

Angeles County are *La Opinion* and *El Mexicano*. Those published weekly include *El Pueblo*, Mexican American Sun, Eastside Sun, Wynerwood Chronicle, Eastside Journal and Belvedere Citizen. The five last mentioned papers are only partially printed in Spanish. During election campaigns, however, the amount of Spanish language material increases due to advertising by political figures.

<sup>27</sup> These papers are *Excelsior*, *La Prensa*, *Diario las Americas*, *Novedades*, *El Tiempo El Sol de Mexico* (all of which are published daily) and *La Nacion*, *El Herald*, and *El Fronterizo*, which are published weekly.

<sup>28</sup> Petitioners rely, in support of this contention, on Evidence Code section 451 which provides, in pertinent part, that "Judicial notice shall be taken of: . . . (e) The true signification of all English words and phrases. . . ." (Italics added.) Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged defines a "newspaper" as "a paper that is printed and distributed daily, weekly, or at some other regular and usu[ally] short interval that contains news, articles of opinion (as editorials), features, advertisements, or other matter regarded as current or new." Magazines, on the other hand, do not as a matter of definition devote themselves in part to political matters and petitioners' showing in this regard is limited to the stipulated degree of political coverage in *Grafica* and *La Raza*. But a publication which, appearing at daily or weekly intervals, consistently and studiously ignores political news is simply not a "newspaper" in the common understanding of that term in our language and culture.

<sup>29</sup> Evidence Code section 459 provides in relevant part as follows: "(a) The reviewing court shall take judicial notice of (1) each matter properly noticed by the trial court and (2) each matter that the trial court was required to notice under Section 451 or 453 [of the Evid. Code]." (Italics added.)

<sup>30</sup> Evidence Code section 550 provides in pertinent part: "The burden of producing evidence as to a particular fact is on the party against whom a finding on that fact would be required in the absence of further evidence."

<sup>31</sup> Respondents suggest additional goals to be served by the English literacy requirement. First, they advance the notion that restricting the franchise in this manner permits only those who can "mingle" with and "have contact with" the entire electorate to vote, and excludes those who confine their business and social contacts to a small minority group. Presumably, this results in a more knowledgeable electorate.

But while such catholic intermingling may be an admirable ideal, it does not appear necessary to achieve an electorate which has access to sufficient information to make intelligent electoral decisions. And to the extent that it indicates a fear of and effort to preclude the unified expression of minority community political sentiment, it is constitutionally unacceptable. (See *Carrington v. Rash*, *supra*, 380 U.S. 89, 94: "Fencing out" from the franchise a sector of the population because of the way they may vote is constitutionally impermissible.")

Second, respondents suggest that limiting the franchise to English literates will exclude those "so indifferent to the language and political affairs of their country . . . that they would not exercise the franchise with responsibility." Exclusion of the indifferent, however, is far from a compelling state interest, especially since it is left to conjecture how indifference leads to a serious lack of "perspective."

In any event, the indifferent may, presumably by definition, be relied on to exclude themselves with far greater precision than is possible through legislation and without legislation's concomitant exclusion of those who, like petitioners, are vitally interested but unable to read English. Precision is crucial to the constitutionality of any state effort to select out for interest. (See *Kramer v. Union School District*, *supra*, 395 U.S. 701, 704-706.)

Finally, respondents maintain that this limitation on eligible voters excludes those "so . . . intellectually incapable" that they, too, could be expected to exercise the franchise without perspective. The mysterious quality of "perspective" remains undefined, but even assuming an adequate definition were provided, the argument is unpersuasive.

California has already established minimum standards of mental acuity required of eligible voters; it excludes "idiots" and "insane persons." (Cal. Const., art. II, § 1.) Should California desire additional, more stringent, intellectual standards, it must adopt a far more accurate method of measuring the relevant quality, intelligence, than is provided by the crude and psychologically unsupported expedient of equating linguistic ability with intelligence.

<sup>32</sup> The difficulties in efficient distribution of both English and Spanish electoral materials may not be as severe as respondents intimate. For instance, prospective voters could be required to inform the registrar at the time they registered whether they would use the English or the Spanish system. Thus the state could anticipate the requisite number of Spanish language ballots that would

be needed at specific precincts, and it would know the addresses to which sample ballots and ballot pamphlets should be mailed in each language.

Other states have adopted such bilingual systems. In Hawaii, where literacy in either English or Hawaiian suffices, candidates' names may be printed in both languages. (Hawaii Rev. Laws, § 11-38.) (1963 Supp.) New Mexico statutes provide that ballots and instructions are to be printed in both Spanish and English and authorize personal assistance in voting for those literate in neither language. (New Mexico Stat. Ann., §§ 3-2-11, 3-2-41, 3-3-7, 3-3-12, 3-3-13.) In Louisiana, one can vote if he can read either English or his "mother tongue." (La. Rev. Stat., tit. 18, § 31.) And, of course, the problem of assuring intelligent and accurate balloting has been met by those more than 30 states which have no literacy requirement at all. Florida, for example, permits voters not literate in English to request assistance of any person, including but not limited to official voting inspectors, who may enter the polling booth with the voter in order to provide such assistance. (Fla. Stats. Annot. § 101.051.)

<sup>33</sup> Indeed, we note that a contemplated amendment to article II, section 1 proposes an extension of the franchise to all California citizens who are literate in Spanish, on a statewide basis. (Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 7, Resolution ch. 308, 1969 Stats., pp. 3983-3984.)

<sup>34</sup> Los Angeles County is by far the most populous county in the state, with over 35 percent of all Californians residing therein. As of January 1969, the population of Los Angeles County was estimated at 7,140,100. (1969 Cal. Roster of Federal, State, County, and City Officials, p. 115.)

<sup>35</sup> Unless respondents decide to adopt a new method of determining literacy (see, for example, that employed by New York, which is described by McGovney, *The American Suffrage Medley* (1949) at p. 63 and reprinted in *Katzenbach v. Morgan*, *supra*, 384 U.S. 641 at pp. 663-664) literacy in Spanish is to be determined by the same standard as is currently employed to determine literacy in English. That is, applicants must demonstrate an ability to read the California Constitution either in English or in an accurate Spanish translation. This assumes, of course, that the respondent registrar-recorder (and his counterpart in other counties) will require an identical level of competence in either language and will employ sections of comparable difficulty in estimating this level of competence.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 8, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and to set at liberty them that are bruised.—Luke 4: 18.*

O God and Father of us all, whose concern for the welfare of Thy children never fails and who calls us to be concerned about the well being of our people, prosper, we pray Thee, the labors of those who seek to minister to the needs of our countrymen, especially our prisoners of war. For these prisoners we offer a special prayer. Comfort them with Thy heavenly grace, strengthen them in their trials, and keep alive in them the

hope of release from capture and a reunion with their families.

May the replicas picturing the state of our prisoners in our Capitol crypt arouse our people to the need of doing all we can to relieve their suffering and may we not rest until it is done.

In the name of Him who is the strength of our lives, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 4, 1970, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10184. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

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

H.R. 14300. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to facilitate the disposal of Government records without sufficient value to warrant their continued preservation, to abolish the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3592. An act to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, to clarify the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL**

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

**TOWARD BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS**

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the House is scheduled to consider the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. This bill is especially significant this year. It is always significant and always important.

The committee report on the bill, which was prepared under the direction of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN), is extremely well done. I would hope that all Members, especially those from urban areas, might study the report which has been available to the Members since Thursday last.

The report points out that the bill might well be termed a bill for the protection of public health; or, it might well be termed a bill to help stabilize the American economy; or, it might well be termed a bill to encourage rural development; or, it might well be termed a bill to fight pollution; or, it might be termed a bill to help provide better nutrition to the American people, especially the poor; or, it might be termed a bill to help farmers, and it does help farmers and it contains some subsidy for farmers. Or, it might be termed a bill to subsidize consumers, because the subsidy which goes to farmers is actually a subsidy to consumers.

I would hope, in order to get this bill in better perspective, the report on the bill might have the attention of Members of the House.

**EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION, PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965**

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 1045 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1045

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15712) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), and pending that I yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1045 provides a straight open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15712 to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The purpose of H.R. 15712 is to extend to June 30, 1971, the present annual authorizations for titles I through IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Title V authorizations relating to regional economic development will expire on June 30, 1971.

