that these exit fees may also violate the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights by imposing double jeopardy on Soviet Jews trying to go to Israel.

The parallels between this situation and those which gave birth to religious freedom in this Nation are obvious.

This is one great moral reason why we cannot allow the persecution of Soviet Jewry to go unchallenged. Too often we are immune to man's inhumanity to man. Let us not be in this case of obvious harassment of Soviet Jews.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, the Supreme Soviet will meet to ratify a decision to place a tax on Jews wishing to leave the Soviet Union.

This tax ranges from \$5,000 to \$37,000, depending on the prospective emigrant's level of education.

Since the average yearly income of a worker in the Soviet Union is \$1,836, this ransom, in effect, denies the Soviet Jew the right to emigrate to a country of his choosing. A Soviet Jew with a high school degree would have to save 100 percent of his earnings for nearly 3 years before he could buy his way out of slavery.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the tax wholly precludes any type of emigration for most of those Soviet Jews with a high school education or above.

While a few Russian Jews could possibly amass this relative fortune, the Jewish leadership in the Soviet Union has taken the position that under no circumstances should the ransom be paid. In their view, the Soviet appetite is unlimited, and if ransom is paid, it will only encourage further taxes.

Mr. Speaker, what can we do? Do we stand by passively while the Russian Government creates a class of slaves? Or do we act in a manner which will convince the Soviet Government that we despise this immoral and unjust practice?

I suggest, in the strongest language, that we choose the latter course of action—that we bring such force to bear that the Soviet Government will yield to our pressure and let the Soviet Jews emigrate to the country of their choosing.

Currently, the Soviet Union needs wheat. They also need credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance the wheat imports.

Mr. Speaker, we have the wheat, and

I feel that it is our "bargaining chip" to put the pressure on the Soviet Government to refrain from ransoming Soviet Jews.

Even beyond the moral implications of their actions, we must act to show the Supreme Soviet that it is in their best interests to allow the free emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. For the Soviet Government to do otherwise would not only seal the vicious circle of persecution of Russian Jews, but would also deny the Russian masses the bread they need to produce.

I would like to commend Chairman CELLER and Congressman PEYSER for their leadership in this battle, and for bringing this problem to our attention. I endorse their efforts, and would like to associate myself with their eloquent and timely remarks in behalf of Soviet Jews.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join with my colleagues and protest and deplore the present attitude of the Soviet Government regarding the emigration of Soviet Jewry. The imposition of a tax for exit visas from Russia, ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000, is reminiscent of the early days of Hitler, who also at one time offered to trade German Jews for gold or trucks or other items.

The action of the Soviet Government is in effect a requirement of ransom or extortion, actions which are deplored by civilized people. There can be no doubt on this score for a recent article in a Washington paper disclosed that the deputy chief of the visa branch of the Interior Ministry in Moscow told Dr. David Korn, Chairman of the Soviet Jewry Committee, in a transatlantic telephone conversation that:

If you want your relatives to leave, transfer through your American bank the necessary amount, and they will leave.

Such action, if it is not now so considered, should be in the same category as that of ransom and hijacking of airplanes, which should be rated an international crime. The Soviet's actions however are more heinous in that it involves human beings—human lives.

Mr. Speaker, early in August there were reports that the President had discussed the matter of emigration by Soviet Jews during his Moscow visit and an agreement had been reached with the Soviet Government. I would doubt that the President would have envisioned or agreed to anything that smacked of ransom or extortion.

I believe that it would be well, Mr. Speaker, for the Soviet Government to recognize that approval of this action by the Supreme Soviet will be looked upon with more than extreme disfavor by our Government and this Congress. The Congress has much to say about the relationship between our Government and the Soviet Government; we have a voice in the trade relations between the two countries; and we have a voice among the peoples of the world. Let the Soviets be aware that we will not still our voice on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I raise my voice here today not only for myself but for the people of my district. I believe that I also

raise my voice for all the decent and civilized peoples of the world.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that the Government of the Soviet Union has begun to demand large financial payments from its Jewish citizens who are trying to emigrate to Israel.

That demand can best be described as ransom. Such arbitrary, unreasonable demands by any government are not to be condoned. That such a policy is instituted by one of the world's most influential nations makes it all the more despicable.

While I believe the recent U.S. rapprochement toward the Soviet Union is a wise and necessary step, I believe our administration ought at the same time to make it perfectly clear to the Soviet leaders that this Nation believes their action toward the Jews is an action that free men find abhorrent.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I can only rise in strongest protest over recent developments in the Soviet Union's continued harassment of Soviet Jews. It is incumbent upon this Congress, the administration and the American public to convey their sense of outrage to the Soviet Union at what can only be described as holding to ransom each Jewish person with a higher education desiring to emigrate to Israel. At a time when we are being asked to effect trade relations with the Soviet Union in the form of most favored nations status, it is time to convey our feelings over this latest restrictive policy loudly and clearly. On September 19, the Supreme Soviet will meet to ratify this "head tax" on Soviet Jews. It is vital, therefore, that we join in a unanimous denunciation of this policy before that time; that we go on record as notifying the Soviet Union that their repression of Soviet Jews will indeed have an effect on any consideration of trade relations and change in foreign policy. We cannot afford to sit idly by while human beings are being put up for sale, and all accounts verify this is what is happening. The Soviets' own constitution states in article 21 that each citizen shall have the right to a free education in all of the schools. The Soviet's latest position is clearly contradictory to remarks made in the influential journal of the Young Communist League which just 1 year ago stated that the official position of the Soviet Union was that the repayment of expenses involved in education was being satisfied in full in the form of 3 years required service in some branch of the Government. If one examines the actual sums that are demanded by the Soviet Union by Jews who wish to emigrate, it is beyond a doubt that they are far beyond their capabilities. The "head tax" ranges from \$5,000 to \$37,000 depending upon the level of education completed. It is self evident that no one earns a salary anywhere near that sum, no matter how highly professional. As a matter of fact it would take from 5 to 8 years of saving all of one's earnings in order to be able to make the staggering payment. In the Soviet Union the average monthly income is estimated at \$153.

How then does one manage to come up with this astronomical fee?

Most assuredly we have entered a new and welcomed era of negotiations with the Soviet Union—one which I applaud. But we cannot afford as a nation to gloss over the illegal and immoral treatment of Soviet Jews, to sacrifice the dignity and worth of these people, in our efforts to seek rapprochement. I urge my colleagues in this House to join with me in expressing our strong protest over this latest repressive treatment of Soviet Jews.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in this special order today on the persecution of Soviet Jewry, as I have joined in this debate in the past when this issue was before the House, because I firmly believe that the persecution of any people is and must be the concern of men of conscience everywhere.

The persecution of Soviet Jews has long been apparent to the world and I need not catalog the events of the past several years. The latest demands for unusual exit fees, ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000, for each Jewish person with a higher education who wishes to go to Israel is a gross violation of human rights which cannot be silently tolerated.

This Member, Mr. Speaker, will weigh this issue heavily when determining how he will vote on the variety of issues, including liberalization of credits and other economic policies which will come before the House and which affect U.S.-Soviet relations.

I sincerely hope that the September 19 meeting of the Supreme Soviet will not result in the ratification of the fee schedule and the imposition of a further burden on the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, the Supreme Soviet will meet to ratify a schedule of fees, ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000, for each Jewish person with a higher education who wants to go to Israel. I feel it is very important that the Congress of the United States show its strong and determined support of Soviet Jews before that date.

I want the Soviet Union to know that their restrictive emigration policy will cause this Congress to extensively scrutinize any proposed Soviet-American trade pacts. I want the leader of the Soviet Union to know that the Congress must amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and take other substantial legislative steps before expanded Soviet-American trade can take place.

If the Soviet Union wishes to trade with the United States, I believe it is appropriate for the U.S. Congress to demand that Soviets honor the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and permit the free unhindered emigration of Soviet Jewish citizens.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my abhorrence and condemnation of the recently announced Communist policy of placing a huge ransom on the emigration from the Soviet Union of Jews with higher education.

While I have been cautiously pleased

with the recent easing of tensions between the United States and Russia, I have also warned against the danger of forgetting the atrocities against human rights that continue to be committed by the Soviet leadership.

This latest outrage serves to point up once again the total disrespect by the Soviets toward the dignity of individual human beings. In short, this is discrimination and prejudice in its crassest form.

The Communists, of course, have always tried to prevent the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union through intimidation and harassment. But the courageousness of Soviet Jewry was vastly underestimated by the Soviets as the number of Jews who have braved these reprisals by applying for emigration permits has increased by vast numbers. In an attempt to halt this new flood the Soviets have now instituted this policy which amounts to human bondage reminiscent of the days of Nazi Germany.

We are told by Soviet propagandists that those exorbitant exit fees, ranging from \$5,000 for a bachelor's degree to \$37,000 for a doctorate, are in payment for the education provided by the state and to prevent a "brain drain."

But the real motives of the anti-Semitic dictators are threefold: First, they hope to halt the outflow of Jews who wish to migrate to the land of their people. Second, the policy is aimed at intimidating young Jews who wish to further themselves through higher education. In other words, it is an attempt to relegate Jewish citizens to the lower economic and educational status. And, third, and perhaps most appalling, is this new Soviet plan of making money off this modern slave trade. The low wages paid to Russian workers means that any ransoms paid for the freedom of Russian Jews will come from foreigners—chiefly from American citizens of the Jewish faith.

The Israeli Knesset has adopted a resolution appealing to all nations to condemn this Soviet act of human degradation. Surely the United States, with its long heritage of freedom, should be the first nation to take positive action.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, would be very reluctant to support any type of trade policy that benefits a nation which profits from dealing in human exports. Any concession to the Soviet Union while it continues its barbaric anti-Semitic policies are clearly contrary to American ideals and interests.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman in the well for yielding to me.

I wish to voice the strongest possible dissent against the United States granting any trade concessions or other benefits to the Soviet Union as long as the Soviet Union pursues the unconscionable policy of levying blackmail and ransom upon the Jews of Russia who desire to emigrate to Israel.

It is shocking that any nation which claims to be a civilized nation would associate itself with such a barbarous practice. It is exacting tribute in the most unconscionable way from people

who seek to realize an age-old dream of being reunited in their ancient homeland with their own people, where they can enjoy freedom and live in dignity.

I hope our Government will not sacrifice the principle of denouncing and attempting to forbid such a practice by the Soviet Union in exchange for some profitable trade transaction with the Soviet Union. It is contrary to the character and the history of our country for us to ignore such unconscionable practices on the part of those with whom we establish intimate relations which are advantageous to such powers.

I hope the message will go forward from this Congress that the Congress denounces this vicious practice and will agree to no concessions or favored-nation trade agreements with the Soviet Union until the Soviet Union stops levying such foul tribute and accords to the Jewish people the free right to return to their ancient home.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the ransom policy announced by the Soviet Government to apply to every Jewish person who wishes to emigrate is an intolerable injustice. It is a violation of commonly accepted standards of human rights and dignity as expressed in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It cannot be justified on any terms, and Soviet officials must be put on notice that, particularly when added to the harassment and imprisonment to which Soviet Jews are so frequently subjected, it is a policy which is as much anathema to the United States and other nations and peoples of the world as, for example, the policy of apartheid in Africa.

In the wake of this deplorable action by the Soviet Government, Mr. Speaker, we see newspaper reports of "major breakthroughs" in negotiations between the Nixon administration and Soviet leaders on billions of dollars worth of prospective trade deals. The major breakthrough has apparently been on the matter of the Soviet Union's World War II debts, which the United States set as a precondition for successful negotiations.

It is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, that our Government should be engaging in trade negotiations in which a financial matter like war debts is a precondition, while no mention or consideration whatsoever is made on the matter of human rights and human decency at issue in the new Soviet policy toward Jews who seek to exercise their right to emigrate.

It is incumbent upon the administration, Mr. Speaker, immediately to set repeal of the Soviet ransom policy as a precondition for further negotiation on trade, and no further trade negotiations should be conducted until this issue has been confronted. That the administration should stress financial preconditions and ignore this attack upon human rights is an indication of the desperate lengths to which it will go to obtain what it undoubtedly regards as a political popular set of agreements with the Soviet Union.

In order for any of these trade deals to be carried out, action by Congress will be required to extend most-favored-na-

tion status to the Soviet Union. I certainly do not think that the Congress should extend such status so long as the Soviet Union continues to impose ransoms on Jews, and I feel the Congress must and will insist that this ill-conceived and unjust ransom plan be rescinded before any serious consideration is given to enactment of legislation giving most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for the special order on Soviet Jews.

The Berlin Wall has been moved to Moscow. And the world is the poorer for it.

As President Kennedy might have said, whatever our shortcomings as a nation, we do not have to build a wall of bricks or taxes—to keep our people in.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today to protest the Soviet Union's demand for a ransom for Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate from that country.

The Soviet Union's whole attitude and actions in dealing with its Jewish citizens have been despicable. The right to emigrate is basic and is clearly set forth in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet they have continued their policy of harassment and abuse and now ransom against those Jews who seek to exercise their rights.

Now the Soviet Union has come to us with hat in hand and asked for favorable trading arrangements. They are seeking trade credits and most-favored-nation status. No deals should be made or discussed until the issue of the Soviet Jews is settled.

The Jews in the Soviet Union are being persecuted. Let us make no bones about it. They are systematically being exterminated as a viable religious body by a totalitarian state. It may not be the mass slaughters and concentration camps of the Hitler regime in World War II, but the goal of extermination of a group of people is the same.

Can it be that we have forgotten what Hitler did just a scant 30 years ago? Can it be that we as Americans have forgotten that to preserve our own human rights and freedoms, we must fight for the rights and freedoms of peoples the world over.

Hillel, the rabbi and teacher of great people, said:

If I am not for myself—who will be for me? If I am only for myself—what am I?

It appears that too many Americans are only for themselves.

The cause of Soviet Jewry is a just one. The right to emigrate is an international and humanitarian right that transgressed once against one group of people is a transgression multifold against all the people of the world. No ransom, no harassment, no intimidation should be permitted to snuff out this right.

We here in America cannot stand idly by while the Soviet Union makes criminals of the Jews in their country and then puts a price on their head. The only crime the Soviet Jews are guilty of is that they desire to live in accordance with their heritage. They are guilty of daring to speak and write in their own languages. They are guilty of attempting

to transmit their culture to their children. They are guilty of demanding the right to live with dignity as Jews.

Mr. Speaker, if they are guilty of these crimes then we are all guilty as well.

What has happened to the great government of the United States? In 1903 the highest government officials spoke out against the infamous Kishinev pogroms. And again in 1940, this Nation went to war to protect human rights and freedoms. Why the silence today? Has America abandoned its national tradition to fight for freedom everywhere in the world?

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that our efforts here today will put the Soviet Union on notice that Members in this body will not stand idly by while they persecute the Jews in their country. If they expect to receive better treatment in the family of nations then they must start first by treating their own citizens in a dignified and just manner. Let them let the people go.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in protesting the ransoms exacted from Soviet Jews seeking emigration to Israel. These extortionate exit fees—ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000, fortunes all but unheard of in the Soviet Union—are demanded of each Jew with a higher education who wants to quit Russia for Israel. On September 19, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Soviet is scheduled to meet to ratify these ransoms, to cloak them in "legality."

I want to point out that such a step will mean that the U.S. Congress will examine more closely—much more closely—our developing trade agreements with the Soviet Union.

Jews in the Soviet Union already endure discrimination in virtually every way conceivable. All but institutionalized, the Soviet Government's bigotry strikes out at Jews in jobs, housing, education, travel, cultural activities of every kind.

More than 2,300,000 Jews now live under the Kremlin's yoke. Yet no newspaper—indeed, virtually no publication whatever—is published in Yiddish. No school teaches in the Jews' tradition or tongue. No theater celebrates their cultural heritage. No central organization binds them together in common purpose. Even food, the kosher dishes Jews have savored in a tradition still surviving after thousands of years, is denied them. Few shops, if any, carry these foods or their principal ingredients.

Soviet Jews endure persecution almost reminiscent of the 18th century czarist pogroms that left hundreds of thousands hanged and pilloried throughout Russia.

It is hardly surprising, Mr. Speaker, that many Soviet Jews want to emigrate to Israel. But the Kremlin grants few exit visas—perhaps 10 percent of those sought, and even these slowly and grudgingly. Their cost is nothing short of extortionate: \$1,000 until recently, and now as high as \$37,000.