The current amounts are as follows: Title I, section 105, \$500,000,000; title II, section 101(c), \$170,000,000; title III, section 302, \$50,000,000; and title IV, section 403(g), \$50,000,000.

The act provides Federal help, in cooperation with the States, to assist communities, areas, and regions which are suffering from excessive unemployment or underemployment by providing financial and technical assistance needed for the creation of new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1045 in order that the bill may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned, as I know a number of my colleagues are, in connection with some recent decisions by the Department in decertifying certain counties within the Nation, and since I happen to have one of those counties in my own district, I am very much concerned about the criteria that have been used in such decertification under the Economic Development Act, and along with many other Members of Congress I am seeking some reconsideration in connection with that. This indeed has been an excellent program for the benefit of certain areas of the country where we have been faced with substantial and continuing unemployment.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

House Resolution 1045 makes in order

for consideration of H.R. 15712 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for an extension of the present authorized amounts to those titles of the act—titles I through IV—which expire this year, in order to continue the authority to operate the programs through June 30, 1971.

No substantive amendments in the organic statute are made by the bill beyond the 1-year extension.

Funds previously authorized by prior legislation which are carried forward by the bill for 1 year include:

For title I, section 105, \$500,000,000; for title II, section 101(c) \$170,000,000; for title III, section 302, \$50,000,000; authorization total, \$770,000,000.

The Economic Development Act of 1965 applies to many areas of the country the policies developed for Appalachia. It seeks to find solutions to the unemployment and underdevelopment in several poorer areas of our Nation. Financial and technical assistance is made available to assist in creating new jobs in such areas. Long-range planning and development is emphasized. The Department of Commerce supports the legislation. There are no minority views.

I have no further request for time but I reserve the balance of my time.

This is a good program and should be passed—I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15712) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15712) with Mr. SLACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 153]

Abernethy	Brasco	Celler
Adair	Bray	Chisholm
Alexander	Brock	Clark
Ashbrook	Brown, Calif.	Clay
Ashley	Broyhill, N.C.	Comte
Aspinall	Buchanan	Conyers
Ayres	Burton, Calif.	Corbett
Baring	Bush	Cowger
Barrett	Cabell	Crane
Bevill	Carey	Culver
Bingham	Carter	Daddario
Bolling	Casey	Daniel, Va.

Dawson	Hébert	Pollock
de la Garza	Hungate	Powell
Derwinski	Jonas	Preyer, N.C.
Dickinson	Jones, Ala.	Price, Ill.
Diggs	Jones, Tenn.	Railsback
Dingell	Kirwan	Reid, N.Y.
Dorn	Kyros	Reuss
Dowdy	Landrum	Rivers
Downing	Long, La.	Robison
Dulski	Lowenstein	Rooney, N.Y.
Esch	Lujan	Roudebush
Farbstein	McCarthy	Ruth
Fascell	McCulloch	St Germain
Feighan	McEwen	Schadeberg
Fish	McMillan	Scheuer
Fisher	MacGregor	Stagers
Foley	Maillard	Steed
Ford, Gerald R.	Mann	Stratton
Frelinghuysen	Mathias	Syrington
Fulton, Tenn.	Mayne	Taft
Gallagher	Meskill	Teague, Tex.
Gaydos	Michel	Thompson, N.J.
Gettys	Miller, Calif.	Tierman
Gialmo	Mills	Vigorito
Gilbert	Mollohan	Watkins
Green, Oreg.	Moorhead	Watson
Griffiths	Moss	Weicker
Hagan	Murphy, N.Y.	Whalley
Halpern	Nix	Whitehurst
Hanley	O'Neill, Mass.	Whitten
Hansen, Wash.	Ottinger	Williams
Harrington	Passman	Wilson, Bob
Hastings	Pepper	Wold
Hawkins	Pike	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 15712, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 292 Members responded to their names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15712 which is legislation to renew and extend the authorization of funds for titles I through IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended through the fiscal year of 1971. This bill simply provides for an extension of the present authorized amounts to those titles in the act that expire this year in order to continue the authority to operate through June 30, 1971, and permit the Economic Development Administration to continue the operation of its programs under the existing authority in the legislation for the next fiscal year. The bill, if enacted into law, will mean that all of the authorizing legislation under the Economic Development Act will expire on June 30, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works. It has the full support of both the administration and the members of the Committee.

The provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act when passed in 1965 were based on the best features of the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. There were no duplications or repetitions of these programs. The Area Redevelopment Act, enacted into law in

May of 1961, expired on June 30, 1965. The public works acceleration program enacted in September of 1962 was financially exhausted in about 2 years. The Appalachian Regional Development Act provided for specific programs for that region and does not permit any duplication of projects under this legislation within that region.

Titles I through IV of the act provide for assistance to "redevelopment areas" and "economic development districts," where unemployment and underemployment conditions have been persistently greater than in the Nation as a whole. Programs for assistance in these expiring titles include direct and supplementary grants for the construction or improvement of development facilities; long-term low interest loans for development facilities and for commercial and industrial establishments; and technical assistance, planning, research and demonstration projects.

Title V which provides for the establishment and funding of the regional commissions under the act does not expire until June 30, 1971.

Since 1965 there has been a broadening of the authority of the title V regional commissions by amendments enacted in 1967 and again in 1969. Last year the technical assistance provisions were amended to permit demonstration projects and this year's authorization was increased by \$25 million for this title. The special impact criteria of the Economic Opportunity Act was added to title IV last year to further expand the designation of "redevelopment areas." However, there has not been a thorough review and examination of this legislation since its enactment in 1965.

With this purpose in mind, I have our own Subcommittee on Economic Development programs to make an in-depth study and evaluation of the economic development programs. The evaluations by the subcommittee as well as those by the Economic Development Administration are now underway. There is a great need for this kind of legislation. The committee expects to find more effective ways to coordinate our many programs which provide public works facilities on a broad scale to combat both the growing problems in urban areas as well as the out-migration problems in rural communities which in turn compounds the problems of our cities.

Before the end of this session, the committee intends to begin extensive hearings to obtain the benefit of the evaluations, as well as to receive substantive proposed changes to this legislation.

We welcome the assistance of all the Members who wish to present their ideas or amendments.

As I conclude my remarks, I would like to express my thanks and congratulations to all the members of the committee for their continued cooperation and bipartisan efforts in working together toward developing the future course of this legislation. I particularly want to thank Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. CLEVELAND for their guidance. Under the leadership of Mr. EDMONDSON, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs, and Mr. CLEVELAND, as senior

minority member, their subcommittee has been of immeasurable assistance to the full committee in dealing with economic development legislation. Their evaluations, when completed, should also be of great assistance to the full committee in its deliberations on the proposed changes to this legislation.

I respectfully recommend my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, basically, this bill is a straight extension of four titles of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, continuing those four titles through to the same termination date that presently is in the law for title V which provides authorization for the regional commissions that are established under this act.

Titles I through IV of the act provides for assistance to "redevelopment areas" and "economic development districts," where unemployment and underemployment conditions have been persistently greater than in the Nation as a whole. Programs for assistance in these expiring titles include direct and supplementary grants for the construction of improvement and development facilities; long-term interest loans for development facilities and for commercial and industrial establishments; and technical assistance, planning, research, and demonstration projects.

A brief analysis of the sections of H.R. 15712 as they would amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—Public Law 89-136—is as follows:

Subsection (a) would amend section 105 to continue for 1 year the \$500 million authorization for grants and supplementary grants for public works and development facilities.

Subsection (b) would amend section 201(c) to continue for 1 year the limitation of \$170 million on title II's open-end authorization for public works loans and business loans and guarantees.

Subsection (c) would amend section 302 to continue for 1 year the \$50 million authorization for technical assistance, research, and demonstration projects.

Subsection (d) would amend section 403(g) to continue for 1 year the \$50 million authorization for EDA grant and loan assistance to economic development centers and districts.

I might say with regard to this latter point that there was a little confusion a few weeks about whether or not the money for these economic development districts would be continued. We have received, and you will find in the report on this bill, a firm commitment from Secretary of Commerce Stans that these grants will continue to be made to the economic development programs during the period of the extension.

This bill, therefore, simply provides for an extension of the present authorized amounts to those titles in the act that expire this year in order to continue the authority to operate through June 30, 1971.

The committee intends to hold extensive hearings in the near future to obtain the benefit of the evaluations of these programs that are presently underway as well as to receive substantive proposed changes to this legislation.

The appropriations bill—H.R. 17575—which provides for the appropriations for fiscal year 1971 for this agency was passed by the House on May 14, 1970. This bill provides \$160 million for grants and loans for development facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and IV of the act. The bill included \$50 million for loans and guarantees of working capital loans for industrial development pursuant to titles II and IV of the act and provided \$20,200,000 for payments for technical assistance, research, planning grants, and demonstration projects as authorized by title III of the act.

With the enactment into law of this bill, all of the authorizing provisions of this act will expire on June 30, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, the total amount of the authorizations for these titles for the next fiscal year is \$770 million. Fundamentally, the Appropriations Committee is continuing the policy of the Congress of funding approximately one-third of the authorization level of this program. I think in consideration of the fact that financing has been only one-third of the authorization level that we have been able to demonstrate considerable achievement under this bill and under this program since it was enacted in 1965. I think the Public Works Committee correctly reached the judgment that a further extension of 1 year was in order.

We are hoping to have hearings during next year to consider the administration's recommendations for improvements and changes in this program. We expect to have some new program recommendations to present to the House at the next Congress.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from Oklahoma, of course, is the chairman of the Subcommittee on EDA Investigative Matters of the Committee on Public Works.

If I recall correctly, it seems that it was about a year ago that the subcommittee had hearings and there were, I felt, some serious allegations made against the operation of the program. At that time, if my memory serves me correctly, there were loans and/or grants made to fund many different enterprises that were in competition with various enterprises already in the community with the same kind of operation. I believe it involved motels and the nursery business.

I believe I am correct that there was going to be a staff investigation of those allegations, and I am wondering what the outcome of those investigations have been.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Kentucky says that there were allegations of many loans and grants of this type. However, I think as a matter of fact you could count on the fingers of one hand the specific allegations of this

type that were presented to the subcommittee with specific complaints regarding particular projects. We have in the case of each of the projects on which we received specific complaints gone into some detail with the department, and with the sponsors of the projects who in each instance are local people who bring these projects to the Government to determine the merits of the complaint.

I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that in several instances I have personally reached a conclusion, and I think members of the subcommittee have concurred in some instances, that there have been some cases in which there have been projects that on second sight or second consideration it would have been wiser not to have made the loans. There has been serious question in one or two instances of the spirit of the law being followed, if not the letter of the law.

However, I do think those instances are rather rare. I do not think that that is a general criticism that can be leveled against this program. And I think the department in charge of these programs, since these complaints were made, and since there were investigations, has been proceeding rather cautiously and carefully to check out this question of competition with local business activities before they make a loan.

Mr. SNYDER. Has the gentleman from Oklahoma, as the chairman of the EDA Subcommittee, been able to get any more cooperation through the people downtown who have to do with these programs than he was able to get a year or so ago, when he was expressing some concern about them cooperating with him, or giving him some information on these loans?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would not say that their cooperation has been 100 percent, but I will say it has been well above 90 percent, and in comparison with some Government agencies dealing with congressional committees, that is pretty high.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I rise to compliment my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for the work that he has put into this matter, and also the great Committee on Public Works. I certainly wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment authored by the Public Works Committee which would prevent the de-designation of any redevelopment areas from June 1, 1970 to June 1, 1971. This is not a local or parochial amendment. As of today it involves close to 100 counties in this country. Faced as we are with a general deterioration in our national economy, nationally, unemployment has now reached 5 percent, the matter will certainly involve the welfare of many additional development areas in the very near future.

Should the committee amendment not be adopted, we would undoubtedly during the next few months be faced with an extremely anomalous situation. The Economic Development Administration would be mandated pursuant to old and

imprecise economic data, to remove many areas from the eligible list at the very same time that those areas were sharing in the general increase in unemployment. This, of course, would constitute a nonsensical situation. At the very time a community's unemployment were rising and it was most acutely in need of the very type of assistance authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, we would be barring that community from any further such assistance. The bar against further grants for public facilities under these circumstances would be particularly unfortunate. Adequate local water and sewer facilities are necessary prerequisites for future industrial expansion. In addition, however, economists are in agreement that periods of economic slack such as we are now experiencing are the ideal time to undertake public works. Unused manpower and resources are available and thus the construction of public works would not have to compete with the demands of the private sector of the economy. The creation of inflationary pressures would be avoided and most important idle men would be put back to work.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Public Works will soon undertake a comprehensive re-evaluation of the Public Works and Economic Development Act with a view to bringing this 1965 legislation up to date. The measure which we enacted in 1965 has accomplished a great deal of good. It has fully met the expectations of those of us who fought for its enactment at that time. But come next year, 6 years will have elapsed and the time will undoubtedly have arrived for its updating and recasting. The whole subject of regional economic development is a relatively new one and one that obviously the Congress must thoroughly review from time to time in order to make sure that we are maximizing our goals in this area. I am told that the increased efficiency and rapidity with which statistics on deteriorating economic conditions within these areas are available will be a subject to which the committee is to devote a considerable portion of its attention. I commend the committee for its plans to look into this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my support for the committee amendment, urge its adoption, and endorse final passage of the bill as so amended.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should just like to respond further to the questions posed by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) and say that that is one of the reasons why we felt it wise to only extend the program for 1 year, so that the committee in its entirety can evaluate information based on the staff investigation and will therefore be able to incorporate any suggestions by next year.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, and the gentleman has probably answered the

question already, but has that staff investigation been completed?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The investigation by the staff is proceeding on a number of different fronts, and in a number of different projects, and at this time we have men in the field, and the staff is evaluating some of the projects on which there have been some questions raised.

Mr. SNYDER. Could I ask the gentleman if at the time it was determined to pass this bill out any of these folks who had complained about these loans in competition to them, and putting them out of business, were any of them invited in to express their concern in the hearings?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky that at the particular time this bill was marked up no public witnesses were invited to testify at that time.

Mr. SNYDER. There were just executive hearings, is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is substantially correct.

Mr. SNYDER. With people from downtown, and members of the committee?

Mr. EDMONDSON. There were public and executive hearings.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, but there were no public hearings?

Mr. EDMONDSON. There were public hearings but there were no public witnesses invited in at the time of the actual markup. We had held public hearings and we have heard some of the people in communities where there have been complaints of competitive businesses started.

Mr. SNYDER. But not preliminary to reporting of this bill? The hearing you mention was some months ago.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would say not in the last few weeks—no.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, in further response to the gentleman from Kentucky, we must keep in mind that not only is the committee conducting an in-depth study and review of this program, but so is the Department of Commerce and the Economic Development Administration.

Because these reviews and studies are in progress, this is the reason we have continued this program for 1 year to let not only the Department of Commerce but the committee also continue this in-depth study so that we can come up with suggestions to correct any of these inequities similar to what you are bringing forth here.

But you must also remember that when there is a project approved by the Economic Development Administration, that is originated at the local level and it is the local people who requested the assistance for this particular project and they surely should be aware of any inequities insofar as it affects their local economy. Apparently, in some cases they have not, if the situation is as you have indicated.

But because of this in-depth study, we

hope to go over some of these problems but here again you must realize the department is not at fault in this. It is the local people who initiate these projects.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one observation?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I would say to the gentleman that regardless of where these projects originate, the question is whether or not they merit the loans that are requested. I am sure in the gentleman's local community, you will find one businessman objecting to the use of Federal funds to establish competition to his business, and that would be true in anybody's local community.

I am not alleging that these charges we have heard a year ago are well founded or not well founded—I do not know. But I do recall that the gentleman from Oklahoma chaired a subcommittee in which certain allegations were made and I am attempting to inquire into what determination has been made on those charges and if, in fact, an investigation has been completed, which apparently it has not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. During recent days and weeks, there has been some concern expressed on the part of several of us regarding the classification of counties that participate in the EDA program.