After years of groping through the redtape strewn in their path by Soviet officialdom, Jews granted visas face still more vexing obstacles. Their departures are delayed—often for months, sometimes for years. And, since they must explicitly renounce Soviet citizenship to be-

come eligible for visas in the first place, they are suspended in a kind of eerie political limbo—without jobs, without permanent living quarters, without official status of any kind. They become, as the newspapers whimsically say, "nonpersons."

We in the Congress must continue to make their plight known to the world. We must continue to make speeches. We must continue to sponsor resolutions. We must continue to plead with worldwide organizations like the United Nations.

Even the Soviet Union, no matter how glacially aloof to the world community, cannot ignore public outrage.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this discussion of the serious obstacles raised to Soviet-American trade expansion by the vicious and unrelenting persecution of Russian Jewry. The latest ransom demands are still another of the special restrictions upon Jewish citizens which run counter to the U.S. Declaration of Human Rights.

This Congress has repeatedly voiced its concern for the plight of Soviet Jewry. It is well that we do so. As Rabbi Zev Segal, chairman of the Essex County, New Jersey Conference on Soviet Jewry stated at the hearings held by the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe last November:

I think it is fair to say that the new, vigorous, outspokenness of Russian Jewry has been, at least in part, fanned and encouraged by demonstrations of support and concern voiced by a myriad of groups and individuals, large and small, throughout the civilized world. It would be a disaster, ladies and gentlemen, if the worldwide outcries in which we have been participating were to diminish or regress.

Its inevitable result would be to isolate and make most vulnerable those Russian Jews who are now demanding their human rights.

Those human rights include free emigration, but emigration from the Soviet Union has entailed many complications and frustrations to which has now been added a ransom of from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for each Jewish person with a higher education who wants to go to Israel.

This new schedule of fees awaits ratification by the Supreme Soviet on September 19. It is right and proper that the Congress should protest this affront against human freedom which is a universal cause.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans would welcome an amelioration of tensions, but Russia's efforts to win economic advantages cannot be considered in a vacuum. The Soviet ransom demands against helpless human beings cannot be ignored in any discussion of economic agreements. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over Export-Import Bank legislation and related matters, I for one will have to view any pertinent proposals in the light of the condemnation to living death of the Jewish community in Russia. The victims of Soviet inhumanity cannot be forgotten in any forging of economic agreements.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues here and millions of outraged Americans across this land to protest the barbaric practice that has been adopted

by the Soviet Union to prevent Jews from emigrating to the State of Israel.

In czarist Russia, the buying and selling of human beings was a normal phenomenon. Like slaves, the Russian serfs were considered as chattel, the possessions of their owners. The price fluctuated depending on the serf's abilities, skills, and education.

This form of human measurement is being revived. The Soviet Union has announced that its citizens—especially Jewish Russian—can buy their exit visas—and their liberty—for prices that rise with the educational attainment of the individuals involved. A Soviet serf with a doctoral degree is purchasable for \$37,500; a basic college graduate costs \$15,000; the trade school graduate can be had for under \$5,000.

Soviet Jews seeking emigration to Israel are the group most affected by the new laws and price scale. Few persons except the official elite in the Soviet Union having savings of this order. The practical effect is to bar emigration and presents Soviet Jews, in particular, with a situation of intolerable blackmail.

In imposing fees on professional emigrants, the Russians argue that the state should be reimbursed for the cost of the higher education these individuals received free of charge in the Soviet Union. Not only are the new fees exorbitant. Even if applicants are not allowed to leave the country, the mere act of applying for exit visas is considered enough cause for them to be stripped of their degrees and dismissed from their jobs.

I believe the American people expect us to do everything we can to express our abhorrence for this new Russian serfdom. I believe they expect us to make it clear that the Soviet Union can anticipate no meaningful expansion of trade between our two countries.

I cannot support the extension of credits or the consideration of most favored-nation treatment for Soviet exports as long as the Soviet Union treats people as "serfs" to be bought and sold.

There can be no extensive trade with the Soviet Union as long as the Soviet regime demands ransom for Jews seeking to emigrate to Israel. We cannot abandon our obligation as people who love freedom. We must withhold the economic cooperation the Soviet Union seeks until it respects civilized practice with respect of the rights of emigration.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Government is continuing its harassment of its Jewish population. The latest form of discrimination is to impose exorbitant visa fees based on the level of the person's education. These fees range from \$5,000 to \$25,000—much more money, of course, than the Soviet Government has paid for the individuals' education. In fact, the norm in Russia is for the average citizen's work production to be about twice that which he even earns, a fact which emphasizes that the Russian Government does not lose money on its citizens. Whatever the reasons are for this latest form of discrimination, it is obvious that the Russians are desperately seeking to end emigration of the educated Jews.

The question which must now be asked

is what we, as Members of Congress can do to stop this barbaric ransom of humans? The answer, as I see it, was stated very well by a Mr. Leonard W. Schroeter—an American attorney who is also principal legal assistant to the Attorney General of Israel—who recently met with the top Jewish leaders in the Russian community. Mr. Schroeter states that, according to these leaders:

The only hope of rescinding the tax is if—massive political and economic pressure can be mounted in the West.

These Soviet Jews have no intention of paying the ransom. They feel that if the initial money is paid, there will be no limit to the further demands made on these Jews before they can obtain their visas.

I agree with Mr. Schroeter and the Russian Jews he spoke with when they say that there must be economic reprisals against the Soviet Union. We must make it clear to the Russians that they will receive credits and new trade deals only if these new visa restrictions are removed. I will not vote for any new trade concessions for the Soviet Union, and I do not see how any Members of Congress can, in good conscience, do so either, as long as these high fees are imposed on persons wishing to emigrate.

If the Russians will not bow to world public opinion, perhaps they will submit to economic pressure. Congress has the power and special constitutional responsibilities in this area. Legislatively we have authority to deal with Eximbank credits, most-favored-nation treatment, and overseas private investment corporations. Perhaps more important, the House and Senate have already passed a measure, Public Law 92-412, entitled the Equal Export Opportunity Act and International Economic Policy Act of 1972, which places some restrictions on our trade with foreign countries. For example, title II establishes the Council on International Economic Policy and states that international economic policy should be developed with a view toward, among other things, "achieving freedom of movement of people." This has already become law, and we can use it *visa-à-vis* the Russians.

The Soviet action has already had an effect on the Russian Jewish community. Young people have begun withdrawing from universities and are refusing to even begin their studies. For the men, this means army duty which amounts to an 8-year obligation. This, of course, means that there is no chance to emigrate elsewhere for that 8-year period. Also, parents whose children have served are frequently prevented from emigrating.

The United States Government must take steps to prove to the Russians that economically it will be counterproductive to continue to impose this levy. And, we must assure the Russian Jews that we are more interested in protecting their lives than we are in selling material commodities to the country holding them hostage.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in denouncing the Soviet Union's latest move toward repressing its Jewish people.

In his visit last May, President Nixon was able to extract promises from the Soviet leaders to increase the level of emigrants to Israel to 2,500 a month. So far this year, about 20,000 Jews are reported to have received clearance to emigrate from the Soviet Union, which is double the rate of 1971.

Even with the rate increase, the Jewish desire to abandon the Soviet Union far exceeds the allotted emigrations.

The Soviet leaders were faced with extreme embarrassment by this outrush of citizens, and were faced with a potential demand by other groups to leave under the same policy. So the Soviets unearthed an illogical and illegal tool to stem the flight of Soviet Jews.

As of August 3, a person must pay off his public education at a rate set by the Soviet Union, before emigration is allowed.

Needless to say, the rate exceeds every body's ability to pay. And the order violates the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights which the Russians have agreed to. The fee effectively blocks emigration.

In the past, congressional protests have evidently had some positive effect on the policy of the Soviet Government toward its Jewish citizens. It is hoped that our voice today will stop ratification of this onerous exit fee when the Supreme Soviet meets on September 19.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the sad plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union is by no means unknown to the Members of this body, or to the citizens of this country who can almost daily read of new harassment inflicted by the Soviet Government in relentless and vicious persecution of this religious and ethnic minority.

We have watched in unbelieving horror as Russian Jews have been deprived of their jobs, their rightful property and their freedom, as they have been separated from their families without any prior warning and thrown into prison to languish for weeks and more often for months, without any charges leveled against them. These are the tactics one can read about in the bizarre fiction of Kafka, yet they are also the macabre reality of life in the Soviet Union for those Jewish citizens who have expressed their desire to emigrate to Israel or some other country. Upon application for an exit visa, a Soviet Jew can expect to be fired from his job, or at least demoted to menial work, especially if he is a professional, with an accompanying cut in wages, without regard for his education or professional skills. At best, he can expect to be evicted from his home and deprived of his personal property, and if he is lucky, avoid the labor camps or prison cell. As a second-class citizen already, his request for permission to escape the source of his persecution singles him out as an object of even greater persecution and misery, and what is worse, more often than not, the visa is never granted.

The tragic irony is that the Soviet Government will not let its Jewish citizens live in peace as productive citizens in their country, yet at the same time, it refuses to permit these tormented people

to find peace in other countries which have indicated their willingness to accept them as immigrants.

In previous months, international sentiment, especially strong pressure from the United States has succeeded in calling world attention to the plight of Soviet Jews and resulted in some temporary easing of the harassment and an apparent liberalization of the emigration quotas.

Now that the Soviets have been forced to yield to world pressure and permit some Jews to leave, they have decided to capitalize on the situation by putting an exorbitant price on the head of each person who applies for emigration, based on the education and training of that individual. Thus, an engineer, a doctor, or a technical specialist must pay as much as \$25,000 in addition to the standard cost for an exit visa to buy his way out of the country, while a teacher or lawyer would pay a lesser "ransom."

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the realities of Soviet life for these people, and the limitations on their income. First of all, under the best of circumstances, a Russian citizen earns on the average the equivalent of only \$2,000 a year. With the confiscation of property, and loss of job that inevitably follows application for an exit visa, the chances of most Soviet Jews for raising the required "ransom" are obviously minute. And for those few Jews who are fortunate to either have some personal means or can obtain assistance from friends in other countries, the resulting oppression of these people's friends and family remaining behind is intensified.

Such treatment is clearly beyond the realm of human dignity and compassion and we must condemn the latest actions by the Soviet Government that require exorbitant and unreasonable exit fees as one more intolerable and inhumane act in its efforts to dominate and destroy this innocent segment of its population and religious life generally.

Mr. Speaker, we saw all too vividly what happens when a nation is allowed to carry forth its policies of hate and destruction against one group of people. The tragedy of Germany's ovens and gas chambers is too immediate to us all that we can accommodate the Soviet Union's actions or tolerate them any longer.

Surely we have learned the harsh lesson of complacency, and have seen the results of a nation's disregard for human values. Therefore, I would condemn in the harshest terms the Soviet Union's new "ransom" policies and join with my colleagues in calling upon that government to respond to the dictates of the honest evidence of compassion and human decency and permit those Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union to do so.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution condemning the Government and leaders of the Soviet Union for creating a class of slaves in the 20th century by forcing thousands of people to live and work in a country which they want to leave, because they do not have the money to ransom themselves into freedom.

This policy of putting a price on the head of every person with an advanced

education, who wants to emigrate from the Soviet Union is aimed solely at the thousands of Russian Jews, who are trying to go to Israel.

This decision to ransom Russian Jews is a barbarism which can only be compared to Hitler's offers to trade Jews for trucks.

Now we learn that these same Russian leaders are asking for economic concessions to make trade with the United States easier and more profitable.

It is time that our Government started using our economic power to help oppressed peoples such as the Russian Jews.

If the leaders of the Soviet Union want special favors from the United States let them start acting like civilized men in their treatment of people.

It is my feeling that Congress should not approve any legislation giving the Soviet Union favorable credit terms for purchases in this country, low tariff privileges to Russian products entering the United States, or which establishes investment guarantees for American companies operating in Russia.

The resolution I introduced condemning the Russian leaders has been cosigned by some 95 Members of the House. I urge everyone of them to affirm this condemnation by taking a stand against granting the Soviet Union special economic favors until this demand for ransom of the Russian Jews is eliminated.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this time of year is most solemn for the Jewish people. It is the beginning of a new year and we pray for peace and good health throughout the coming months. However this Rosh Hashona is marked with sadness as well as solemnity because of the massacre in Munich 2 weeks ago and the Soviet decree of August 15. This decree has already resulted in untold human suffering and has sent new waves of fear for Russian Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel. Russia's brand of 20th century human bondage is a most dispicable act and should be condemned by men of good conscience everywhere.

It is unconscionable for any society to place price tags on human freedoms. The new Soviet policy which charges exorbitant exit fees for educated Jews ranging from \$4,300 to \$37,400 is just another example of how human freedoms, rights and values are reduced in the U.S.S.R. Slavery has been abolished more than 100 years ago and yet new forms of Soviet slavery are apparent today.

In the past few years, the easing of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States has become more apparent. The recent SALT agreements as well as the President's timely trip to the U.S.S.R. has indeed demonstrated that the United States and Russia can find common ground on which to build a lasting peace. But it is distressing to note that while there are such hopeful signs there is a cloud of despair of future progress. Unless the Soviet Union rescinds its policy of harassment and persecution of Soviet Jews a serious road block to future trade and economy agreements lies ahead.

To many Americans the latest Soviet

reaction is reminiscent of the Nazi era where the same type of extortion and repression were practiced against German Jews who sought freedom.

It is ludicrous to except the Russian contention that these fees are necessary to reimburse the State for expenditures made toward educational purposes. Everyone knows that under the Soviet system people are paid low wages despite the fact that they produce a great deal. Actually what the state "gives" in benefits it takes in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is quite clear. In Moscow, for example, it has been estimated that of 400 applications for visas almost 60 percent would be subject to this high exit tax. The average amount per application was estimated at 15,000 rubles. According to many sources there are more than 150,000 applications for visas in the Soviet Union and we estimate that there are about 45,000 applicants who would be assessed an average of 15,000 rubles each.

There is no doubt that the whole idea of putting a price on freedom will damper the hopes of those who seek religious and spiritual freedom. This Mr. Speaker, is an intolerable situation.

Last April, I returned from a study mission on the subject of the immigration of Russian Jews with our fine and capable colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). We observed firsthand the arrival of hundreds of Jews from the Soviet Union in Vienna en route to the State of Israel. We saw them as they arrived. We met with them, talked with them, and witnessed their reactions as they stepped off planes and trains and touched for the first time, land other than their native Russian soil. We saw the look in their eyes and could sense the joy in their hearts. But we could also sense their apprehension. Nevertheless, their determination to face the challenges of their new life was most apparent. It was without doubt the most moving experience in my life.

The day after these emigrants arrived, we visited them at a temporary shelter where we sat in groups, and through interpreters, talked informally about their plights in the Soviet Union. If ever anyone had doubt of the suppression of freedoms in the Soviet Union, I only wish they could have listened to these refugees. Among them were doctors, engineers, teachers, journalists, tailors, shoemakers, farmers, housewives, elderly men and women, children and young couples. They all came with but one goal: to find new life within the concepts of their spiritual and moral beliefs and to be free of repression and fear.

We also visited an absorption center in Israel where highly sophisticated programs were planned for the constructive readjustment of Israel's newest citizens. We saw typical housing units for Russian refugees and we spoke to many of the residents. Not all were newcomers, some had lived there for months; others for years.

Later on in our mission we were privileged to be on hand at the airport in Tel Aviv to meet the plane which carried the same groups we met at the train station and at the airport in Vienna and

at their temporary residence there before they embarked for Israel.

Several of the refugees recognized us as they stepped off the plane with their bright eyes and broad smiles—surely more outgoing than when they arrived in Europe—more confident and more determined. We exchanged hearty "shaloms" and warm handshakes. This was a touching scene, one that I wish every Member of this House could have experienced.

Our hearts were enlightened by what we saw, what we learned, and what we experienced. This experience evidenced the great hope ahead for people who wish to be free.

The Russian Jews we met were the fortunate ones, for their applications were approved by Soviet officials based on supporting affidavits from relatives in Israel. There have been an average of 2,000 such emigrants a month coming to Israel since the beginning of this year.