In my own instance in Minnesota, we have several counties that have been declared ineligible within recent days and weeks. In my judgment something is wrong with the formula which is being used for the purposes of determining eligibility. Because, in three counties in my district, two of them are what might well be said to be the poorest counties in the district and in the greatest need of help. But with small populations and a small labor force, and a good number of the population in those communities being on farms, they are not classified in the same manner as where there are industrial areas. For some reason or another, it works out that they do not meet the unemployment requirements and so they have been taken off the eligible list.

This is positive evidence that there is something wrong with this formula. I understand that some consideration has been given to this and that there is the possibility of an amendment being offered that might leave eligible counties, as of now, to continue for another year. Is the gentleman acquainted with this?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman has raised a point that has been of real concern to our full Committee on Public Works. The chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON), sent a letter to the Secretary of Commerce more than a week ago raising the question of dedesignation and the criteria used for dedesignation. The Committee on Public Works considered the situation and considered the fact that the data available to us was proven to be inadequate in the case of many of these counties and that the outmigration data being used to establish outmigra-

tion from these counties is certainly not current.

For these reasons, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), will offer an amendment at the appropriate time that would block any further dedesignations of any of these counties now designated EDA areas without a specific request from the local governing bodies that they should be dedesignated. I believe the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) will take care of the point the gentleman has very appropriately raised, and I am quite sure it will have the overwhelming support of the Public Works Committee, and I hope we will adopt it in the Committee of the Whole and in the House of Representatives itself.

Mr. LANGEN. May I express my gratitude to the gentleman for his explanation and compliment my colleague from Minnesota for his intention to offer the amendment. I am sure that through a reevaluation of the program next year these inequities can probably be corrected.

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

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

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman from Oklahoma has explained to the gentleman from Minnesota that I plan to offer an amendment which would maintain the status quo and to direct that the counties which have been dedesignated will continue to be eligible under the EDA program. A thorough reevaluation, reappraisal, review and reexamination of the EDA program, is now underway. I understand that a major part of the work is already done. When the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development and his staff come before our Public Works Committee, which we hope will be early next year, they will have some very comprehensive proposals to recommend. They will give us a very detailed report of how the program has worked in the past 5 years. What sections of the program ought to be beefed up or enlarged; where they have worked well and those areas that ought to be strengthened that have not worked well, and what parts might even have to be trimmed off as unnecessary and superfluous.

We do assure the gentleman that the amendment will be offered under the 5-minute rule when general debate is over. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. LANGEN. I shall be glad to support the amendment, and again I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, as cosponsor of this bill, I rise in support of H.R. 15712. I was the original author of this legislation. Over the years I have seen how desperately it is needed to provide permanent jobs and opportunities through growth for the people of undeveloped areas.

The committee bill simply makes the following changes to the existing law:

Subsection (a) would amend section 105 to continue for 1 year the \$500 mil-

lion authorization for grants and supplementary grants for public works and development facilities.

Subsection (b) would amend section 201(c) to continue for 1 year the limitation of \$170 million on title II's open-end authorization for public works loans and business loans and guarantees.

Subsection (c) would amend section 302 to continue for 1 year the \$50 million authorization for technical assistance, research, and demonstration projects.

Subsection (d) would amend section 403(g) to continue for 1 year the \$50 million authorization for Economic Development Act grant and loan assistance to economic development centers and districts.

Therefore, the total amount of authorizations for these titles for the next fiscal year is \$770 million.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act became law in 1965 to permit the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, to help areas, districts and regions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning the overall economic development of these areas by providing financial assistance to enable these areas to help themselves achieve lasting improvement. It is time now to take a new look at what has been accomplished and what is needed for the future.

In a large measure, the success of this program can be attributed to the emphasis the act places on long-range planning and programming to be developed locally. The purpose of these plans are to develop within the community what is needed for the permanent development of a stable and diversified local economy. An area must develop its own overall economic development plan before its projects are eligible for assistance. Therefore, the projects given assistance under the act originate in the community it will serve based on the needs of the community established by its development plan.

#### PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY PROGRAM

Of particular interest to me is the public works and development facilities program authorized in title I of the act. Public works activity is the necessary first step toward building a foundation that enables industry to establish new plants.

A study of 129 Economic Development Administration public works projects which have been completed and in operation for at least 1 year shows that about 19,400 new permanent jobs have been generated. Economic Development Administration provided about \$20 million for these 129 projects.

Of the 129 projects studied, 78 involved industrial park development. The study indicates that companies and businesses establishing operations in these parks have generated about 15,850 new jobs.

Economic Development Administration is not a large agency, but size certainly has nothing to do with results. The funds provided by Economic Development Administration are used as seed money to stimulate new local and private investment.

As of May 8, 1970, Economic Develop-

ment Administration had obligated \$878.9 million for 1,753 public works grants and loans.

What we should keep in mind is that long-range economic development takes time. So the real impact of Economic Development Administration activity cannot be measured today. We can see what has been set in motion and it is considerable.

But it is what will come next month, next year, and 5 years from now in the way of new jobs and growing industries that will tell the real story.

Economic Development Administration had completed 742 public works projects as of May 19, 1970. Another 510 were under construction, and 507 projects were in preconstruction stages.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. BATNIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation and that which he is putting into the record in his extension. I appreciate the background of combining the old Public Works Law into the Area Redevelopment Law, as well as making titles I-IV jibe with previously extended title V, but I am in a rather paradoxical position and really rise to gain information and maybe throw out a new view, other than has been brought up here on this continuing legislation.

My paradoxical position is that perhaps no group uses this authorization any more than the southwestern counties of Missouri, the so-called Ozarks Mountain area. In fact, we have resources and development surveys of 11 counties going on, authorized by and contracted for by the Economic and Development Agency, and also we participate in the four-State Ozarkian Regional Commission, which would be involved in title V.

I understand we are simply extending the various studies of the committee and of the Department of Commerce downtown as to ways to change this, but I wonder if in the meantime we have caught ourselves on the horns of a dilemma, of either control of taxpayers' funds granted through this agency directly or decentralization and control of the funds through the various Governors or the planning agencies.

It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that maybe we have just about planned ourselves out of existence. I think we have plans in almost every agency, and some of these are regional or multicounty planning agencies that operate under funding from the EDA are now insisting through the local appointing authorities of the planning agencies, usually the Governors and/or the various county courts in some representation assembled, that we cannot get rid of them, and we cannot stop the planning, that they must be consulted on all projects, and they get continuous grants of taxpayers' money for more planning; yet, they seek to control the allocation, if it is decentralized down through the States to the respective Governors of the States. The end result is that, because of the

dilemma, because of the power grants versus the duplicity and overlapping, because of planning versus control, because of government versus local private industry assuming the initiative, we have come to a dead stop.

My real question, as a result of this preamble, that I ask the distinguished gentleman is: Have we not about arrived at the time where we ought to quit planning and start action? And, if so, how can we control it directly without this being segmental legislation?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, all I can say at this point is that the gentleman has put his finger on the nub of the problem as far as the regional commissions are concerned under title V.

May I explain to the Members that title V is not affected by this legislation, because we extended that last year for a 2-year period. At that time we made it abundantly clear to the Governors and the Governors' representatives who appeared before our committee at that time, that the committee was not one bit pleased with much of the work that was going on. I will be candid and say on this floor that I must confess we were particularly dissatisfied with how our commission in the Great Lakes area operated. It has a choked-up, incomplete, and superficial program. The so-called plan for the Great Lakes did not have the real concept of a regional plan as was envisioned by the committee when the EDA act was set up. It did not have the depth nor the breadth nor the type of operation of programs that had been put into effect very successfully in Appalachia on a much larger scale.

Some of the commissions have come up with a good report. I think the commission covering the area represented by the gentlemen in the Ozarks, has done a good job. It depends a great deal on the administrator, it seems.

But the gentleman raises a really valid point. All I can say is that this matter will be given a really thorough going over, a really good going over, when the EDA makes its report and its recommendations on titles IV and V early next year.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to reiterate I understand this was bringing titles I through IV up to the same termination date as title V, and I do not want to be speaking in opposition to it, nor be faultfinding with the various regional commissions at this particular point, although they are under study locally also, in addition to the department, and in addition to this fine commitment.

I believe it is quite wise and proper that the committee brings this legislation to the floor today in order to extend for 1 year the time limitation, pending all the studies that are going on. In addition to the regional commissions, there are some planning groups that are set up under EDA, and there are surveys being made under titles I through IV also, which have the same end result and put us on these horns of the various dilemmas of control versus decentralization, of Federal Government versus State government, of power groups versus duplicity.