But out of 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union this number is small indeed, yet it is a good beginning and points to the effectiveness of responsible action. The consensus of all of those to whom we spoke is that responsible U.S. attitudes and world opinion has helped motivate the Soviet Union to relax its policy toward an effort to allow these numbers to migrate. But now we know that not to be completely true.

Let us make a commitment not to rest until all of those who seek religious and cultural freedom are able to achieve it.

We know that life for Jewish people in the Soviet Union is getting more difficult. Radio communications have been cut off. Radio Liberty has not been heard in Russia for more than 4 months and I am also told that the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Co. have been jammed. There are now confirmed reports that during the President's trip to Russia the KGB and the police prohibited Jews who lived in Moscow to leave the city and also illegally arrested many prominent Russian Jewish leaders.

We in the Congress must make it abundantly clear that we abhor this unconscionable tax and we must do all that is in our power to see that, for the sake of human dignity, it is rescinded.

As soon as I learned of this newest discrimination tactic I asked the acting U.S. Representative to the United Nations to bring this matter before the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

Legal scholars have agreed that this new policy of charging unreasonably high exit fees is a clear violation of article XIII of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

I have also been in contact with our distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush, and he has assured me that he is pursuing every available avenue to help remedy this injustice.

But now we as a legislative body must pursue the channels open to us.

I want to make certain that the Soviet Union knows how damaging their actions are to future detentes between our Government and theirs and that as a Member of Congress I will have serious reservations of giving my approval for

future trade and economic concessions while this slavery exists in Russia.

The Congress has the undisputed power to deny a most-favored-nation status to Russia by not amending section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1972. Clearly Congress also has the power to pass on Soviet applications for future credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation as well as the Export-Import Bank.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, will carefully examine future trade agreements with the Soviet Union with the repressive action of its government clearly in mind. I appeal to men of good will to raise their voices in strong protest to this latest form of Soviet injustice.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed impelled to join with Mr. POBELL and my other distinguished colleagues here in appealing today for a suspension of U.S. trade with the Soviet Union until the question of the inhumane treatment of Soviet Jews is equitably resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I was appalled upon learning of the latest move by the Soviet Union to impose an emigration head tax in the amount of thousands of dollars upon Russian Jews desiring to emigrate to Israel. This inexcusable outrage reflects a complete disregard and contempt of basic fundamental human rights and it arouses the fullest public condemnation of all decent and freedom-loving people.

Because of the barbarous treatment of Soviet Jews, I was very pleased to join with Representative ERLBERG and other concerned colleagues in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 706 designed to express the sense of the Congress that the Government and leaders of the Soviet Union should be formally and severely censured.

The grave injustice of past Soviet infringements upon the Jewish people, including the levying of a \$1,000 fee for emigration permits, the loss of jobs, threats of forced enlistment in the army or possible imprisonment and general harassment, is now multiplied many times over through the almost unbelievable demand that a ransom of from \$5,000 to \$25,000 be paid for each Jewish person with a higher education who wants to emigrate to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, this action violates the spirit and letter of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights by blatantly disregarding the universally recognized right to emigrate from one's country and it further violates the values and hopes of the world community at large. In joining with my colleagues in condemning the Government and leaders of the Soviet Union for perpetrating this inhuman and discriminatory outrage on thousands and thousands of Jews living in the Soviet Union, it remains my most earnest hope that the innocent victims of this continuing persecution may soon be granted a full redress of grievances and permission to exercise their individual rights as human beings and toward these objectives I will continue to express my convictions and exert my efforts.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my many colleagues from constituencies all across

this Nation to protest with all the vigor at my command the demand of the Soviet Union for a ransom for each Jewish person with developed skills who wish to emigrate to Israel.

On September 19, 1972, the Supreme Soviet, the highest legislative body in the Soviet Union, meets to ratify a schedule of ransom payments of from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for persons in specified categories who wish to go to Israel. I would like to point out to the Soviet Government that I shall look with a jaundiced eye upon a liberalization of trade with the Soviet Union while the policy is continued. To put it as bluntly as I can, I shall simply oppose any regularization of trade relations with the Soviets while this policy exists.

Mr. Speaker, this latest act is simply a continuation of a long standing policy of persecution of the Jewish people by the Soviets. Jews in Soviet Russia are deprived, are forced to endure all sorts of hardships because of their religious faith. Jewish schools have been closed; only a few synagogues remain open and Jews who practice the faith of their fathers openly are subject to all sorts of implied and direct reprisals.

For the record, the schedule of ransom payments is as follows:

Graduates of Moscow University: 12,200 rubles.

Graduates of other universities: 6,000 rubles, although all universities are theoretically equal. The state invests considerably more in terms of eminent faculty, library and laboratory.

Facilities and living quarters for the education of Moscow University students than elsewhere.

Diploma holders of high technological institutions: 7,700 rubles.

Agricultural and forestry specialists: 5,600 rubles.

Physicians and pharmacists: 8,300 rubles.

Teachers who have graduated from pedagogical institutes: 4,500 rubles.

Graduates of Institutes for Foreign Languages: 6,800 rubles.

Graduates of musical conservatories, theater, and motion picture schools: 9,600 rubles.

Three categories of persons are required to pay the following fees:

Those who completed graduate studies but have not received a graduate degree: 1,700 rubles.

Holders of the degree "Candidate of Science," roughly equivalent to an American Ph. D.: 5,400 rubles.

Doctors of science: 7,200 rubles.

Accordingly, the maximum possible payment for emigration for a doctor of science who is also a graduate of Moscow University would be 20,300 rubles.

Mr. Speaker, this policy has to be reversed and I call upon our Government to use all its good offices to see that Soviet Jewry has this burden lifted.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I am both appalled and outraged that the Soviet Union places a fee on human life. Not only are the Jewish people of Russia being prevented from emigrating, but they are also being prevented from living a "normal" life, because they can no

longer consider education to be a free learning experience.

The Russian Government's specious and transparent excuse for the fees—educational costs—commits educated Jews to modern barbaric slavery. Such action clearly violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—to which the Soviet Union is a party—an international agreement which guarantees the right of every citizen to emigrate.

I believe these actions are official bigotry and tyranny and not, as the Soviet Government suggests, an "internal matter." With respect to a person's chosen domicile, I find this unconscionable action inconsistent with 20th century values. Therefore, Congress should carefully examine continuing trade with Russia as long as such callous and ruthless behavior persists.

RESULTS OF 1972 OPINION POLL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VANIK). Under a previous order to the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my colleagues our office has always benefited from the annual opinion poll which we conduct each year among our constituents in Missouri's Fourth Congressional District. When these polls are returned, participants frequently send along added comments that help keep me abreast of the thinking of the citizens I have the honor to represent.

These results of our 1972 opinion poll have now been carefully tabulated. The reason I enter these results in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is to share with my colleagues the viewpoints expressed by what I believe are the straight-thinking people of America's heartland—west central Missouri. I have always admired their forthright expressions. I respect the good judgment of the recommendations they make for coping with the problems we all must face.

Let me emphasize the totals in this poll have been arrived at by careful reading and then counting the answers on every single ballot. We have noted and recorded the many handwritten comments. This tabulation is not a "sampling" or just a rough estimate of results. Rather, it is an actual and exact count of all the responses we received which was compiled this summer by a student intern and then rechecked by the regular staff.

Your attention is directed to the following highlights from the tabulation of responses:

Fifty-five percent of those who participated consider that President Nixon's trip to Peking and Moscow was an effective contribution to world peace. Fifty-two percent believe NATO troop levels should be reduced only after agreement for mutual balanced force reductions. On the current subject of amnesty, only 3 percent favor total amnesty as opposed to 53 percent against amnesty and 37 percent favoring amnesty upon agreement to serve in some nonmilitary capacity.

There should be no question about our constituents' views on busing. Fifty-eight percent favor attending schools nearest their homes with 32 percent supporting "freedom of choice assignment." And 42 percent support a constitutional amendment to prohibit busing.

Forty-two percent consider wage-price controls are worth continuing, but 36 percent do not think they have been fairly administered. The administration continues to have the support of the Fourth Missouri District on Vietnam policy. During our 1970 opinion poll, 58 percent supported the Vietnamization policy. In 1972 the percentage has risen to 61 percent who favor the continuation of the present troop withdrawal. Our constituency continues to prefer stiffer penalties for crimes involving firearms rather than legislation to prohibit the sale and possession of firearms. Eighty-four percent voted in favor of increasing such penalties and 62 percent opposed legislation prohibiting the sale and possession of handguns.

Our constituents' opinion about spending priorities proved most interesting. Seventy-nine percent favored spending to control crime and narcotics; 64 percent favored increased aid to the elderly; 49 percent supported increased Federal aid to education and 55 percent believe more money should be spent on environmental protection. The space program was most often singled out as the agency that should be reduced, with 53 percent voting for less money for that agency.

Other interesting highlights were the opposition expressed to the diversion of highway use taxes for mass transit and to the proposed value-added tax. On the other hand, our people favor a national health program and also a national primary for the selection of a presidential candidate. A resounding 91 percent insisted upon work requirements for all able-bodied welfare recipients under the age 65.

The complete results of my 1972 opinion poll are as follows:

RESULTS OF 1972 OPINION POLL

1. Was President Nixon's trip to Peking:
 - 55.25% An effective contribution to world peace.
 - 13.62% Unproductive.
 - 26.83% Undecided.
 - 4.30% No response or unascertainable.
2. Was President Nixon's trip to Moscow:
 - 55.09% An effective contribution to world peace.
 - 13.43% Unproductive.
 - 26.81% Undecided.
 - 4.67% No response or unascertainable.
3. NATO troop levels. The U.S. should:
 - 18.39% Unilaterally reduce number of our troops.
 - 52.33% Reduce our troop strength only after agreement for mutual balanced force reductions.
 - 16.83% Maintain present levels.
 - 10.09% No response.
 - 2.36% Other.
4. If you believe we should either reduce our forces or recall them—do you think we should continue to provide military equipment to our NATO allies?
 - 32.85% Yes.
 - 19.91% No.
 - 45.85% No response.
 - 1.39% Other.
5. What do you think our policy should

be towards those young men who fled this country to avoid possible military service?

3.66% Guarantee total amnesty.

53.99% No amnesty.

37.55% Amnesty conditioned upon agreement to serve the country in some non-military capacity for such length of time as Congress may determine.

3.19% No response.

1.61% Other.

6. On the subject of busing do you favor:

1.82% Assignment of pupils to schools to achieve racial balance.

58.8% Assignment of children only to those schools nearest their homes.

32.28% "Freedom of choice assignment" of pupils, recognizing the existence of some de facto segregation, but with the objective to achieve equally high quality schools for all students.

4.00% No response.

1.61% Other.

7. In the event you may have preferred choice (b) above (Assignment of children only to those schools nearest their homes) which of the following anti-busing measures would you favor to guarantee attendance at neighborhood schools:

15.94% Congressional moratorium on busing.

42.73% Constitutional Amendment to prohibit busing.

38.69% No response.

2.64% Other.

8. On the subject of wage-price controls, do you believe these measures:

42.90% Have controlled inflation and thus are worth continuing.

28.20% Have been ineffective, and should be discontinued.

26.95% No response.

1.95% Other.

9. Do you think the wage-price controls have been fairly administered?

22.46% Yes.

36.23% No.

40.20% No response.

1.11% Other.

10. Which of the following best expresses your feeling about Vietnam:

61.22% Continue present troop withdrawal and Vietnamization policy.

6.91% Commit additional United States ground combat troops in sufficient numbers to halt the current invasion.

20.91% Immediate and total withdrawal of all United States troops.

4.66% Other.

6.30% No response.

11. We have now had about 18 months' experience under the Agricultural Act of 1970, which many thought to be inadequate for meeting farm needs; in your opinion, under this present farm legislation, are farm earnings:

18.33% Better.

11.13% Poorer.

41.72% About the same.

28.19% No response.

.63% Other.

12. Do you favor a federal law prohibiting the sale and possession of all handguns?

13.90% Yes.

62.21% No.

23.89% No response.

13. Do you favor new and stringent restrictions on the sale and possession of handguns, including registration?

48.68% Yes.

30.13% No.

21.19% No response.

14. Should penalties for crimes involving firearms be increased?

84.41% Yes.

3.28% No.

12.31% No response.

15. Should all present gun control laws be eliminated?

13.74% Yes.

55.99% No.

30.27% No response.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Federal expenditures come from tax dollars paid by each constituent in all the Congressional districts. In an effort to pinpoint possible savings, would you give us your best judgment whether we should spend more, less, or about the same on the following:

[In percent]

	More	Less	Same	No response
Defense (other than Vietnam).....	17.48	30.97	43.08	8.47
Education (increased Federal aid to help reduce pressure of State and local taxes).....	49.20	15.32	27.17	8.31
Continued space exploration.....	8.00	53.63	30.37	8.00
Aid to the poor (poverty program).....	19.55	38.36	31.36	10.73
Mass transit projects.....	31.02	29.57	21.65	17.76
Increased aid to the elderly.....	64.20	3.58	24.56	7.66
Crime and narcotics control.....	79.76	1.48	12.20	6.56
Environmental protection, water and air pollution control.....	55.38	8.94	27.18	8.50
Rehabilitation of inner cities (urban renewal)....	14.84	38.15	32.13	14.88
Rural revitalization program.....	31.50	19.26	32.54	16.70

NEEDS OF THE ELDERLY

Respondents were asked to list, in order of priority, four interest areas. In scoring this section, priority points were assigned to each response according to each respondent's answer. Four points were given to each answer which listed a certain interest area first, three points to each which listed an area as second in priority, etc. At the conclusion of this exercise, the total priority points assigned were added up, and the percentage of the total assigned to each interest area is given below. This procedure insures a result which indicates relative priorities, which is what the question was intended to determine.

31.67% Health Programs.

22.71% Housing.

32.28% Income Maintenance.

13.34% Transportation.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Finally, your opinion please on the following undecided but vital issues proposed or pending before Congress:

1. Diversion of highway use taxes to finance mass transit systems.

Yes, 20.34%.

No, 55.98%.

Undecided, 15.94%.

No response, 7.74%.

2. Federal regulation of private pension plans to guarantee portability and vesting in order that workers, when laid off or changing jobs, receive the full benefits which they have earned.

Yes, 64.55%.

No, 16.91%.

Undecided, 11.26%.

No response, 7.28%.

3. Without regard to the relative merits of various proposals, do you feel we need a system of national health insurance?

Yes, 46.15%.

No, 33.82%.

Undecided, 12.60%.

No response, 7.43%.

4. Constitutional Amendment limiting the President to one six-year term.

Yes, 28.23%.

No, 54.00%.

Undecided, 11.36%.

No response, 6.41%.

5. The Administration's proposed plan for VAT (Value-added tax or national sales tax).

Yes, 13.42%.

No, 61.50%.

Undecided, 17.10%.

No response, 7.98%.

6. Selection of Presidential candidates through a national primary rather than

through the present individual state primaries or state convention method.

Yes, 67.22%.

No, 15.94%.

Undecided, 11.11%.

No response, 5.73%.

7. A requirement in the law that every able-bodied welfare recipient under 65 register for a job, and then either take job training, or go to work at a job when offered on penalty of loss of all welfare benefits.

Yes, 91.70%.

No, 2.97%.

Undecided, 2.47%.

No response, 2.86%.

THE PROBLEM OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this morning, along with her Members of Congress, I received a "Special Bulletin to the Congress" from the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Mr. Speaker, this indicates that the Commission has in small part recognized some of the criticisms of the Commission today and have attempted to make some slight improvement and for this I am glad.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I note the highlights of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission's action to date, I cannot help but note from their own report how inadequate the Commission has been to date. Also, it seems to me that they are making certain claims that may not be the whole truth, and also from their own report, they apparently are involved in many programs which are incidental and make no real contribution to the objective of the bicentennial.

The most glaring shortcoming of the report is evidenced now in writing that they have not enlisted nor sought the cooperation of the historical societies and associations nor have they shown an interest in and a cooperation with institutions like the Library of Congress and the history and archives program.

The greatest tragedy of all is the fact that the prestigious American Association of State and Local History, under the magnificent leadership of William Alderson, has not been sought and used. Mr. Speaker, this organization is very important because it has over 5,000 local and State historical associations and societies that are part of its membership and its program. This organization could be invaluable in every program that would enhance, involve, and promote history at the grassroots level.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly said, and I repeat today, that the great shortcoming of the present Commission is not its membership, but its leadership. The way the present Commission is structured, it has its basic loyalty to the executive department of Government where I am sure there is a sincere desire but where there is also a great lack of experience and certainly a lack of time to give to this kind of promotion, and so, Mr. Speaker, there is something basic wrong with the present organization.

We ought to follow the example of, and learn from, the experience of previous

centennial commissions. With that in mind, I pursued a study of some very important commissions that have made significant contributions and were very successful. In the future I will be placing in the RECORD a summary of other commissions, but today I want especially to call attention to the U.S. George Washington Bicentennial Commission, the U.S. Sesquicentennial of American Independence and the Thomas Jefferson Centennial Commission of the United States, and the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission. In each of the commissions, as in others that will be noted later, the act provided that the Commission elect their own chairman and vice chairman. This is a great and important difference. It creates a situation where the chairman and vice chairman are more responsive to the wishes of the Commission—a sound arrangement. Here will be noted a brief summary of each, including their statutory authority, their appropriations, and their principal activities. The principal source in each case that I am presenting was the final reports of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the report and summary follows:

REPORT OF CENTENNIAL COMMISSIONS
GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL
COMMISSION

The U.S. George Washington Bicentennial Commission was established by authority of Public Resolution No. 38 (43 Stat. 671-672), approved December 2, 1924 (copy enclosed). The resolution provided that the commission consist of 19 commissioners (the President of the U.S., presiding officer of the Senate, Speaker of the House Ex officio; eight persons appointed by the President; four Senators appointed by the President pro tem of the Senate; and four Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House). The resolution specified that the commissioners would serve without compensation (except for travel and hotel expenses), and that they would select a chairman and vice chairman from among their members.

At the first meeting of the Bicentennial Commission, held at the White House on February 16, 1925, the President was authorized to appoint a secretary pro tempore, and he so designated Rep. John Q. Tilson of Connecticut. An executive committee of the Commission was authorized to look after the budget, secure headquarters for the Commission, and in general to act for the Commission between full meetings. It is unclear from the Commission's final report who appointed the executive committee, but it does state (on p. 602): "Pursuant to the authority of the commission at its meeting February 16, 1925, the following members were appointed to constitute the executive committee of the commission . . ." [the four Senatorial members, the four Representatives, and three of the presidential appointees].

The executive committee met on February 27, 1925, and elected President Coolidge as chairman of the Commission, Senator Simeon D. Fess of Ohio as vice chairman, and Representative John Tilson as secretary-treasurer. In subsequent years of the Commission's life, both Presidents Hoover and Roosevelt also served as chairmen of the Commission. The Commission's activities apparently came to a close at the end of 1933, although it had originally been authorized to continue in existence until December 31, 1934.

Total appropriations to the Bicentennial Commission, 1925-1932, were \$1,270,716.

Profit to the Federal Government from the sale of the twelve Bicentennial commemorative stamps (which came largely from collectors who either did not use the stamps at all or put more stamps than necessary on an envelope) with estimated at \$1,000,000. And profit from the sale of the Definitive Writings series (explained below) was estimated at \$71,170. Thus, the final report of the Bicentennial Commission estimated that the actual cost of the Commission amounted to \$199,545.

The guiding rationale of the Bicentennial Commission was that it should not be a "world's fair" kind of thing, with industrial exhibits, entertainment, and the like. Rather that "a new form of Celebration was to be launched; that it was to be a serious appeal to the hearts and minds of men, women and children; that it was to be entirely devoid of the carnival spirit, and was to be essentially educational . . . [that it was to be a] new form of Celebration, which took the Celebration to the people rather than bringing the people to the Celebration. . . ." (p. 2 of their report).

One of the major projects of the Bicentennial Commission was to put together an accurate life history of George Washington, and this three-volume "Literature Series" was distributed free to the libraries of the country. Another major effort of the Commission was to prepare and distribute educational materials to school children, to organize school contests in essay and oratory, and to assist young people's organizations in every state.

Another important project of the Commission was the compilation and publication of the "Definitive Writings of George Washington." Authorized by a special act of Congress, it was to be published in approximately 25-volume sets and sold by the Superintendent of Documents. The series included all the available important and interesting documents written by George Washington, with the exception of his diaries which had already been published.

A suggestion that a Memorial Highway, to connect the home of George Washington at Mt. Vernon with the Arlington Memorial Bridge, received strong support from members of the Bicentennial Commission and was considered a project of the Commission. The road was authorized by Congress and constructed, and of course we know it today as the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Other projects of the Commission included support for the reconstruction of the Washington ancestral estate at Wakefield, Virginia; the publication of the George Washington Atlas (maps made by or for him and maps concerning his activities) which is included in Volume 1 of the Literature Series; and the George Washington Bicentennial Historical Loan Exhibition in the District of Columbia (pictures of George Washington and his contemporaries along with other Washingtonians loaned by various people).

And, of course, the Bicentennial Commission sponsored or assisted in sponsoring a number of ceremonial events commemorating George Washington during the bicentennial year, 1932.

A brief summary of the organization of the Bicentennial Commission will give some idea of the scope of its activities. We are also including a copy of the table of contents of the final volume, because it outlines in considerable detail the activities of the Commission.

At the height of the Commission's activities in the early part of 1932, about 175 people were employed by the Commission; the staff was directed by Representative Sol Bloom of New York. The Commission staff was divided into major departments as follows: Publicity; Women's Activities; States, Cities, and Towns (to secure cooperation

from local groups for bicentennial activities); Education (educational programs for school children); Historical (which served all departments of the Commission); Special Activities (including commemorative stamps, medals, and participation of foreign countries); and Pageants and Music.

SESSQUICENTENNIAL OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE
AND THE THOMAS JEFFERSON CENTENNIAL
COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES

This commission was established on a considerably more modest scale than the George Washington Bicentennial Commission. It was authorized by Public Resolution No. 20 (44 Stat. 327-328), approved April 26, 1926 (copy enclosed). Like the Bicentennial Commission, the Sesquicentennial Commission was to consist of 19 members, appointed in almost the same fashion (the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House ex officio; eight persons appointed by the President, four Senators appointed by the Vice President; four Representatives appointed by the Speaker). The resolution also provided that the commissioners should serve without compensation (no specific provision was made for travel or hotel expenses), and that no appropriation should be made by the Congress to carry out the purposes of the act.

The moving force behind the Sesquicentennial Commission was the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, which had been incorporated in 1923 for the purpose of establishing Monticello as a memorial to Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence. Indeed, in the resolution creating the Commission, it was directed "to prepare a plan or plans for a program in cooperation with the officers and board of governors of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation. . . ." At the first meeting of the Commission, called by President Coolidge and held at the White House on May 13, 1926, the President was elected honorary chairman and Dr. Edwin Alderman, president of the University of Virginia, was elected honorary vice chairman. Stuart G. Gibboney, president of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, was elected chairman of the Commission, and Charles Francis Adams was elected vice chairman.

Also at the first meeting, President Coolidge asked for suggestions from the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, and reports were received from the National Jefferson Centennial Committee and the National Educational Committee of the Foundation. The Centennial Committee suggested a five-part program for the celebration of the American Sesquicentennial and the Jefferson Centennial as follows: (1) Jefferson's big pilgrimage (automobile parties to escort Jefferson's one-horse carriage, in which he had ridden to the Continental Congress, from Monticello to Philadelphia where the international sesquicentennial exposition was being held); (2) observance of American Independence week; (3) commemoration of Jefferson memorial day, July 4, the centennial of Jefferson's death; (4) celebration of the sesquicentennial of the Declaration of Independence on July 5; (5) United States birthday party tour to Europe (private tour arranged and sponsored by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation). The educational committee of the Foundation laid out a rather detailed program for celebration of American Independence Week from June 28 to July 5, 1926. The program for American Independence Week was unanimously adopted by the Sesquicentennial Commission.

Other actions taken by the Commission at its first meeting were: authorization of the chairman to send letters to civic officials and patriotic organizations throughout the country to urge observances of American Independence Week; provision for the printing of official stationery for the Commission (whose cost would be borne by the Foundation); the election of an executive committee; and the

creation of a subcommittee to prepare an address relating the reason for the establishment of the Commission so that it might be promulgated to the American people.

On May 31, 1926, President Coolidge addressed the American people "calling upon them to renew their fidelity to the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence, while according to Thomas Jefferson, its author, the recognition due him by virtue of his services enumerated by the President in his address" (p. 2 of the Commission's report).

The celebration of American Independence Week was carried out as planned, beginning with the ringing of bells throughout the country at 11 a.m. on June 28 as the "Echo of the Liberty Bell" and concluding with national exercises held at the University of Virginia and Monticello.

Finally, the Commission submitted four recommendations to the Congress for consideration: (1) that April 13 of each year be celebrated as Thomas Jefferson's birthday; (2) that the Commission continue to support the nationwide effort to raise funds for the preservation of Monticello; (3) that an appropriate shrine be established and dedicated as a memorial to Thomas Jefferson in the City of Washington; and (4) that the Commission be continued in office to follow through on these recommendations.

The Commission apparently expired with the submission of its final report to the Congress on February 1, 1928.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The Civil War Centennial Commission was established by authority of Public Law 85-305 (71 Stat. 626-628), approved September 7, 1957 (copy of law enclosed). The Commission was to consist of 25 members (the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House as ex officio members; four Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate; four Members of the House appointed by the Speaker of the House; 12 members appointed by the President (2 of whom would be from the Department of Defense); one member from the Department of the Interior; and one member from the Library of Congress). The law provided that members would not be compensated, except for travel and per diem expenses.

This body was similar to the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, for it, too, continued in existence for a number of years (1957-1966), and the celebration itself stretched over the whole four-year period of the centennial of the Civil War (1961-1965).

The law creating the Commission provided that the Director of the National Park Service (the Interior member) should call the first meeting for the purpose of electing a chairman. This meeting was held on December 20, 1957; General U. S. Grant, 3d, was elected chairman, and Representative William Tuck of Virginia was elected vice chairman. General Grant resigned from the Commission in 1961 for reasons of health, and President Kennedy appointed Dr. Allan Nevins to Commission membership in October of 1961; he was elected chairman of the Commission at a December meeting. Representative Tuck had also resigned during the summer of 1961, and Representative Schwengel, an original Congressional member, was elected vice chairman. Mr. Schwengel also served as executive director from September through December, 1961, because executive director Karl S. Betts resigned shortly after a controversy developed concerning the holding of the Fourth National Assembly in Charleston, South Carolina (explained below). Historian Dr. James I. Robertson of the University of Iowa was elected executive director by the Commission in December, 1961, and he remained in

office through June 1965. Assistant executive director, Edmund C. Gass, acted in that capacity until 1966 in order to wrap up the activities of the Commission.

According to an audit report of the General Accounting Office issued July 18, 1957 (U.S. General Accounting Office, Report to the Congress of the United States; audit of Civil War Centennial Commission for the period September 7, 1957, through May 1, 1966. Washington, July, 1967. 17 p. [E641.U586]), total appropriations received by the Commission from 1958 through 1965 amounted to \$840,750; other receipts (sale of booklets, royalties from commemorative medals, donated funds) totaled \$24,909. Total expenditures and unliquidated obligations came to \$775,741, leaving an unobligated balance of \$89,918. We are enclosing a copy of the complete GAO report for your information.

The first task of the Centennial Commission was to formulate goals and programs for the centennial celebration; many ideas came from the First National Assembly it sponsored in early 1958, which was attended largely by representatives of State Centennial Commissions, city and county committees, and patriotic societies. The First Assembly recommended that it be reconvened the following year; and National Assemblies were held each subsequent year in various cities through 1965. They played a large part in planning centennial activities. The final, Eighth National Assembly was held in Springfield, Illinois, and was the largest one of all. According to the Commission's report (p. 29) it was "a moving blend of drama, music, poetry, art, friendly badinage and serious discussion . . ." and can be regarded "as a culmination of the commemoration, for it reflected the Centennial's variety of expressions in ceremony, pageantry, discourse and scholarship."

One of the principal aims of the Commission was to awaken the country to the centennial and to insure widespread public participation. A series of commemorative stamps was issued by the Post Office Department, and an awards committee was established to recognize unique contributions to the centennial celebration effort. At the same time, it was acknowledged by the Commission that racial feelings in the nation were running high during the early 1960's, and they did not want to undertake anything in commemoration of the Civil War that would in fact exacerbate the existing situation. One problem did arise in connection with the Fourth National Assembly in Charleston, April 11-12, 1961, when it was discovered that several officers of the national Commission had committed themselves to using a segregated hotel as their headquarters in Charleston. Strong protests were made, accompanied apparently by considerable publicity, and President Kennedy then intervened to suggest that the headquarters be changed to a U.S. naval base on the outskirts of Charleston. Following this incident, there was some change in the Commission's makeup, as noted above.

There was also some change in the direction and emphasis of the Commission following the appointment of Dr. Nevins to the Commission. He said:

"We shall use our energies and influence to help make the national commemoration of the Civil War both instructive and constructive. To this end we shall discourage observances that are cheap and tawdry, or that are divisive in temper . . . We shall encourage observances which will assist the American people to understand the mingled tragedy and exaltation of the war, and to draw from it lessons both practical and moral commensurate with its importance . . ." (p. 13 of report)

In this connection the Commission felt

that while some commemorations of the Civil War would be military in nature, at least equal attention had to be given the great political, social, economic, and cultural developments of the war years. Some sham battles were reenacted, but these were solely the productions of State and local centennial organizations.

A number of booklets about various aspects of the Civil War years were issued by the Centennial Commission and were widely distributed throughout the country. Beginning in 1962, the Commission increasingly concentrated its energies upon four major undertakings in the area of scholarship. Two of these projects involved the collection, editing, and publication of the papers of Ulysses S. Grant and Jefferson Davis. Representatives of three of the State Centennial Commissions (Ohio, Illinois, and New York) established the nonprofit Ulysses S. Grant Association and contributed initial funds for planning and organization. Ultimately headquarters were offered to the Association by Southern Illinois University. The national Centennial Commission assisted by publicizing the work of the Association and helping to make working arrangements with the National Archives and the National Historical Publications Commission. A similar kind of arrangement was made for the Jefferson Davis papers, and a Jefferson Davis Association was formed with headquarters at Rice University.

A third scholarly enterprise was one for which the Commission itself assumed primary responsibility: an annotated bibliography, consisting of some 5,000 titles, of the most useful and utilized books about the Civil War. The fourth major project, the "Impact Series," consisted of 15 detailed studies tracing and analyzing the impact of the Civil War on as many nonmilitary aspects of American life.

Two special programs were sponsored by the national Centennial Commission: the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the issuance of the Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation at the Lincoln Memorial in September, 1962, and a symposium on the Gettysburg Address held in Washington in January, 1964. Other agencies of the Federal Government also held commemorative events during the centennial period, and innumerable activities were held in cities and towns throughout the country, which were sponsored by State and local centennial organizations. In all, 45 States and the District of Columbia established officially sanctioned commissions. A number of State centennial committees as well as one local committee were recipients of the national Commission's highest award, the Centennial Medallion, for their contributions to the centennial commemoration.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH ON THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order that I might support the action taken by our Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush, on the Middle East situation. There is no question of my interest and dedication to see a lasting peace in the Middle East. I agree with Ambassador Bush when he said that the resolution he vetoed was one-sided and certainly not in the best interests of peace. The loss suffered by Israel in the Munich mas-

sacre cannot be overlooked. I am submitting the Ambassador's full statement as a matter of record:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

MR. PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today on a complaint by the Syrian government. The Middle East has again been the scene of violence, as it has so often in the past. The Council is again seized of a problem with which it has repeatedly failed in the past to come to grips in an equitable way.

We should all recall that until a few days ago the world had again dared to hope because a climate of reasonableness and realism seemed to be developing in the area. There were grounds to hope that new opportunities for progress towards peace in the Middle East were opening up before us. Then came "Munich"—the senseless act of terrorism there which cast a pall over these hopes. Yet we are now meeting on a complaint by Syria—a complaint that stands out for its unreality. It makes no reference to the tragic events at Munich. It gives no salve to the wounded conscience of an agonized world.