I believe it is wise to point out, if indeed the economy of the times has not overtaken the event, to the place where we are at the end of this final fence-gate instead of starting point; the termination, we seriously consider letting these things lapse and the regular economy take over.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I have concluded my remarks.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

I am particularly concerned about a provision in title IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 which was enacted last year. This is the special impact program, which was included in the 1969 amendments—Public Law 91-123. The purpose was to make parts of counties and municipalities eligible as redevelopment areas. In our urban centers there are areas of hard-core unemployment, containing large concentrations of low-income persons, which did not qualify for assistance until the special impact program was created last year.

For title IV, last year, \$50 million was authorized. I understand that \$50 million is authorized again this year.

I commended the committee last year for its inclusion of these pockets of poverty within major cities, an objective which I and others had long sought. In fact, I had introduced legislation to accomplish this since 1963 and testified before the Public Works Committee on several occasions. Unfortunately, the Economic Development Administration has not as yet designated any special impact area, nor has it set aside any funds or established guidelines for the special impact program. The failure of EDA to fund the program is distressing.

My question is this: Was it not the intention of the committee last year in approving the special impact program to have the EDA fund it and move ahead with it?

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is right.

There is a problem in those areas of the so-called severe concentrated unemployment, which technically we could not define as a redevelopment district. Actually they had severe economic distress and were truly and justifiably entitled to assistance, and should be getting assistance.

All I can say at this point is that we will certainly check with EDA to see what assistance they are planning to give to these hard-core unemployment areas. They certainly should have been doing something by now. I assure the gentleman that we will check on that promptly and report.

Mr. RYAN. I appreciate the gentleman's concern.

Mr. BLATNIK. I do want to underline that we are very much concerned about this and look with great favor on this type of assistance, which we feel is thoroughly justified in those areas.

Mr. RYAN. I know the committee believed that assistance was urgently

needed. That is why the special impact program was enacted. The situation is more critical now than last year because hard-core unemployment persists and is even more acute than it was last year.

I appreciate the gentleman's assurance that he will do whatever he can to see that EDA does in fact implement the program.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, as a strong supporter of the Appalachian regional development concept, which legislation I had the privilege to cosponsor and in which I believe I have played a part in developing legislation covering that program since the introduction of the original bill, I rise today to support another very worthwhile program—the Economic Development Act of 1965.

I believe the action by the Committee on Public Works in extending the authorization for titles I through IV of this program through fiscal year 1971 is needed and necessary. The total amount involved in this authorization is \$770 million.

This program has proved to be an effective one in the past. I am certain in the years to come as the law is further refined and the Economic Development Administration within the Department of Commerce obtains an even better understanding of the problems involved under the legislation its effectiveness will steadily increase.

In the light of the present economic situation and the problems we may be facing in the months ahead with rising unemployment and the resulting ever widening spread across the Nation of many of our citizens without work it is good to know a program such as EDA is already on the books. It combines the best features of the old Area Redevelopment Act, the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962, and, of course, the act I have previously mentioned, the Appalachian regional development program.

Its effectiveness has been proven in many ways across the country and has already provided assistance in my home State of Alabama in such areas as Scottsboro, Bridgeport, Moulton, and Athens.

I reiterate my strong support of this legislation pending before us and I urge its adoption by this body.

I conclude by complimenting the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON) for his fine, overall leadership on this legislation, and the distinguished gentlemen from Minnesota and Oklahoma (Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. EDMONDSON) for the diligence and efforts with which they have pursued this program to make it the meaningful one that it is. I also commend the distinguished Members of the minority side of the committee, and in particular, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to express approval of this proposal for an extension of 1 year. This is appropriate action.

I have had an opportunity to observe operations under the Act in certain areas where it truly has fulfilled its announced objectives. Whatever shortcomings may be ascertained as a result of pending in depth studies, can be corrected. The program serves a very useful purpose and must be continued in force.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, the 1-year extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL). He has very well expressed the same concerns that I and some of the other members of the committee have had as it pertains to accomplishing more effective coordination of economic development programs. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding at times on the part of local planning groups because various titles of the act have been considered as separate legislation with differences in expiration date. This has also compounded the overall work of our committee and perhaps tended to confuse many of the Members of the House. The bill, H.R. 15712, simply extends all titles into a common expiration date of June 30, 1971. This year's extension will afford the time needed to complete studies and evaluations now going on as to the best way to mold the program after that date.

Since the public works and economic development program was brought into existence in September 1965, it has been strengthened and extended to cover additional depressed regions, including the Ozark region in which most of the Third Congressional District of which I have the privilege to represent in Arkansas lies.

The regional commission program, as well as the public works and development facilities program, have been very meaningful toward my district's, and in fact a large part of our entire State's, long-term economic development. They also have had significant short-term impact on the income level of workers who have been involved in the actual construction of certain projects. The EDA business development loan and guarantee program is also most important in stimulating industry and business to locate investments in disadvantaged areas. The planning and technical assistance program also has helped to supplement private and public initiative with assistance to government entities in low-income areas that will be valuable in obtaining lasting economic improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong believer in this legislation and while realizing that it needs and is going to be further

improved, it is even now a very meaningful Federal-State-local partnership approach that is effectively up-grading and creating jobs in areas where the per capita income level has been lagging far behind the national average.

In looking over reports of EDA projects funded in my district and the EDA investment per direct job, it appears to me that it will not take the Federal Government too long to make a net profit on the additional or newly created personal income.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15712, an act to extend for 1 year the Economic Development and Public Works Act.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of helping my distinguished friends on the Committee on Public Works write the first EPA Act 5 years ago, in 1965. Although the program has been encumbered with administrative redtape, it has been a great tool for the people of southern Illinois in helping themselves. We have built industrial parks, water and sewer projects, access roads, and other needed programs. Although the Nixon administration has had a marked slowdown in funding for southern Illinois projects, we have several meritorious applications pending, and I am hopeful that with the passage of this legislation that we can now move forward with more funds for southern Illinois and other similar areas which have been suffering from outmigration due to lack of job opportunities.

The 1970 census just completed in my district shows a net loss of 3,000 additional people. This is much, much less than the loss between 1950 and 1960, and much of the improvement in our economy has been directly due to Government self-help programs such as EPA. In the next 10 years we will be able to stop all outmigration and bring back many of the 250,000 people who have left southern Illinois over the past 20 years.

Programs such as EPA are a must if we are to complete the job we started out to do—full prosperity for southern Illinois and the Nation.

In closing, I want to thank our distinguished chairman (Mr. FALLON), the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON), the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER), and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), and the other members of our Committee on Public Works for their hard work on this legislation.

I want also to commend our very able chief counsel, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Lorenz, EDA Counsel, and Mr. Enfield, minority counsel, for their hard work.

Mr. Chairman, to be poor is to die a little each day. This legislation is one way to help them live.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Do I understand that this bill would authorize in the next fiscal year \$770 million?

Mr. HARSHA. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What has been the authorization request in the past?

Mr. HARSHA. This is a continuation of the same authorization we requested last year.

Mr. GROSS. Was the authorization fully funded last year?

Mr. HARSHA. It has never been fully funded, I might advise my good friend from Iowa. As a matter of fact, the funds have been historically about one-third of what we authorized over the years. As a matter of fact, this year we have already passed an appropriation bill for this program. There are only \$230.2 million exclusive of administrative expenses of the \$770 million authorized that have been appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a pipeline in connection with this legislation?

Mr. HARSHA. Not in the usual sense. But there are authorizations that have not been fully funded that could subsequently be funded.

Mr. GROSS. Then, there is money in the pipeline. Is that correct?

Mr. HARSHA. In this respect there is. The authorizations are already enacted and do not lapse. The Committee on Appropriations could come in and adopt a supplemental appropriation to pick up any of the unspent authorization funds that have not heretofore been appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me an estimate of the expenditures under the previous authorizations since 1965?

Mr. HARSHA. I can say this: Beginning in fiscal year 1966 there has been a total of \$3.8 billion authorized under this program. There has only been \$1,449 million appropriated of the \$3.8 billion.

Mr. GROSS. And some of that remains unspent. Perhaps committed but unspent. Is that correct?