There is an obvious connection between the actions of which the Syrian government now complains and the tragic events which took place in Munich this past Tuesday. Did the Syrian government join in complaint or expressions of outrage when terrorists invaded the Olympic Village, in violation not only of law but of the spirit of Olympic brotherhood, and murdered innocent athletes? Did we hear even a word of condemnation from the government of Syria for this despicable act? No, quite the contrary. The Syrian government continues to harbor and to give aid and encouragement to terrorist organizations which openly champion such acts.

And the Syrian government is not alone in its encouragement of terrorism. Certain other governments in the area—whether by word and deed, or by silent acquiescence and failure to disassociate themselves from the acts of a minority that preaches and practices lawlessness and violence—cannot be absolved of responsibility for the cycle of violence and counterviolence we have again witnessed this past week.

Mr. President, the ultimate root of the problem is, of course, the absence of peace in the Middle East. My government has labored long and hard in this cause; in the effort to achieve a just and durable peace the United States has been and will continue to be second to none.

We shall continue to work toward the goal of peace, but the absence of peace cannot be exploited as a pretext for violence on any side. Those who preach violence and employ it as a matter of policy always begets violence. The crimes that were carried out at Lod and at Munich cannot but breed tragedy for their perpetrators and for those who befriend them. States which harbor and give succor to terrorists cannot then claim sanctuary for themselves. The greatest tragedy of all is that when violence is employed, innocent people, on all sides, are almost inevitably made to suffer. Slain Olympic athletes in Munich—or heartbroken mothers searching for dead under rubble in Rafid—these are some of the immediate victims of terror. But indeed the whole civilized world is the real victim of terror. Mr. President, we deplore the loss of lives on both sides.

Today the United States is engaged in a major effort along with other members of the international community, to make our airways, our sports fields and our other gathering places safe from terrorism and violence. A beginning has been made, in various

international conventions dealing with aircraft hijacking and related problems, to establish a strong framework of law in these matters among the nations of our interdependent world. Secretary Rogers has urged rapid and meaningful action in the Subcommittee of ICAO now meeting in Washington. He has urged rapid action in ratifying existing conventions by governments that have not yet done so. But recent events make clear that the problem is much broader and more pernicious in nature. My government urges that the issue of terrorism in all its aspects receive the highest priority when the General Assembly convenes later this month. The commendable initiative of the Secretary General in placing this question on the Assembly's agenda ensures that the world can no longer close its eyes to this pressing matter.

Mr. President, the United States will continue to work for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. But one-sided resolutions of the type which this Council has so frequently adopted in recent times, do not contribute to the goal for peace; indeed, they create an atmosphere in no way conducive to peace by encouraging perpetrators and supporters of acts of terrorism to believe they can escape the world's censure.

Let us not put our heads in the sand and perpetrate the notion of "unreality" that is often assigned to the United Nations.

Munich was so horrible, so vicious, so brutal, so detrimental to order in the world and to peace in the Middle East that we simply must not act here as if it did not exist.

We believe each member of the Council, indeed of the entire international community, should make it unmistakably clear that acts of terror and violence practiced against innocent people as a matter of policy are unacceptable in a civilized world. Each of us has a responsibility to make clear that those who practice such acts, or aid and abet them in any way, are the ones deserving of censure and condemnation. Only then will we begin to eliminate this scourge from the earth, and with it the acts of counterviolence to which history inevitably proves it gives rise.

Mr. President, in closing, I would like to read out the text of a resolution which could be helpful to address itself to the thrust of our remarks here and which we would now like to introduce.

"The Security Council,

"Gravely concerned at the renewal of terrorist attacks on innocent persons.

"Deplored the loss of innocent lives on both sides and the outbreak of renewed violence in the Middle East.

"Convinced that acts of terrorism, and any encouragement and support for such acts, are totally unacceptable in a civilized society and are inimical to the maintenance of the ceasefire in the Middle East.

"1. Condemns the senseless and unprovoked terrorist attack in Munich on September 5 by terrorists of the so-called Black September Organization which resulted in the loss of life of numerous innocent victims.

"2. Calls upon those states harboring and supporting such terrorists and their activities to cease their encouragement and support of terrorists, and to take all necessary measures to bring about the immediate end of such senseless acts."

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS ON AID TO CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we are currently considering a variety of pro-

posals which would attempt to legalize Federal aid, whether direct, indirect or through tax credits to private and parochial schools. Those who favor this approach seem bent on passing legislation which may not pass a constitutional test. Others would seek to amend the constitution to make such aid constitutionally permissible. I believe that the latter route is proper. Let the people decide but do not endeavor to hold out the false illusion of proffers of assistance which cannot be constitutionally implemented.

Not every issue breaks down into a simple pro and con position. I have always been opposed to the concept of public funds going to private or parochial schools. In 12 years on the Education Committee, however, I have come to the conclusion that there is a decided public good to be served by giving the parent some option in the matter of the education of his children. The public education lobby has become so big and so powerful that the only check we can now place on it—I do not see any here in Congress—is the simple and fundamental option that a parent be accorded in choosing public or private education. I believe there is a national purpose to providing this choice. It is obvious that this choice will be meaningless if private schools close and this segment of our total educational picture dries up because of financial reasons. I have always thought a national voucher plan would work. In this program, the parents would be entitled to choose the school their child would attend and the Federal funds available would be credited, as in a voucher, to that school. If \$250 dollars is available to that parent, this money would go to the public school or to the private school of their choice. This portability of funds would make the parent, not the school system supreme. It would operate as a check and balance on the monolithic educational system we seem to be building. The individual, not the Government, would be in the driver's seat for a change.

Under any proposal, the voucher plan included, there are serious constitutional issues which cannot be brushed aside, even by those who are politically inclined in an election year to make promises. There are many cases to be considered and in particular some of the recent Supreme Court decisions would seem to present some pattern. In researching these cases, the pitfalls of aid to private and parochial schools would seem to mandate a clear-cut necessity of amending the constitution if any aid of this type is to even be considered.

Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1971, the Supreme Court decided two cases involving State statutes providing assistance for private and parochial elementary and secondary education—Lemon against Kurtzman; Robinson against DiCenso—and the Federal Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 which assists colleges and universities—including Church-related institutions—in the construction of academic and related facilities—Tilton against Richardson. The two State

cases were combined in a single opinion—Lemon against Kurtzman—holding the statutes in Pennsylvania and Rhode Island unconstitutional under the first amendment. A separate opinion in Tilton affirmed the constitutionality of the Federal statute, except with respect to a provision permitting, after 20 years, unrestricted use of a facility.

The division against the two State statutes was 8 to 1—except that Justice Marshall abstained in the Pennsylvania case, making it 7 to 1—and the constitutionality of the Federal statute was narrowly upheld by 5 to 4. The Court was so divided in its opinions in the cases that it could best be characterized as fragmented. Only Justice White would have sustained the constitutionality of all three statutes. In Lemon Justices Douglas and Black joined in the majority opinion but also issued a strongly-worded concurring opinion in which Justice Marshall joined in part—Justice White dissenting; Justice Brennan delivered a separate opinion concurring in Lemon and dissenting in Tilton. In Tilton Justice Douglas delivered a fierce dissent which was joined in by Black and Marshall.

These divisions within the Court make it more hazardous than ordinarily to apply what the Court has said in these cases to other existing legislation or proposed legislation and predict what might be held.

I. PROVISIONS OF THE STATUTES

Pennsylvania's Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Education Act—1968—and Rhode Island's Salary Supplement Act—1969—both involve State subsidies for teachers of secular subjects in non-profit, private schools. In Rhode Island the payment of a 15-percent salary supplement, for teachers in nonpublic schools in which the average per pupil expenditure for secular subjects is below that of the public schools, is made directly to the teacher. Eligible teachers must teach only courses offered in the public schools, using only materials used in the public schools, and must agree not to teach courses in religion.

In Pennsylvania, the State superintendent of public instruction is authorized to purchase certain secular educational services from nonpublic schools, and to directly reimburse such schools for their expenditures for teachers salaries, textbooks, and instructional materials for courses in mathematics, modern foreign languages, physical science, and physical education. Textbooks and instructional materials must be approved by the State, the instruction must be devoid of religious content, and the schools must keep books subject to State audit which identify the separate cost of the supported secular subjects.

The Federal statute provides assistance in the form of grants and loans for qualified public and nonprofit private institutions of higher education for the construction of academic and related facilities, which for a period of 20 years may not be utilized for religious worship or instruction. The U.S. Commissioner

of Education enforces the limitations on use by onsite inspections.

II. BASIS FOR THE DECISIONS

A. (LEMON V. KURTZMAN)

The two State statutes were considered together and the opinion of the Court was delivered by Chief Justice Burger.

The opinion abandons earlier and somewhat threadbare references of the Court to an absolute wall of separation between church and state and openly acknowledges that judicial caveats against entanglement must recognize that the line of separation, far from being a "wall" is a blurred, indistinct and variable barrier depending on all the circumstances of a particular relationship. At the same time, the Court reaffirmed that the establishment clause rules out sponsorship, financial support, and active involvement of the sovereign in religious activity.

The Court summarized the cumulative criteria developed by the Court over many years for judging constitutionality of statutes in this area, as follows:

First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principle or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion, *Board of Education v. Allen*, 392 U.S. 236, 243 (1968); finally, the statute must not foster "an excessive government entanglement with religion."

The third criteria, drawn from a 1970 case—*Walz v. Tax Commission*, 397 U.S. 664—challenging preferential tax treatment for church properties, is new to the school cases under the first amendment and is the one principally relied upon to decide these cases. It seems to me that the Court obviously was unhappy with attempts to rationalize such aids as bus transportation—*Everson*, 1947—on the grounds that their main purpose is secular or designed to serve all children equally, and accordingly sought an additional standard to tighten the distinction. Indeed in these two cases the Court conceded that the statutes had a secular legislative purpose; it did not even decide whether the statutes were successful in avoiding the prohibition against advancing a religion, because it found that the very mechanics of attempting to avoid advancing religion led to the entanglement prohibited by the *Walz* criteria. Vital as this entanglement criteria is to the outcome of all three cases, it must be considered together with other and equally basic views enunciated in the opinions.

For example, the Court quoted with approval the finding of the U.S. District Court in the Rhode Island case that the parochial schools constitute an integral part of the religious mission of the Catholic Church and that the characteristics of the schools make them a powerful vehicle for transmitting the Catholic faith to the next generation. The Court also observed that this process of inculcating religious doctrine is—enhanced by the impressionable age of the pupils—and concluded that parochial schools involve substantial religious activity and purpose.

Having made this strong finding as to the religious character of parochial schools, the Court proceeded to argue that the State legislatures had themselves recognized this "considerable religious activity of the schools" and in attempting to guard against it had to provide for careful governmental controls and surveillance by State authorities in order to insure that State aid supports only secular education. The Court concluded that it did not have to decide whether the legislature had been successful in this effort, because even if the State were successful in separating the secular instruction from the religious, the accounting, surveillance, and other controls would create an intimate and continuing relationship between church and state which constitutes an impermissible degree of entanglement. This led Justice White in his dissent to observe that the standard was one where the legislature could not win: If there were no controls the law would be void for fostering religion and if there were controls it would be void for excessive entanglement. It is very important to note here the stress that the Court laid on the form of the aid provided.

The opinion states that decisions from *Everson*, 1947; *Allen*, 1968, have permitted the States to provide church-related schools with secular, neutral, or nonideological services, facilities, or materials—and bus transportation, school lunches, public health services, and secular textbooks supplied in common were not thought to offend the Establishment Clause. However, in *Lemon* and *DiCenso* the Court found two key differences in the form of the aid. First, both State statutes involved aid for teachers' salaries and the Court noted that teachers have a substantially different ideological character than books—a textbook's content is ascertainable, but a teacher's handling of a subject is not. The Court said it did not assume that teachers in parochial schools will be guilty of bad faith but that it simply recognized the great difficulty of a dedicated religious person, teaching in a school affiliated with his or her faith, remaining religiously neutral. Second, in the case of Pennsylvania, the Court noted that the statute "has the further defect of providing State financial aid directly to the church-related school and declared that this factor distinguishes both *Everson* and *Allen*, for in both cases the Court was careful to point out that State aid was provided to the student and his parents—not to the church-related school. The Court again quoted *Walz*, citing dicta to the effect that:

A direct money subsidy would be a relationship pregnant with involvement and, as with most governmental grant programs, could encompass sustained and detailed administrative relationships for enforcement of statutory or administrative standards.

Finally, the Court took note of a different kind of entanglement: That of the political controversy surrounding aid to parochial schools. It stated that the pressure for the State to increase its aid as costs mount and the need for continuing

annual appropriations would aggravate the potential for political divisiveness and declared that political division along religious lines was one of the principal evils against which the First amendment was intended to protect. The Court also observed that we have no long history of aid to church-related education as we do of tax exemptions for churches and indicated an unwillingness to further increase the momentum in constitutional theory toward support of religious enterprises.

B. TILTON AGAINST RICHARDSON

In view of the foregoing discussion I think it is fair to say that the Court was hard-pressed in applying its own standards to uphold Federal construction grants to church-related colleges and universities. Nevertheless, it managed to do so—in an opinion by the Chief Justice joined by only three others.

The Court distinguished construction aid to church-related colleges from the support for parochial elementary and secondary schools on the following grounds: First, college students are less susceptible to religious indoctrination and religious indoctrination is not a substantial purpose or activity of the colleges, which reduces the likelihood that Government aid will in fact serve to support religious activity and correspondingly diminishes the necessity for intensive Government surveillance; second, entanglement between church and State is also lessened by the nonideological character of the aid—that is, a building; and third, the one-time, single-purpose construction grant creates no continuing financial relationships or dependencies requiring governmental analysis of the institution's expenditures on secular as distinguished from religious activities. The Court stressed that no one of these factors was controlling, but that cumulatively all of them shape a narrow and limited relationship with Government which involves fewer and less significant contacts than the two State schemes before us in *Lemon* and *DiCenso*. The Court felt also that cumulatively these factors substantially lessened the potential for political controversy along religious lines.

For anyone who finds these distinctions difficult, it is comforting to note that a majority of the Court rejected them: one Justice—White—spurned them and contended that all three statutes are constitutional while four others—Douglas, Black, Marshall, and Brennan—rejected them and argued that all three statutes are equally unconstitutional.

As previously noted, the Court did strike down that part of the Federal act which places a restriction on the use of the buildings for a religious purpose for a period only of 20 years, saying that the restriction should apply for so long as the buildings have substantial value, because otherwise the structure might be used to promote religious interests. The opinion provides no guidelines as to precisely how long such restrictions would have to apply to satisfy constitutional requirements.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION

The Court in *Tilton* reiterates the hazards of attempting to apply the principles of one case to fact situations which might be presented by other cases. It says that "there are always risks in treating criteria discussed by the Court from time to time as 'tests' in any limited sense of that word" and that "the standards should rather be viewed as guidelines with which to identify instances in which the objectives of the Religion Clauses have been impaired." Indeed, as Chief Justice Stone wrote some 25 years ago in *Federation of Labor against McAdory*:

It has long been [the Court's] considered practice not . . . to formulate a rule of constitutional law broader than is required by the precise facts to which it is to be applied . . . , or to decide any constitutional question except with reference to the particular facts to which it is to be applied." (325 U.S. 450).

Accordingly, my views are offered cautiously and it might be the better course to approach all questions of the applicability of these rulings with equal caution. Nevertheless, Members of this body have on independent responsibility to assess the constitutionality of every proposed piece of Federal legislation and this memorandum is intended to assist you in carrying out that responsibility, so I shall have to engage in a degree of speculation.

First, in my judgment, direct financial aid to church-related elementary and secondary schools clearly is ruled out by these opinions as an impermissible aid to religion, and some proposals which have the appearance of being indirect aids might fall on the grounds of doing by indirection what cannot be directly accomplished.

Second, I feel that a serious question is raised with respect to direct aid to church-related colleges and universities which goes beyond construction grants.

At the same time, it is my view that all existing Federal programs—or at any rate the major ones with which our committee is most concerned—fall within constitutionally-sanctioned limits. It is important to remember that the court in *Lemon* specifically reaffirmed to validity of such aids as bus transportation, school lunches, public health services, and secular textbooks supplied in common to all students. I think it is also reasonably safe, arguing from obvious analogies and applying the entanglement doctrine of these cases, to conclude that benefits to pupils such as shared arrangements with the public schools for instruction in secular subjects—which often is found in ESEA title I programs—and the loan of instructional equipment—analagous to the loan of textbooks and library materials upheld in *Board of Education v. Allen*, and which would have been authorized by the House-passed version of H.R. 514 in the 91st Congress—are valid. I feel that the name standards would support programs such as institutes and fellowships for teachers under the Education Professions Development Act which treat all teachers equally and do not involve a re-

lationship between the Government and the church-related school.

Moving beyond these programs the ground becomes a bit more speculative. For example, I see little in these cases which would apply to assistance for preschool programs for needy children which might—as in many Headstart programs—be conducted by churches—provided that the programs are open to all children who fit the criteria without regard to their religion and provided that there is, in fact, no religious instruction or worship conducted. There might be problems here in two respects:

First, governmental surveillance of the church budget with respect to these programs could present a problem, and second any substantial residual benefit to the church in its religious activities which might accrue from extensive remodeling of facilities, and so forth, would be a concern. However, I would think that the fact that the church did not run preschool programs of the type supported as a part of its religious mission would tip the scales to the side of constitutionality.

Still more speculative—at least in my judgment—are some proposals to indirectly aid church schools. Perhaps this is not a fair description of the so-called "voucher plan" which is in the early experimental stage, but to the extent that it might be so regarded the proposal is endangered. As Justice Douglas forcefully pointed out in his dissent in *Lemon*, a long line of cases have held unconstitutional State grants to students where the result was to assist private, racially segregated academies and thus act as tools of the forbidden discrimination. It certainly is conceivable that a voucher plan of grants to students which had the effect of substantially aiding church-related elementary and secondary schools would be treated similarly. However, the lack of governmental entanglement in such a plan might weight the constitutional balance in its favor. In any event, the voucher plan is cast in a constitutional "gray area."

Another possibility not absolutely foreclosed by *Lemon* would be the employment of public school teachers, under public control and direction, to teach certain secular subjects in private, non-profit schools—perhaps in schools enrolling without regard to religious affiliation a certain percentage of pupils from low-income families. While I personally feel that such an arrangement would be ruled out as a direct aid to religion, there is a tenable line of argument that it would involve neither religious control of teachers nor the type of accounting between religious and secular expenditures which the Court found entangling in *Lemon*. Certainly, neither this kind of provision nor educational vouchers would be so patently unconstitutional as to put them beyond congressional consideration.

One result of all these doubts may be to revive widespread interest in various plans for tax relief to parents on account of educational costs—a proposal which falls well within all existing constitutional guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, at the higher education level I think these decisions also leave existing Federal programs intact. Certainly little question would be raised about student assistance, including fellowship assistance for faculty members engaged in secular studies. Yet, while the opinion in Tilton goes far to distinguish between degrees of church relatedness at the higher as opposed to lower levels of education, it also asserts limitations on governmental assistance. One must keep in mind that one provision in the Federal Construction Act was stricken because it opened the possibility of religious use of a facility after 20 years. Accordingly, I feel that any scheme of general institutional grants at that level must be approached very carefully. Such a plan could well end up on the horns of the dilemma posed in Lemon where the absence of any accounting constitutes an aid to religion and the presence of accounting constitutes an unconstitutional entanglement. It would appear that those who favor such assistance would tie it as closely as possible to student aid in some form or another—with the view that the closer the tie the safer the measure would be constitutionally.

IV. CONCLUSION

The foregoing is not intended as a complete analysis of these decisions, but rather as a brief guide to the main holdings and some thoughts as to their implications for existing and proposed Federal programs in education. As such, I hope it is useful to you in answering correspondence and in considering legislation currently before our committee. For the reasons given in the opinions in these cases, I would advise you not to reach any hasty conclusions about what is or is not constitutionally permissible in the wake of these cases. Whether one is pleased or not with their outcome, I think that we are left with a better idea of where the lines are to be drawn in what the Court itself described as this extraordinarily sensitive area of constitutional law. Drawing the lines will keep a good many lawyers fully employed for a good many years to come.

BETTER DISABILITY PROTECTION NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two bills to extend social security and Federal employee disability coverage to workers who due to inadequacies of the law have no disability protection. There are some unforgivable gaps in our present disability coverage laws. People who have been employed for 30 years without missing a day of work can end up with absolutely no disability coverage.

Take the case of a man employed for 20 years on a social security-covered job. He then worked for the Federal Government for 10 years. After that he returned to private industry under social security. Two years later he had an accident which permanently disabled him. He had no disability coverage whatever.

For Federal disability benefits a person must still be working for the Government. For social security benefits he has to have worked for 5 out of the last 10 years under social security. The coverage he had earlier at both jobs has vanished. This is unfair. The system is at fault. Anyone who has worked that long deserves better.

The present law is also unfair to women who work before they marry and then return to work later in life. Suppose a woman works for 10 years, then she marries and raises children for 10 years. If at that time she is widowed and takes a job, she has no disability coverage for the next 5 years. The 10 years of social security covered work earlier in her life are completely disregarded. She is no better off than the 18-year-old going to work for the first time. That is not right. The law should be changed.

The person who works for the Federal Government for most of his life has to take a big risk to leave his Government job. For the first 5 years in private industry he will have no disability coverage at a time in his life when a disabling illness is more likely than ever before. People should not be locked into Government jobs that way.

Through no fault of their own, hard-working men and women can suffer the harsh consequences of our inadequate disability laws.

My legislation would correct this situation. It requires only that the worker have contributed to social security for 5 years at some time in his life. Thus the housewife returning to work would be covered immediately, as long as she had worked for 5 years before becoming a full-time mother.

In order to cover the individual who leaves Government employment, my legislation would extend Federal disability coverage, once that has been earned, for 5 years after termination of Federal employment. At the end of that time social security coverage would take over.

These amendments are vitally necessary to give workers and their families the continuous protection I feel they have earned.

THE POWER CRISIS: PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF UTILITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the New York State Public Service Commission is currently holding hearings on Consolidated Edison's latest application for a rate increase. Con Ed is presently seeking an average boost of 16.1 percent, for a total of \$181 million per annum; in addition, they seek an immediate increase of 10.6 percent.

I have had the opportunity to present my views to the PSC, and am including my full statement in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. Briefly, in addition to opposing the requested increases, I call for an immediate and permanent moratorium on Con Ed construction for power production, a restructuring of the PSC to include consumer

representatives as at least half of its total membership, a revamping of Con Ed's "inverted" rate systems under which homeowners and small businesses pay far higher electric rates than big businesses, and a return to bimonthly billing of customers. Finally, I state that "the time has come to provide for public ownership of electric power in this State."

The full text of my statement before the PSC follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE NEW YORK PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I welcome the opportunity to present my views to the commission with regard to Consolidated Edison's request for a rate increase averaging 16.1 percent and totaling \$181 million to be paid for by New York's beleaguered consumers. I urge you to reject this request as well as the company's bid for a temporary increase of 10.6 percent before the end of the year.

The company does not deserve it. The people of New York City cannot afford it. The cost of living in our city is already the highest in the nation. Despite our so-called rational economic stabilization policy, New York's rent control machinery has been declared exempt from national guidelines and tenants in both controlled and uncontrolled apartments are being hit by rent increases of 15 percent and up. And although utilities payments are a substantial and recurring part of the monthly budget, the Price Commission declares it has no jurisdiction over rate cases pending before certificated agencies such as the PSC and will not intervene.

It therefore rests with the PSC to scrutinize with the utmost care Con Edison's request and to consider the plight of the consumer who is expected to pay more and more for poorer service and inefficient management.

My office files are filled with letters from constituents complaining of overbilling by Con Edison. In 9 out of 10 complaints which come to our office we have found the consumer to be right and utility at fault. In one recent case this amounted to \$1,500 in overbilling for a small businessman in my district, who was able to get a refund only after we intervened.

I hope the testimony developed at this hearing will lay to rest the myth that Con Edison is New York's largest taxpayer. That is totally untrue. Con Edison pays no taxes at all. Since its money accrues from the sale of electricity, gas and steam, it passes along to its consumers all its operating costs, including taxes.

Con Edison claims that between 18 and 25 percent of electricity costs are paid for operating taxes. The PSC should determine whether appointing Con Edison a city tax collector is an efficient way of collecting city taxes. If Con Ed's rate of return is based partially on sums collected for city taxes, then clearly the consumer would enjoy considerably lower electrical rates if the city became its own tax collector. And the taxes might be more equitably distributed on that basis.

Although the payroll accounts for only 17 percent of the company's total costs, high labor costs are cited as one reason for needing a rate increase. This is certainly true of at least one segment of Con Ed's employees—its executive staff. In 1969 three Con Ed executives were paid at least \$120,000, which is more than the chief executive of the United States earns. Charles Luce, chairman and chief executive, was paid \$150,000 plus 50,000 in deferred compensation. Con Ed says it "fights to reduce costs" and we may well ask why it does not bring that fight with its executive staff.

Another Con Edison practice that does not benefit the consumer is the recently instituted monthly billing. Indeed, it may well

contribute to the high cost we pay for electricity since it is both wasteful and inefficient. Billing 12 times a year rather than six times requires a 100 percent increase in computer printouts, envelopes, postage and labor. It requires an unnecessary 100 percent increase in the load of the postal delivery system. Estimating the alternate month consumption often produces unreasonably high estimates and customers have complained that no reduction is shown on the following month's bill. I propose an immediate return to semi-monthly billings. And proper billings, including the overcharges which I referred to earlier, result from computer and human errors. By cutting billing in half management should release enough personnel so that a system of dealing adequately with improper billing can be established.

Con Edison's inverted rate structure under which large users pay less per KWH than small users is outmoded and should be abolished. It was instituted at a time when utilities were eager to increase power consumption. That is no longer the case and for too long the residential consumer in New York and Westchester has been asked to subsidize the low rates paid by industrial and commercial consumers.

When a commercial or industrial group can purchase power at "bulk" rates, it has no incentive to conserve power to cut costs. If rates were higher for industry, they'd still use the same amount of electricity because presumably they need it for production of goods and services.

The PSC study currently being prepared will doubtless make recommendations for drastic changes in the outdated inverted rate structure, which mandates that the poor subsidize industrial electrical power, is not only unfair, but also illegal. Such a rate structure discriminates against a whole class of people—those living in the inner city. In New York more poor people, and especially blacks and Puerto Ricans, live in the center city. It's the older part of town where the pipelines and wires have already been laid and have been working for years. The real cost to utilities lies in stretching these lines to the growing suburbs or to new office and industrial buildings. But the rates of Con Ed are calculated on total costs in the whole area. This means that city rates on the Lower East Side and Harlem are the same as in outlying districts.

In 1969, Mr. Luce reported that in Westchester County all new building will be for high voltage transmission lines underground and that this is a "very costly business". Are people in New York City now subsidizing underground construction in Westchester? The PSC must study this question and make changes in the rate structure to compensate for it.

Not only has Con Ed refused to consider the gross inequities in its present inverted rate structure, but it seeks to perpetuate and increase these inequities through an inverted rate increase. In its present request for grossly increasing rates, Con Ed has called for a 16 per cent increase for residential users, while proposing a sliding scale of 11.6 percent to 23.7 percent for commercial and industrial users.

Who are the "favored" industrial consumers whose increase will amount to 11.6 percent? And who are those expected to pay as much as 23.7 percent?

Con Edison insists it needs \$3 billion for construction. In 1969 the FCC recommended that Con Edison purchase power from the Niagara Authority rather than continue to produce its own power at a cost per m. that is considerably higher than the national average.

Even without the 1969 FCC recommendation, Con Ed's track record on power production does not warrant its continuation in

that field. Costs for power production at Indian Point (a Con Ed nuclear installation) are among the highest in the nation, running nearly 400 percent of "normal" production costs.

The PSC should call for an immediate and permanent moratorium on Con Ed construction for power production, and order the company to enter negotiations with Niagara, State Power and smaller producing companies for the purchase of power to meet increased future needs and for present needs now being supplied by inefficient worn out production in the city.

In his 7-page statement setting forth his reasons for the rate increase request Chairman Charles Luce says the additional money is needed to improve service and meet increasing demands for electrical power. These, incidentally, were the same reasons set forth when they requested a 16 percent increase in 1969, just three years ago.

However, in his latest statement, Mr. Luce has added one more reason to his outlandish demands. He says: "The same financial squeeze has affected Con Edison stockholders... the company has not increased common stock dividends since 1965 and current share earnings are less than in 1965."

PSC should question Mr. Luce under oath to determine whether he and the Con Ed board intend to use some of the proposed rate increase to increase dividends for common stock holders. Are the poor and middle income people of New York, already paying some of the highest electrical rates in the nation, now being asked to pay up to 16 percent more so that Con Ed can increase dividends to its preferred stock holders, many of whom are already among the wealthiest men in the nation?

I note that Mr. Luce carefully confined his statement to "common stock dividends," but failed to mention preferred stock. In 1969 earnings before dividends on preferred stock rose to nearly \$97 million and preferred dividends amount to over \$25½ million. Is Mr. Luce less than candid in his report on the sad plight of stockholders when he confines his report to only common stock holders?

I believe there are good and sufficient reasons why immediate and drastic changes must be made in the rate structure, management and even the ownership of Con Ed, which Fortune Magazine dubbed in 1966 "the company you love to hate".

Fortune said of Con Edison in 1966: "Much of its plant is old, its rates are high, its profits low, its growth is meager and its customers are furious. But at Con Edison the aging management assumes the mantle of martyrdom and trusts that everything will then turn out all right."

There has been new and more expensive management at Con Ed since that Fortune article was written, but its plants have gotten older, its rates have risen higher and its customers are growing more angry by the day.

Instead of rewarding mismanagement with an unjustifiable rate increase, the PSC should move into a full scale inquiry into the entire Con Edison rate structure and the relationship of this privately owned utility to the public which it is supposed to serve.

The present Con Edison board of directors is made up of big business and financial representatives. As an intermediate step, it should be required to restructure its board so that at least 50 percent of its members represent consumers.

But this is only an interim step. I think the time has come to provide for public ownership of electric power in this state. New Yorkers cannot exist without electricity. It is as necessary to them as the air they breathe, the water they consume, and subways and other mass transportation. To continue to produce and distribute a necessary commodity to 8 million New Yorkers at a

profit—and those profits run over \$100 million a year—can no longer be tolerated.

I propose that the city and state and PSC undertake a joint study of this question of public ownership and present a public report within no more than a year's time for action by the necessary city and state agencies and the voters.

In the interim I call on Governor Rockefeller to institute changes in the composition of the Public Service Commission. At least one-half of the present PSC members should be replaced with representatives from the consumer sector of the public in order that the needs of New Yorkers be given effective attention. PSC exists to protect the interests of the consumers and only with adequate representation in that body can consumer interests be guarded.

New Yorkers must no longer be left to the mercy of a group of greedy Con Edison stockholders who have profited from their monopoly position over the years and made consumers pay for it with "brown-outs" and increasingly higher rates. The basic answer to the power crisis in New York is public ownership with guarantees of strong consumer control and representation in the public agency.

NEW CHARGES ON LOCKHEED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am publicly releasing today a new series of documents detailing charges that Lockheed Aircraft discarded tons of metal worth thousands of dollars intended to build the C-5A and C-130 jet transport planes in direct violation of Air Force regulations. The new charges of waste and gross mismanagement are being leveled by Mr. Henry Durham, a former Lockheed employee who has previously attacked Lockheed's performance on the C-5A aircraft in congressional testimony before the Joint Economic Committee chaired by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER).

This latest set of allegations is just one more chapter in what must be called the worst and most blatant robbery of the taxpayer's dollars by a giant defense contractor. Apparently Lockheed violated Air Force regulations by not reporting that it was scrapping tons of metal that had been mutilated by Lockheed workers and intended for use on Air Force planes. If Mr. Durham's allegations are true, then Lockheed is covering-up a multimillion dollar program of mismanagement on the C-5A and other programs.

According to Mr. Durham and the documents which he has produced, both Lockheed and Air Force regulations were violated when Lockheed employees did not file discrepancy reports when stock was mutilated. Instead Lockheed employees just acquired new material without notifying the Quality Control Division of Lockheed of the loss of the material.

The result is that apparently millions of dollars have been wasted, but may never be traced. It is important to note that some replacement metal may not have been heat treated to improve its strength as required by Air Force speci-

cations was still installed on the C-5A. If this allegation is true, then Lockheed is responsible for building an aircraft that is not only deficient but downright dangerous.