Mr. HARSHA. Yes. There is some carryover. However, any uncommitted funds lapse.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman will put that in the RECORD in connection with his remarks.

Mr. HARSHA. In 1968 there was \$631,000 carryover, but that was unobligated and died.

Now, the unobligated appropriations lapsed. In fiscal year 1969 it was \$870,000 unobligated. That has lapsed but there is nothing to prevent the Appropriations Committee from coming in and appropriating the remaining unfunded authorizations.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15712, which I had the privilege to cosponsor. The utilization of economic development programs to boost the lagging economics of those areas which have not been able to keep pace with the rest of the Nation, has been proving its merit since the inception of the idea. The Economic Development Administration began in fiscal year 1966 with 1,280 such areas qualified for assistance. This number had been reduced by July 1, 1969, to 910 qualified areas

attesting to the success of the program. However, due to economic conditions, austerity programs by the Department of Defense and other factors this has now risen to 982 qualified areas as of May 21 this year, and there are additional areas to be increased. This increase pointedly indicates the need for continuance of this very successful program.

These long-range economic development programs stimulate local interest, local planning, and local private capital investment which serves to reduce unemployment and underemployment invariably present in disadvantaged areas. Such programs, in addition, help reduce the rural outmigration to cities, which outmigration decreases the rural tax base while it increases urban problems. Such programs have another advantage which should not be overlooked. Although historically funded at less than one-half the authorized amounts, the remaining unauthorized balances in any 1 fiscal year represent a cushion for subsequent appropriations—that was what I was trying to point out to the gentleman from Iowa—during that year as a temporary job-producing measure in the event of a slackening in the national economy.

Under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, such programs as basic grant-in-aid, and supplementary grants for public works and development facilities, public works and business loans and loan guarantees, as well as grants for technical assistance, research, and demonstration projects, make up the assistance given to areas, districts and regions—the three economic development levels. An area may be a city or a county; a district is usually several counties banded together to combat lagging economy by grassroots planning and investment; and regions are multi-State organizations formed to stimulate economics on a broader scale.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly discuss the business loan program, title II, of the Economic Development Administration inasmuch as others will discuss other titles of the bill.

EDA is the only agency in the Federal Government which has the authority to make business development loans directly to industrial firms. It also can guarantee related working capital loans.

And EDA makes these loans where they are most needed—in areas where economic problems are severe—in many cases so severe that without help from EDA there would be no sizable industrial activity at all.

A survey of new and expanding industrial and business facilities that have been assisted under this program produced some notable findings.

The survey covered 120 businesses now in operation.

Although not all of these firms are in full production, these 120 projects have produced about 11,900 permanent jobs.

When these plants and businesses are in full production, it is expected that more than 16,800 jobs will have been created.

As of May 8, 1970, EDA had obligated \$210.7 million for 245 business development loans, and guaranteed 55 working



capital loans, for a total of \$24 million. Keep in mind that this money is to be repaid, with interest, to the Federal Government.

Such are some of the accomplishments of the very important business loan program which is funded under title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, and which would, under H.R. 15712, be extended for 1 more year at a maximum authorization of \$170 million.

The economic development regions, or regional action planning commissions, are already authorized through fiscal year 1971 and it is, of course, the purpose of H.R. 15712 to continue authorizations for programs such as the business loan program I have just mentioned, for areas and districts through the same period. This legislation would also permit the Committee on Public Works to complete its current indepth oversight and evaluation of these programs, in addition to the evaluation now being made by the Department of Commerce, and to shortly begin its hearings which should bring into focus whatever legislation is needed to strengthen this vital relief for economic distress.

One other important point. Although H.R. 15712 would authorize for fiscal year 1971 for titles I through IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act a total of \$770 million, I wish to emphasize that on May 14, 1970, the House passed H.R. 17575, the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, which would appropriate for the same four titles and for the same fiscal year a total of \$230.2 million exclusive of operation and administration moneys. Such an appropriation would represent less than one-third of the authorization for these programs.

In short, the passage of H.R. 15712, which legislation has been endorsed by the administration, would allow the continuance of these all important economic development programs while evaluations are being completed and determination is made concerning the necessity of basic amending legislation.

I strongly urge the House to adopt this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the committee have any figures as to the number of faucets that are spewing out dollars to so-called distressed areas, economically depressed areas, or what ever you want to call them? How many faucets are there in this Government spewing dollars out to these areas and communities?

Mr. HARSHA. We have the Appalachia program which is confined to the Appalachian area. We have the economic development program—

Mr. GROSS. A program of this kind comes right in on top of Appalachia, or does it?

Mr. HARSHA. Yes. It supplements, you can get supplemental grants under the Appalachian program.

Mr. GROSS. In other words to qualify under this program an area or community must declare itself at least started toward the poorhouse; is that right?

Mr. HARSHA. All you have to have is a certain degree of unemployment, and a certain degree of persistent underemployment, and this has to have continued for a number of years. There is a formula which is set up in the law which you must comply with in order to become eligible. It has to exist and have existed a substantial time, that is, a condition of substantial unemployment for an extended period of time, and in those areas in which the Secretary has determined that there has been a substantial loss of population due to the lack of employment opportunity.

Mr. GROSS. May I suggest to the gentleman—and I know of his interest in this matter—may I suggest to the gentleman and to his committee, since they deal with this legislation, that when they come again to the House floor for an authorization of this kind that if it is possible to do so they compile some figures as to the number of faucets and where they are located, in what agencies, and departments of the Government, that are funneling money out for the purpose for which this bill is directed, or similar purposes.

Mr. HARSHA. While we found that the Appalachian program, for example, has been a very successful program, there was need found by the committee for an additional assistance not only in the Appalachian areas, but other areas which were not covered by the Appalachian program which the EDA would cover. Only certain limited areas could qualify for Appalachian help but there were other areas of chronic unemployment that needed EDA assistance.

Mr. GROSS. I would be very much interested to know how many agencies and departments of the Government are funneling money out on this basis to allegedly distressed areas. I hope the committee will provide that information. In the meantime, let me say that I take a dim view of this legislation for the reason that I am convinced it duplicates a number of programs in other agencies and departments—programs costing additional millions.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from Ohio has just enunciated some of the criteria that is necessary to qualify a county for EDA assistance, such as unemployment, and so forth.

Now am I correct in believing that if the amendment proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), is adopted, that these criteria then will go out the window because those counties would remain in, they would be wedded in unless the local authorities request that they come out from under the program?

Mr. HARSHA. As I understand the proposed amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), I would not say that is quite accurate. It will probably wed in certain

counties who have exceeded this criteria now for the past few months, but I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota to respond to that inquiry since it is his amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. If the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. SNYDER. Basically, the question was that under the existing law there are certain criteria that have to be met in order to qualify under the program. I know that there is some controversy as to whether or not they are using the most current material in making such determinations. If the amendment proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, that has been mentioned earlier, is adopted, then we in effect will throw out these criteria for the purpose of redesignation, not for the purpose of designating new counties, but for the purpose of dedesignating; is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. Not really. The formula will still be in effect; it will still exist, it will still apply, but certainly we do provide a moratorium for these 96 counties. In fairness, some of the figures used in determining the designated counties are several months old, and we know what has happened to the unemployment rates in the last eight months. They are up over 5 percent now, and we have 130,000 more unemployed now than we had in April, and in May. There are more unemployed month by month, so we should take a relook to find out realistically whether the figures used, the criteria figures that the EDA gets from the Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Labor, are accurate.

It is not the fault of EDA. We directed them to use these figures when we enacted the legislation 5 years ago, but we thought we would have recommendations for changes and improvements by now.

They need more time. We will give it to EDA to make necessary recommendations. We support them in this by another year's extension of their authorizations. In the meantime, all we do in fairness to the 96 counties is that we direct that remain eligible under the act till we revise the law.

Mr. SNYDER. The only way a county would be dedesignated is if your amendment is adopted, is on the recommendation of the local officials; is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. The local people can ask for dedesignation.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota and I wish to commend him for bringing this to the attention of the House. In my congressional district the county I consider to be my poorest county would be redesignated this month unless this amendment is adopted. The decision was made upon inaccurate data from the Department of Labor. I think this is a good amendment and it should be adopted.