I am requesting that the General Accounting Office thoroughly investigate the charges outlined by Mr. Durham. I understand that the GAO is now investigating charges similar to Durham's new accusations and hope that they will investigate the specific allegations contained in the material I am forwarding to them.

This scrapping of tons of metals is undoubtedly a significant part of the approximate \$2 billion cost overrun on the C-5A. According to sources at the GAO it is "reasonable" to assume that 40 percent of the C-5A cost overruns are the result of material cost increases such as those associated with scrapping expensive metals.

Mr. Speaker, with Lockheed's secretly scrapping tons of metals it is no surprise that the price of the C-5A skyrocketed.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we all know too well the gravity of the unemployment problem in this country and the compelling need to stimulate noninflationary economic growth so that we can get many of our unemployed back to work. While we are striving to improve our troubled economy, however, we cannot neglect those who have found themselves jobless and searching for a way to keep their families clothed and fed. This is why Congress instituted a measure like the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971—Public Law 92-224—and why the House recently voted to extend the provisions of this law for an additional 6-month period. This program, providing an additional 13 weeks of 100 percent, federally funded unemployment compensation, goes into effect if a State's insured unemployment averages 6.5 percent for 13 consecutive weeks. If the rate falls below 6.5 percent, the program is cut off.

Unfortunately, although this program was created with the right intentions, it contains a very serious shortcoming. Generally, labor statistics are compiled on a regional basis; yet, under the provisions of Public Law 92-224, benefits are granted on the basis of a State unemployment rate. Thus, while the State unemployment figure may fall below the qualifying 6.5 percent, thereby terminating the Federal emergency compensation program, the unemployment rate in areas within the State may well have risen far above the 6.5-percent level, and yet the unemployed in these areas will still be ineligible to obtain relief from the Federal Government. Let me illustrate this tragic defect with an example from my own district in New York State. In July the jobless in New York State received their last unemployment com-

pensation check under the Federal emergency compensation program, because the State unemployment figure had dropped below 6.5 percent. However, in Nassau and Suffolk Counties in my district, the unemployment rate hovered well above 6.5 percent and is still continuing to rise. In July, when the emergency compensation program ended in New York State, the jobless rate in Nassau was 6.7 percent and in Suffolk a frightening 7.9 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this incongruous situation exists in many other areas around the country. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we must provide relief for those pockets of severe unemployment where help is most needed and where jobs are hardest to find. Today, I am introducing legislation to correct the inequity in the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act which prevents those areas with severe unemployment from receiving Federal assistance. My bill would provide that if the emergency unemployment compensation program has been in effect in a State, the program will continue to be in effect in those areas within the State which have unemployment rates about 6.5 percent, even if the State figure has fallen below that level. The main purpose of this legislation is to insure that those counties with aggravated unemployment problems will continue to receive assistance for as long as they need it. In addition, my bill would extend the emergency unemployment compensation program for 1 year. The present program is scheduled to terminate this coming December; a 1-year extension of the program will serve further to insure that, until we can alleviate this Nation's unemployment problem, the jobless in our country will not go unprotected.

Mr. Speaker, I know that our main effort must be to stimulate and encourage employment, and I hope that the Congress will take it upon itself to restore to this country a healthy and expanding economy. But until we do see a significant improvement in this Nation's economy and a significant reduction in our unemployment rate, the Congress must also look to the needs of the thousands who are suffering as a result of our present economic ills.

SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, is conducting hearings to study the impact on farmers and others who may be affected by the recent large sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

One aspect of the grain sale that has come to my attention involves those producers who sold their wheat prior to any knowledge of the sale to the Soviet Union and therefore were handicapped in making marketing decisions. Since the first wheat in the Nation is harvested in Texas beginning as early as May and continuing into July, virtually all of Texas pro-

duction was harvested before the sale to the Soviet Union was announced on July 8. Traditionally, most of this early wheat crop is sold at time of harvest.

The Agricultural Act of 1970, at the urging of the Nixon administration, provided that the wheat certificate paid to farmers on their share of domestic consumption would be calculated to reflect the difference between the average market price for the first 5 months of the marketing year, July 1–November 30, and the parity price as of July 1—\$3.02 per bushel.

The sale of wheat to the Soviet Union has resulted in increases in the market price. Everything being equal, such an increase is good for wheat producers. However, since the increase in wheat market prices will reduce the amount of the certificate paid to farmers on the domestic portion of their wheat, only those farmers who sold at or above the 5 months' average market price will receive the parity price of \$3.02 per bushel. Those farmers who sold below the 5 months' average market price will receive less than the parity price by whatever amount their sale price was below the 5 months' average market price. Farmers in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and other States in the early wheat harvest area sold wheat at prices below the anticipated 5 months' average market price and they will not be able to get parity price for their production.

The evidence is clear that there was heavy early selling in these and other wheat-producing areas. As of July 31, only 59.4 million bushels of wheat were under loan for support price purposes as against 77.1 million bushels on July 31, 1971. In Kansas, for example, where the harvest was completed by July 31, 36.8 million bushels were under loan as compared to 51.9 million on the same date in 1971.

Let me cite an example of how farmers who sold wheat before the market prices advanced in response to Soviet Union wheat sales will lose unless the current provision of law is changed, as provided in a resolution I will introduce today. The average market price in July was \$1.32; in August \$1.51. It is anticipated that there will be further market price increases in September, October, and November which could result in an average market price during those months of \$1.75. Averaging the prices for the 5 months brings market average for wheat to \$1.62 per bushel.

This \$1.62 per bushel price under the 1970 Agricultural Act is the point at which the USDA begins to calculate the amount of wheat certificate. Since the parity price was \$3.02 on July 1, the wheat certificate paid to producers on their domestic production will amount to \$1.42 per bushel.

But, it can be clearly seen that these farmers who sold below the estimated 5 months' average market price of \$1.62 per bushel, would lose the difference between their sales price and the 5 months' average market price. Let us take the specific case of a Texas farmer who sold his wheat at \$1.32 per bushel. Since this sales price is below the average market

price of \$1.62, he would lose 30 cents per bushel. Instead of receiving the parity price of \$3.02 per bushel, he would receive only \$2.72 per bushel.

I hope the fair-minded Members of this House will see the inequity in this situation. My position simply is to bring equity in the payment by the Government to producers who are eligible for wheat certificates. No farmer in this Nation should be penalized in the amount of the wheat certificate he receives by his geographic location in the Nation.

The producers in early wheat harvest areas were further disadvantaged by the cloak of secrecy surrounding the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. I intend to explore fully the missing links in the events connected with the sale in the course of hearings of my Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains.

To do justice by wheat producers who stand to lose income under conditions connected with the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, I am today introducing a joint resolution to provide for the special deficiency payments to wheat producers who will receive less than parity on the domestic production of their wheat under the present procedure of figuring the amount of wheat certificates.

Senator LLOYD BENTSEN is introducing an identical resolution in the other body today to make this a joint effort in the Senate and House.

In brief summary, the resolution, if enacted, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make special deficiency payments to wheat producers who sold all or any portion of his 1972 crop of wheat for less than the average price for the first 5 months of the marketing year—July 1–November 30, 1972. The deficiency payment would be calculated as I have indicated above—the difference between the average 5 months' market price and the price the producer received in the sale of his 1972 crop of wheat, to make up the difference between the producer's actual sales price and the average actual market price for the 5 months of the marketing year July–November 1972.

The effect of the bill would be to assure that no producer receives less than the parity price of \$3.02, because he did not have the market intelligence to be aware of the increase in market price due to the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

I hope that Members of the House will take the time to review in detail the inequities that have been created in the early wheat harvest areas of the Nation. I hope that you will agree with me that action is needed to bring equity where inequity now exists.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to further develop the case for the legislation I am introducing throughout the hearings of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains.

EAST-WEST TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a long standing interest in foreign trade. As chairman of the Joint Economic

Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, I have worked over the years toward improving economic relations between the United States and the nations with whom we trade.

The matter of East-West trade has interested me particularly, because it is a fact of history that bilateral trade can be instrumental in bringing about improved political relations between countries.

With this in mind, I was encouraged when the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to the formation of a commercial commission for the discussion of ways to improve economic relations between our countries. I am still hopeful that the conditions for trade relations between our countries will be improved as a result of the work of this commission and others working toward that end.

Now we are reminded by distinguished Members of this House and of the other body that the Soviet Union is embarked upon an insulting and self-defeating "head tax" on Soviet Jews seeking to emigrate to Israel. The imposition of such a tax—ranging up to \$25,000—is, as Senator RIBCOFF has said, "a totally reprehensible form of extortion."

My distinguished colleagues have urged that trade concessions, such as most-favored-nation treatment and other benefits, be denied to the Soviet Union as long as this tawdry levy is imposed. We are urged to reject legislation favoring the U.S.S.R. until this visa fee policy is lifted.

I agree that this visa tax is reprehensible. And it is deplorable that a nation seeking improved trade relations would so crudely seek to discourage the movement of people to places they seek to make their home.

I hope the Soviet Union will discard this vindictive and demeaning tax, and I want to associate myself with those who oppose extending trade benefits to the Soviet Union so long as such a policy is in effect.

THE GREAT RIVER ROAD—A SCENIC HIGHWAY FOR ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for significant Federal participation in the up-coming national celebration of the Mississippi Tricentennial—the 300th anniversary of the discovery of the Mississippi River by Marquette and Joliet.

The legislation I introduce today would, for the first time, provide Federal assistance, to the 10 States concerned to help in the building and beautification of the Great River Road—the scenic highways that America will build along the shores of the Mississippi—scenic roads stretching from Canada, through Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of the Great River Road has been discussed since the 1930's. Originally it was hoped that a great National Parkway would be located on the banks of the Mississippi. After all,

it is the most significant north-south scenic corridor in the Nation, and is within easy driving distance of millions and millions of American families. There is no need for me to rhapsodize on the beauty and diversity of the Mississippi River Valley—it is a combination of the swift Colorado, the tropical and delta Niles, the bluff-shadowed Rhine, the Blue Danube triumphant—and all beginning in the lake country of Minnesota as a clear, fresh, north-country stream.

Over 8 years ago the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty recommended the establishment of a system of scenic and recreational highways and parkways. The Council recommended a \$4 billion, 10-year program to provide the American people with the kind of roads they deserve, if they are really going to be able to enjoy the scenic and recreational values of this vast and beautiful expanse of America and its people.

Mr. Speaker, no type of recreation in this country is as popular as pleasure driving. Americans drive more than 300 billion miles a year for pleasure—that is nearly 11,000 trips down the entire length of the Great River Road—from Lake Itasca to the Gulf of Mexico.

A study of outdoor recreation in Iowa, suggests that the demand for decent, safe, and attractive scenic roads is far outpacing the roads we are providing.

Like the rest of the country, in Iowa, pleasure driving is the most popular outdoor recreation activity—78.7 percent of all Iowans average 18 days of such driving—or a total of more than 28.1 million user-days a year.

Driving was then followed by other activities closely associated with and available along the Great River Road—77 percent picnicking; 59 percent sight-seeing; 58 percent hiking and walking; 40 percent fishing; and 35 percent boating.

Clearly the demand for the access and the recreational facilities that would be provided by roads such as the Great River Road is overwhelming and is increasing almost geometrically.

Mr. Speaker, the day may very well come when we will see stretching along the banks of the Mississippi the parkway that Americans deserve. Clearly the need is there. But today, in consonance with recommendations of the Federal Highway Administration and the National Park Service, we must necessarily tailor our plans to the financial realities we face. It is for that reason that I introduce a bill that embodies the philosophy and hopes of the two distinguished chairmen of the Public Works Committees of the Congress, Congressman BLATNIK and Senator RANDOLPH and yet pays heed to the economic realities of the day.

Today, I am introducing a bill that will provide a beginning of this system of scenic highways we all recognize as so necessary. The bill I introduce would provide \$30 million for each of 2 fiscal years. It would help States begin acquisition of properties and easements necessary to protect the environmental and esthetic values on the Mississippi banks.

It would also provide some beginning help in constructing and reconstructing the road surfaces themselves and the attendant scenic viewing points and roadside parks necessary for proper enjoyment of the vistas the Mississippi affords.

Mr. Speaker, we must begin somewhere. I sincerely hope that the Great River Road will serve as a worthy prototype of the national system of scenic highways we will eventually enjoy. I can think of no more worthy place to begin nor a more auspicious date on which to begin this undertaking. The Mississippi is an integral scenic corridor—we celebrate the 300th anniversary of its discovery this coming year—the need is recognized—modest funds are requested—congressional awareness and support are promising.

It is my hope that the Congress will take this opportunity to provide all Americans with this beginning—a beginning too long delayed; but a beginning whose time has come.

There is a phrase very much in evidence today: "Let's make driving a good thing again!" Mr. Speaker, let us in the Congress provide a place for that to happen—along the beautiful, scenic, and historic banks of the great Mississippi River.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to thank the very distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee for sponsoring this bill with me. His guidance and encouragement has been the critical force in holding out hope to us all that this long delayed dream will be realized.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the bill (H.R. 16687) at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD:

H.R. 16687

A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, to provide for the Federal funding of land and easement acquisitions and the construction and improvement of necessary roads and scenic viewing facilities in order to develop a national scenic and recreational highway program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 145. Development of a prototype of a national highway program.

"(a) (1) The Congress finds—

"(A) that there are significant esthetic and recreational values to be derived from making places of scenic and natural beauty and historical, archeological, or scientific interest accessible to the public;

"(B) that there is a deficiency in the number and quality of scenic roads, parkways, and highways available to the motorist public;

"(C) that with increase population, greater leisure time and higher percentage of privately owned automotive vehicles, more families than ever are seeking suitable areas in which to drive for pleasure and recreation;

"(D) that the growth of cities and large metropolitan centers has decreased the quantity of open-space and recreational areas available to the general public, especially urban dwellers; and

"(E) that substantial economic, social, cultural, educational, and psychological benefits could be gained from a nationwide system of attractive roadways making possible widespread enjoyment of natural and recreational resources.

"(2) It is therefore the purpose of this section to provide assistance to the States and to other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over Federal lands open to the public in order to develop highways throughout the Nation to satisfy such needs and to prove the actual national feasibility of such a system through direct Federal participation in the improvement and construction of the Great River Road and attendant facilities and to further provide for Federal participation in the celebration Mississippi River.

"(b) As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish criteria for the location and construction or reconstruction of the Great River Road by the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in order to carry out the purpose of this section. Such criteria shall include requirements that—

"(1) priority be given in the location of the Great River Road near or easily accessible to the larger population centers of the State and further priority be given to the construction and improvement of the Great River Road in the proximity of the confluence of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River;

"(2) the Great River Road be connected with other Federal aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System;

"(3) the Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs;

"(4) effective control, as defined in section 131(c) of this title, of signs, displays, and devices will be provided along the Great River Road;

"(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, necessary easements for scenic purposes, and the construction or reconstruction of roadside rest areas (including appropriate recreational facilities), scenic viewing areas, and other appropriate facilities determined by the Secretary for the purpose of this section.

"(d) Highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this section (except subsection (g)) shall be maintained by the appropriate state or local jurisdiction and shall remain within their present highway system designation except with respect to such provisions of this title as the Secretary determines are not consistent with this section.

"(e) Funds authorized for each fiscal year pursuant to subsection (h) (1) shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River on the basis of their relative needs as determined by the Secretary for payments to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(f) The Federal share of the cost of any project for any construction or reconstruction pursuant to the preceding subsections of this section shall be 80 per centum of such cost.

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to consult with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over Federal lands open to the public in order to enter into appropriate arrangements for necessary construction or reconstruction of highways on such lands to carry out the purpose of this section. To the extent applicable criteria applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed by the States pursuant to this section shall be applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this subsection. Funds authorized pursuant to subsection (h) (2) shall be used to pay

the entire cost of construction or reconstruction pursuant to this subsection.

"(h) There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (1) not to exceed \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and 1975, for allocations to the States pursuant to this section, and (2) not to exceed \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and 1975, to carry out the provisions of subsection (g)."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"145. Development of a prototype of a national scenic and recreational highway program."

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION EMPHASIS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw to the attention of Members of the House a significant event which the National Park Service, of the Department of the Interior, is initiating next week to increase the environmental awareness of our citizenry.

I refer to the designation, by George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Service, of the week of September 17 through the 23d as the Environmental Education Emphasis Week—EEE Week.

It is, I think, Mr. Speaker, particularly appropriate that next week be recognized by the National Park Service as Environmental Education Emphasis Week.

For this is the centennial year of the creation of our first national park, Yellowstone, which was established in 1862, and which initiated a broad-based concern with conservation and the preservation of America's priceless natural resources.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Second World Conference on National Parks will also be in session next week at Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, and will bring together representatives of more than 100 nations to discuss the common goals and challenges of their national parks and reserves.

I can think of no more fitting manner of drawing to the public's attention the centennial of our first national park than the designation of the week of September 17 as Environmental Education Emphasis Week.

During this week, Mr. Speaker, the regional offices of the National Park Service will emphasize the three major environmental education programs which the Service conducts on an on-going basis:

National environmental education development—NEED—through which instructional materials are prepared for use by educators who wish to incorporate environmental learning into their curriculums.

National environmental study areas—NESA—under which sites are provided, within our park system, for use by schools as "outdoor classrooms."

National environmental education landmarks—NEEL—which are recog-

nized by the Secretary of the Interior as superior environmental study areas.

Hopefully, the public will be made more aware of these environmental education programs through such activities as "show me" tours, poster and essay contests, environmental awareness talks, and workshops for teachers and group leaders.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Education Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, has jurisdiction over the Environmental Education Act. This measure, of which I was sponsor in the House, authorized the establishment, within the Office of Education, of an environmental education office, as well as a wide variety of educational activities including the development, the training of school teachers in environmental studies, and the planning of outdoor ecological study centers.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that champions of clean air, and land, and water, would disagree that if we are to make even minimal progress toward solving the ecological crisis, we need a citizenry educated and informed about the whole spectrum of matters we call environmental. We are going to require as well, changes in our basic attitudes toward the environment and man's place in it.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. Speaker, it was this belief that ran through 13 days of hearings which our subcommittee held on the Environmental Education Act, as witness after witness declared that we needed basic changes in our environmental values, and that education could play a significant role in bringing about that change.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the administration of President Nixon, which originally opposed passage of the Environmental Education Act, and subsequently opposed appropriations for it, has still shown no evidence of a long-term commitment to adequate financial support of environmental education.

Let me hasten to point out that I make this comment more in sorrow than in anger, for Congress demonstrated by its bipartisan sponsorship of this measure, as well as by the broad bipartisan support the measure received on the House and Senate floors, that both Democrats and Republicans in Congress felt environmental education deserved a higher priority in our list of national needs.

Indeed, evidence of the overwhelming bipartisan support which the Environmental Education Act enjoys in Congress is the vote by which it was approved, 228 to 28 in the House of Representatives, on August 3, 1970; and in the Senate, by 68 to 0, on September 9, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the inadequate financial support which this administration has seen fit to give to the Environmental Education Act of 1970, and in light of the great need to inform our citizens of the dangers from continued environmental deterioration, I am delighted to see any agency of the Government supplementing the environmental education programs of the Office of Education.

So it is with great pleasure that I commend the National Park Service for its effort to enlighten the public on ecologi-

cal matters by designating the week of September 17 Environmental Education Emphasis Week.

We can hope, Mr. Speaker, that efforts such as this can help impress upon each of us—to use the words of Joseph Sittler, a distinguished theologian from the University of Chicago—that—

When man so uses nature as to deny her integrity, defiles her cleanliness, disrupt her order, or ignore her needs—the reprisals of insulted nature often take a slow but terribly certain form. Nature's protest against defilement is ecological reprisal.

ROSE MATZKIN, PRESIDENT OF HADASSAH

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Rose Matzkin, of Waterbury, Conn., has recently been elected as national president of Hadassah, the largest women's organization in the United States. Her designation is an honor for our city and we are indeed proud of this recognition which has come to our fellow citizen. At the same time, anyone who knows Rose Matzkin knows that her designation is not an empty honor, but has been made because of her long, devoted, and fruitful service to Hadassah and the cause which it serves. From the point of view of the organization her designation is not simply honorary because its members are well aware of the magnificent service which Mrs. Matzkin has rendered for many years.

I note Mrs. Matzkin's official elevation here as a matter of national interest and as a fitting tribute I include hereafter an editorial which appeared in the Waterbury American on August 24, 1972:

MRS. MATZKIN ELECTED

Waterbury has been honored by the election of Mrs. Rose Matzkin as national president of Hadassah, the largest women's organization in America. It has 325,000 members.

Mrs. Matzkin has been prominent in Hadassah activities on the national and international levels for a number of years. She has made numerous trips to Israel in connection with the organization and has been a prominent speaker.

She has been a member of the national group for more than 35 years. She is a past national vice-president and was previously president of the Waterbury Chapter and of this region. She is the first Connecticut woman ever to lead the group.

The election of Mrs. Matzkin is the third in a series in which women from this area have been named to lead major national and international groups. The first was Mrs. Jeanette Healey, who was elected president of the International Quota Club. Then Mrs. Zabelle Kazanjian was elected and reelected president of the Girls Clubs of America.

These women have set an example of service on behalf of the public. The city is honored by their success.

We wish Mrs. Matzkin a most successful term as president of a distinguished organization.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for September 14

through September 18, on account of official business.

Mr. ASPINALL, from noon Monday, September 18, 1972, until noon Wednesday, September 20, 1972, on account of official business.

Mr. SKUBITZ (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for the week of September 18 on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. RANDALL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 1 hour, today, immediately following the special order by Mr. CELLER, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. McKEVITT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEYSER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 30 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PURCELL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BOGGS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. Dow, and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$552.50.

Mr. HALL to follow Mr. DULSKI in the Committee of the Whole today, with regard to F-15.

Mr. HICKS of Washington, immediately following the remarks of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia on the Sikes amendment in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. GUDE prior to the vote on the Sikes amendment on H.R. 16593.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. HEINZ.

Mrs. DWYER in four instances.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHMITZ in six instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SANDMAN.

Mr. SHOUP in two instances.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. KEATING in two instances.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. MAYNE.

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

Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. EILBERG in 10 instances.
Mr. REID.
Mr. DOWNING.
Mr. JACOBS in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. FLYNT.
Mr. CAREY of New York.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. ROSENTHAL.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mrs. SULLIVAN.
Mr. SARBANES in five instances.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.
Mr. ZABLOCKI in three instances.
Mr. MATHIS of Georgia in five instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3337. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3917. An act to authorize the construction of the completion of the New Senate Office Building on the east half of square 725 in the District of Columbia, to authorize the acquisition of certain real property in square 724 in the District of Columbia, to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to initiate and conduct a study of alternate designs for a vehicle parking garage with limited commercial facilities to be constructed on square 724 and an architectural design competition to be conducted in connection therewith, and to authorize the acquisition of all publicly or privately owned property contained in square 764 in the District of Columbia as an addition to the United States Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6503. An act for the relief of Capt. Claire E. Brou, and

H.R. 14896. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to assure that adequate funds are available for the conduct of summer food service programs for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas which

there are high concentrations of working mothers, and for other purposes related to expanding and strengthening the child nutrition programs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 13, 1972:

H.R. 7375. An act to amend the statutory ceiling on salaries payable to U.S. magistrates; and

H.R. 12638. An act for the relief of Sgt. Gary L. Rivers, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

On September 14, 1972:

H.R. 6503. An act for the relief of Capt. Claire E. Brou;

H.R. 9222. An act to correct deficiencies in the law relating to the crimes of counterfeiting and forgery;

H.R. 10670. An act to amend chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a survivor benefit plan, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14896. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended to assure that adequate funds are available for the conduct of summer food service programs for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers, and for other purposes related to expanding and strengthening the child nutrition programs.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 18, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2332. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to improve the accuracy of the Air Force requirements system for repairable parts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2333. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems in identifying and removing from the market products which violate the law, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 16654. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for

other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 16654. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 16655. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr.

HARSHA, Mr. JONES, of Alabama, Mr. GROVER, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. ZION, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. DORN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. KEE, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 16656. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr.

THONE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ROE, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 16657. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 16658. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 16659. A bill to provide for acquisition by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of the mass transit bus systems engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the National Capital area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 16660. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. RANDALL, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 16661. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medical programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation programs or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 16662. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16663. A bill to create a Cabinet-level Department of Environment and Technology Assessment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 16664. A bill to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act of 1964 by designating certain lands for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16665. A bill to improve the efficiency of the Nation's highway system, allow States and localities more flexibility in utilizing highway funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 16666. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any social security benefit increases provided for by Public Law 92-336 be disregarded in determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16667. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS of Maryland:

H.R. 16668. A bill to authorize pilot field-research programs for the suppression of agricultural and forest pests by integrated control methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 16669. A bill to implement the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage and the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. BROVHILL of North Carolina, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. NIX, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HUNGATE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PIKE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FISH, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 16670. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment, habilitation, and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. REES, Mr. CLARK, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. BIESTER):

H.R. 16671. A bill to provide for the humane

care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 16672. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 16673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide interest on certain amounts withheld from wages and certain estimated payments of tax for purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16674. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall make a study of the overwithholding from wages of the Federal income tax and report, with legislative recommendations, to the Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 16675. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 to extend for 1 year the program of grants for State and local prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs for alcohol abuse and alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16676. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to extend for 1 year the programs of assistance for community mental health centers, alcoholism facilities, drug-abuse facilities, and facilities for the mental health of children; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16677. A bill to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act to provide a method for assuring that social security taxes deducted from an employee's wages are actually forwarded to the Treasury and credited to such employee's account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 16678. A bill to require States to disregard certain social security benefits in determining the need for certain public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 16679. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend disability retirement benefits to employees separated from the service with entitlement to deferred annuity who incur disabilities within 5 years after separation and before the annuity commencing date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 16680. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has 20 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters were earned (and regardless of whether he is fully insured); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 16681. A bill to provide that if an emergency unemployment compensation program has been in effect in a State, such program will continue in any region within that State which has a rate of unemployment above 6.5 percent even though the State rate has dropped below that level, and to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program for 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. ASHLEY, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRITT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 16682. A bill to improve the efficiency of the Nation's highway system, allow States and localities more flexibility in utilizing highway funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 16683. A bill to improve the efficiency of the Nation's highway system, allow States and localities more flexibility in utilizing highway funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 16684. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States for improved educational services for handicapped children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (for himself and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 16685. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire certain lands and interests therein adjacent to the exterior boundaries of the White Mountain National Forest in the State of New Hampshire for addition to the national forest system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16686. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself and Mr. BLATNIK):

H.R. 16687. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, to provide for the Federal funding of land and easement acquisitions and the construction and improvement of necessary roads and scenic viewing facilities in order to develop a national scenic and recreational highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 16688. A bill to provide increased funding for accelerated planning purposes with respect to the creation of scenic highways along the banks of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16689. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make an investigation and study with respect to the feasibility of establishing a national system of scenic highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. SCHNEEBEL, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. REUSS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. NIX, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ROE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts):

H.R. 16690. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act to provide assistance to firms and workers which suffer serious economic injury as a result of the elimination of export controls on agricultural commodities by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. KYROS, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. KEITH, Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. REES, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. DONOHUE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 16691. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act to provide assistance to firms and workers which suffer serious economic injury as a result of the elimination of export controls on agricultural commodities by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 16692. A bill to prevent construction of a dam on New River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 16693. A bill to require States to disregard certain social security benefits in determining the need for certain public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 16694. A bill to amend section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1972 to permit the extension of trade agreement concessions on a selective and a reciprocal basis to products of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. CAFFEY):

H.R. 16695. A bill to amend section 98 of title 28 of the United States Code to place Tangipahoa Parish in the middle district of Louisiana; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 16696. A bill to prevent aircraft piracy by requiring the use of metal-detection devices to inspect all passengers and baggage boarding commercial aircraft in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 16697. A bill to reduce street crime in the United States by substantially increasing police manpower and by providing emergency narcotics treatment in areas designated as high narcotics-related crime areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16698. A bill to prevent aircraft piracy by requiring the use of metal-detection devices to inspect all passengers and baggage boarding commercial aircraft in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16699. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the waiver of certain grounds for exclusion and deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 16700. A bill to provide Federal loan guarantee assistance for certain common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.J. Res. 1300. Joint resolution providing for a special deficiency payment to certain wheat farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 705. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of a booklet entitled "The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. DONOHUE):

H. Con. Res. 706. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Union should be condemned for its policy of demanding ransom for educated Jews who want to emigrate to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mrs. MINK presented a bill (H.R. 16701) for the relief of Zacarias Gonzales Tagamolla, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE NEW "DEFENSE" POSTURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the absurdity of our "defense" posture is evident from the fact that our Government continues to send American fighting men to Germany, presumably to contain communism, yet in actuality, our soldiers go to school to learn how to get along with each other.

At the same time, this country allows two Soviet reconnaissance planes to fly within 50 or 60 miles of the U.S. mainland and Soviet vessels to call in our east coast ports.

It would appear more reasonable, Mr. Speaker, for us to bring our men home from Germany and let them learn to get along with each other in their natural environment. Furthermore, they might be of some use containing communism here in America.

The Soviets maintain a "peace and progress" embassy here in Washington and both varieties of Communists—Soviet and Red Chinese—are within 150 miles of the U.S. border.

In Haiphong, North Vietnam, we mined the harbor to keep the Russian weapons of war out, while at Norfolk, Va., and Baltimore, Md., we welcome Soviet vessels to load U.S. grain to feed the Russian people who make those weapons.

What role are the U.S. military men playing in Germany, anyway?

I include related news articles:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1972]

ARMY OPENS SCHOOL IN RACE RELATIONS

OBERAMMERGAU, WEST GERMANY, Sept. 11.—The United States Army in Europe today opened the first class of a race relations school here designed to correct "an unhealthy situation" between black and white U.S. servicemen.

Maj. Gen. Harold I. Hayward told an opening ceremony: "Equal opportunity for all in USAREUR (U.S. Army in Europe) does not exist at this time."

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Sept. 13, 1972]

TWO SOVIET PLANES SPEND 12 HOURS OFF U.S. COAST

The Pentagon said two Soviet TU95 Bear reconnaissance planes spent about 12 hours Monday flying along the Atlantic Coast of the United States, approaching as close as 50 or 60 miles to the mainland.

The Pentagon said two U.S. planes from the aircraft carrier Forrestal were sent up to track the Soviet aircraft, which were also monitored by radar both from land and from the carrier. The Soviet planes later returned to Havana.

While TU95s have made nine visits to Cuba in the past few years, this was the first time any of them had flown missions along the U.S. coast using Havana as a return base.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1972]

EASTERN BLOC SHIPS UNDER HARBOR BAN

NORFOLK, VA., Sept. 11.—Eastern bloc vessels are being barred from the Hampton Roads harbor because the harbor "poses a serious security problem," says White House aide Peter M. Flanigan.

Flanigan, in a recent letter to U.S. Sen. William B. Spong Jr. (D-Va.), said "the Navy is currently conducting a detailed survey of the area to learn the true nature and extent of our vulnerability to shipborne intelligence collection."

Spong had asked why Polish vessels had been barred from Hampton Roads.

The ban was imposed July 12. About two weeks later, the Navy said an electronic emissions survey of the harbor had been completed and that the ban would be lifted "shortly."

The survey was apparently triggered by an influx of Polish and Russian trawlers into the harbor. About 30 entered between January and July and the Navy suspected that at least several of them were equipped for electronic surveillance.

Flanigan, assistant to the president for international economic policy, wrote Spong that "Hampton Roads commercial maritime interests will be a most important consideration in our decision" regarding the harbor.

There are two large grain companies in Hampton Roads, each with its own pier and elevators, that had expected to participate in a \$750 million deal to send grain to Russia.

Their participation seemed ended with the ban on Eastern-bloc vessels, but the Hampton Roads Maritime Association reported Friday that two Norwegian ships had loaded grain for Russia in the harbor last week.

Flanigan wrote Spong that "with regard to the formula for the carriage of grain by national flag ships, the shipping agreement currently being negotiated with the U.S.S.R. would cover all maritime trade between the two countries."

"In all our discussions with the Soviets it has been recognized that there would be a balancing of American and Soviet ships, i.e.,