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15712, of which I am a cosponsor. I have supported this legislation since initial consideration before our committee in 1965, and I have continually made every effort to improve its effectiveness, beginning with efforts in committee at that time.

In my supplemental views to House Report No. 89-539 on the original legislation, I cited four amendments which did not pass in committee and which I declared I would offer on the floor. I offered three and supported the fourth, which, by previous arrangement, was offered by another Member of this body. Two of these four amendments were adopted; one prohibited assistance under the act when the market to be assisted was already in oversupply. This amendment became section 702 of the act. The other amendment provided that every State would have at least one area entitled to the advantages of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

#### FOUR STATES NOT COVERED

I was gravely concerned with the necessity of adopting this latter amendment, especially since the Senate-passed version of this legislation contained no such protective provision, and I so stated in my supplemental views to the 1965 House report:

It is only fair to States which do not have areas that qualify for the benefit to have at least one area, however small. Under the present state of the law and the facts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Hawaii, and Delaware will be left without any area covered as soon as the first annual review is completed. The reason that they have areas now is because of the so-called Proxmire amendment, which requires the broadest possible distribution of the program, and because of the grandfather clause in the bill.

I cannot speak for Vermont, Delaware, or Hawaii, but the reason that New Hampshire will not qualify under the first annual review is because the unemployment rates in our most disadvantaged area (northern New Hampshire) do not qualify under the criteria of S. 1648. This is because people in northern New Hampshire, when they have not been able to obtain work, have had the 'get-up-and-go' spirit to go out to find work, often at great personal sacrifice. They do not stay at home on unemployment, but their departures leaves a diminished number of taxpayers to bear the burdens of the communities which they have left. This problem of out-migration, which is a real one, has been almost totally ignored and overlooked by ARA officials who rely too heavily on official unemployment statistics. The committee has amended the bill to force upon the ARA Administrator consideration of out-migration problems, but apparently he remains unconvinced. It is unfortunate that the four States that will be excluded from ARA are small States, but hopefully the House of Representatives will protect them in this instance by adopting my amendment.

I was particularly gratified that two of my four proposed amendments passed, in view of the fact that only four amendments were accepted out of a total of 18 offered on the floor.

The bill we have before us is, of course, a simple 1-year extension of existing levels of authorization for those four titles of the Public Works and Economic Development Act which would otherwise expire on June 30, thus extending all of

our economic development legislation to an expiration date of June 30, 1971. The authorizing legislation for the EDA title V regions, as well as the Appalachian region, are currently authorized through fiscal year 1971.

It is particularly important to extend these titles because the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs, of which I am ranking minority member, is currently conducting in-depth evaluations, which should lead in the very near future to hearings directed toward necessary major legislative changes in this field. The administration is simultaneously conducting evaluations of these programs and will shortly submit their recommendations for legislative changes.

This is not to say that the present legislation has not produced beneficial results to needy and disadvantaged areas. On the contrary, while sufficient funding to adequately combat the problems of all such areas has not been available, our subcommittee evaluations, though not complete, have already documented the saving provisions for many troubled economies.

#### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

One particular area of economic development assistance, and one which is often overlooked, is that of the technical assistance, planning, and research programs provided under title III of this act. Subsection (c) of the bill we are now considering would extend the current authorization of \$50 million for 1 more year for these programs.

EDA technical assistance funds are used to help communities and areas pinpoint their problems, measure their resources, recognize growth opportunities, and implement development programs through broad community involvement.

Technical assistance projects being supported by EDA are in operation in both rural and urban areas.

Many of these projects consist of feasibility studies to determine how to combine the human and natural resources of an area to stimulate economic growth.

I have the results of a survey of 290 technical assistance projects which have been implemented on the local level throughout the country. Its results are remarkable.

The survey shows that each EDA program dollar of technical assistance has stimulated an average \$33 in new investment, the overwhelming majority of it from private sources.

New private investment for the 290 projects totaled about \$253 million and new public investment was about \$39 million.

Planning grants from EDA enable a community or county or multicounty area to establish and carry out a systematic development program. This program is the tool needed to reach the long-range goals of EDA—more than better permanent jobs and flourishing industry and business in the less fortunate areas of the country.

These EDA planning grants give local citizens the means to start and continue their long-term growth programs. These grants enable a community to determine

just where it stands, where it wants to go, and how it intends to get there.

The third major program under this title is research, which is used to help measure the effectiveness and to determine the future course of Federal economic development efforts. A major part of EDA's research program involves exploring capital markets and their role in economic development.

As of May 8, 1970, EDA obligations totaled \$47 million for 929 technical assistance projects; and \$15.7 million for 336 planning grants. EDA also had obligated \$10 million for research projects as of that date.

These and other economic development programs covered under this act must be continued until those disadvantaged areas of our Nation no longer suffer the severe job and income gaps between the measure of their economies and that of the Nation's average.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 15712.

(Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the administration has asked for this simple 1-year extension in order to give it still more time in which to develop its own proposals. I do not want to be an obstructionist and, therefore, will agree to this proposal and will support H.R. 15712.

I would like to make a few comments about this program, however, about its past and its potential.

As stated in the committee report, this act was approved 5 years ago "to provide Federal help, in cooperation with the States, to assist communities, areas, and regions in the United States which are suffering from excessive unemployment and underemployment by providing financial and technical assistance needed for the creation of new jobs. Its emphasis is on long-range planning and programing for economic development with the objective of enhancing the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies. This is accomplished by developing and expanding new and existing public works, providing loans for businesses, and technical assistance necessary to create directly or indirectly new opportunities for long-term employment and economic growth."

These are realistic and attainable objectives. Coming from an area of the country to which this act applies directly, I am in full support of these goals. The possibilities that are inherent in the economic development program are exciting.

It is because we have legislation on the books, providing the authority to attack long-standing problems, that I am disappointed. We simply have not made the progress that is possible under this legislation to develop the natural resources and the potential in economically depressed areas of the country. There is no need for new legislation. There is simply a need for improvement and efficient implementation of existing legislation.

Since coming to Congress, I have examined the EDA program in great de-

tail. I have been saddened in what I have found. The conditions existing in the legislation—State and local efforts and initiative—have been fully met.

The people of northeast Arkansas have worked diligently to cooperate with officials of the Economic Development Administration. We have dipped into meager funds in order to acquire minimum professional assistance required in meeting the demands of this agency. We have tried in good faith to satisfy the requirements of the EDA.

Yet, these people, who as taxpayers are actually paying for the program, are rebuffed, and turned down with little or no reasoning. Most people are not involved in these efforts for personal gain, but out of civic pride. They contribute their time, their talents, their efforts and, in many cases, their personal funds. Their only goal is to see their towns and cities develop economically. Their primary incentive is a carrot held out by the Economic Development Administration. This carrot cannot then be withdrawn abruptly, with little or no explanation, without doing great damage to private citizens' inherent trust in their Government. Many of these communities, excited with the prospect of economic development through EDA assistance, have now lost faith and have virtually given up on the future. This is not the way to accomplish the goals set forth in the Public Works and Economic Development Act. And I do not believe it was the way the Congress intended that this program should be operated.

One example might be given to illustrate my point. The States of Arkansas and of Oklahoma, which is represented by my good friend Congressman ENMONSON, who is chairman of this subcommittee, are now involved in a project which could help us realize much, if not most, of our potential. That is the Arkansas River navigation project. I would like to submit an excellent article in the May 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report concerning this project and its potential, at the conclusion of my remarks today.

This project can open up the entire interior of Arkansas and much of Oklahoma to the trade arteries of the world. With the availability of low-cost transportation, the industrial opportunities in our region become most attractive.

The people of Arkansas have worked in good faith to assist this important project, developing resources along the river. Ports are being developed. I would like to point out, however, that this entire development has gone forward without the support or even the encouragement of the Economic Development Administration which should be viewing this project with as much excitement as we are.

Two applications for port projects in northeast Arkansas, which border the Mississippi River that has been open to navigable traffic for 150 years, have even been turned down. Yet, these projects offer the "new opportunities for long-term employment and economic growth" to which this program is addressed.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I shall support this request for a single 1-year extension of the Public Works and Eco-

nomics Development Act. I will be anxiously awaiting the new proposals being drafted by the Department of Commerce, however, and I can give assurances that I will examine these proposals closely. If the program is not achieving its stated goals, then I feel it is our responsibility to make whatever changes might be necessary to make sure that it does meet its objectives. There is no other justification for existence. And if the purposes of this legislation are not being served, then there is reason to question the right to continued existence of this program. I can assure my colleagues that the people of northeast Arkansas are not enamored with the idea of passing laws just for the sake of putting them on display. They should exist to serve, or they should cease to exist.

The article follows:

#### SEAPORTS FOR AN INLAND EMPIRE

TULSA, OKLA.—A land with plenty of room and abundant resources is opening up here in mid-America. Its development promises relief for some of the population pressure that is threatening to overwhelm major U.S. urban areas.

Lifeline for this emerging region is the Arkansas River Navigation Project, a waterway soon to be open all the way from the Mississippi River to Tulsa. This shipping channel, 450 miles long, will give the sparsely populated Arkansas River Basin access to the sea and to 14,000 miles of navigable rivers and canals.

Commerce on U.S. inland waterways has increased fivefold since the end of World War II. The Arkansas River Basin, which includes parts of six States, is looking forward to getting a piece of this kind of action.

Tulsa, with 465,000 population in its metropolitan area, is alive with preparations for the beginning of navigation late this year or early in 1971.

"I have to keep pinching myself when I think of Tulsa becoming a port," says a banker who has been a prime mover in the project. "To think that this area was once a dust bowl and the Arkansas produced nothing but floods!"

#### TAMING A RIVER

The once-wild river has been tamed by upstream reservoirs that will provide an even flow of water for a channel 9 feet deep. A series of 17 locks will lift barges a total of 420 feet from the Mississippi River to the Port of Catoosa on Tulsa's doorstep.

The project's total cost of 1.2 billion dollars financed from the U.S. Treasury, makes it the most expensive public-works project in the nation's history.

Tulsa's Port of Catoosa is just three miles east of the city's limits. Its development, at a total cost of 20 million dollars, is well under way. An industrial park of 1,500 acres will adjoin the port.

Tulsa officials say that the official estimate of 13 million tons of freight a year on the waterway, made some years ago, is on the low side. They see the Port of Catoosa alone handling 12.5 million tons by 1980. That is more freight than presently moves through any one of such busy river ports as St. Louis, Memphis and Pittsburgh.

#### PROSPECTS FOR GROWTH

Tulsa, as the head of navigation on the Arkansas, is seen as the funnel through which the varied products of a vast region will flow to market. At the same time, supplies for this region will come up the River. For example, steel for construction and fertilizer for grain farms are expected to be two major items handled in early days of navigation on the River.

The Arkansas River Basin stretches from the cotton lands of Arkansas through the unspoiled Ozark country, into the cattle ranges of Oklahoma and Kansas, and across the Great Plains wheat fields to the Colorado Rockies.

Cities of the Basin are young and vigorous, with plenty of room to grow. In addition to Tulsa, there is Little Rock, the capital of Arkansas with a metropolitan-area population of 323,000, Oklahoma City with 605,000, and Wichita, Kans., with 405,000.

Resources include 65 different minerals, and one of the largest caches of energy fuels to be found in the U.S.

Coal and limestone are major resources along the waterway. This combination offers the base for steel plants and cement plants. A natural-gas field, 50 miles wide and 200 miles long, stretches along the River where it crosses the Oklahoma-Arkansas border.

Navigation was opened to Little Rock in October, 1968. It reached Fort Smith in the spring of 1970, and is expected to reach Tulsa by January, 1971.

A million tons of freight was forecast for the first year of operation to Little Rock. Actually, 2,225 million tons moved.

#### EXPANSION OF INDUSTRY

Little Rock's public port, with terminal and warehouse facilities, is in operation. A steel plant is going up in the industrial area that adjoins the port. A million tons of bauxite from Caribbean sources moved across private docks to nearby aluminum plants in 1969.

A few miles upstream, at Russellville, Arkansas Power & Light Company is building a nuclear power plant at a cost of 140 million dollars. When it starts producing power in 1973, this facility will increase the company's generating capacity by 20 per cent.

At Dardenelle, barges are unloading corn and other feedstuffs for the booming chicken and turkey industry of northwest Arkansas.

At Fort Smith, a community of 70,000, a subsidiary of the Kansas City Southern Lines Railway has set aside 2,000 acres for a port and industrial park. This is a furniture-manufacturing center.

At Muskogee, Okla., population 40,000, a port costing 4 million dollars is under construction.

Many of the nation's big corporations have picked sites for development along the Arkansas River.

On April 20, Kerr-McGee Corporation dedicated a 25-million-dollar uranium-processing plant near Sallisaw, Okla. This company also plans to establish a coal-mining facility, costing 20 million dollars in the region.

Armco Steel, North American Rockwell, Skelly Oil, and Phillips Petroleum all have plants, or will have, along the River.

Water-based recreation already is a booming industry along the waterway. More than a million visitors were counted in 1969 at 14 recreation sites around the Dardanelle reservoir.

Upstream are man-made lakes behind dams with such names as Eufaula, Tenkiller, Fort Gibson, Markham Ferry, Oologah and Keystone.

#### ACCESS TO MARKETS

Water transportation brings this landlocked Basin into a network of 14,000 miles of adjoining inland waterways. Along these channels, everything from grain to iron ore moves at the cheapest rate offered by any form of transportation.

For a dollar, rivermen claim, you can move a ton of cargo 333 miles by waterway, compared with 66.7 miles by rail, and 15.4 miles by truck.

Railways and trucking companies say that water transportation enjoys an unfair advantage in the Government-built waterways. Rivermen counter that low-cost water transportation is a stimulus to rail and truck lines.

Their region, as Arkansas Basin leaders see it, has been handed the opportunity to

develop without the mistakes that have led to overcrowding and pollution in other areas of the U.S. Arkansas Senator John McClellan promises:

"We don't intend to let the River become polluted. It is easier to prevent it than to remedy it."

Pollution standards have been set, and industries must promise to abide by these before their plans can be approved.

Emphasis is to be on balanced growth. A special study published May 11 by the Department of Commerce recommended that 32 port sites at small communities on the waterway be reserved now.

Over-all development is anticipated that will meet the guidelines laid down by President Nixon in calling for a national growth policy in his 1970 state-of-the-union message. Said Mr. Nixon:

"We must create a new rural environment which will not only stem the migration to urban centers, but reverse it."

This response to the President came from Jetah Taylor, lawyer in Ozark, Ark., who was one of the original boosters of navigation on the Arkansas River:

"There has been so much talk about the Government spending billions to build new cities. I think projects like this will develop our rural areas, and the people will come naturally. The people will do the building."

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support of H.R. 15712 which extends the authorizations for title I through V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, I am proud to have had a part in the promotion and continuance of the EDA program. Since 1965, this legislation has helped to stimulate industrial and community development in many areas across the country which have suffered from chronic low incomes and high unemployment. Unemployment is a tragic waste of productive potential and creates serious social problems. Through this legislation we are dramatically succeeding in creating employment opportunities where they are most needed. We are also witnessing a regeneration of community spirit and initiative to solve local problems. Through investments in job opportunities we are also stimulating community participation in the economic development process.

Most areas that are qualified for assistance from the Economic Development Administration are rural communities which have been plagued with the outmigration of many of its young and able-bodied citizens. These communities, most of which have been dependent on farming and mining, are now victims of automation and resource depletion. By stimulating rural growth through public works investments, we are reversing this outmigration and thus helping to alleviate the awesome problems in the urban areas.

I would briefly like to cite the experience we have had in southeastern Ohio with the EDA program. Through the last year EDA investments helped create new and expanded water and sewer systems, as well as numerous other community development programs. These facilities have induced numerous industries to establish plants in the area and hold

promise for increasing industrial locations in the future. Local enthusiasm and planning has been excellent. Tangible and meaningful results are being seen throughout our area and a new direction of progress is taking hold.

There is still extensive work and review that must be done on the Public Works and Economic Development Act, to make the program more responsive to local conditions. Based on current criteria for development areas, 96 counties have been recently de-designated for assistance. According to the unemployment data that is now being used, Perry County in the 10th District has been de-designated under the provisions of this act although the county suffered a population decline of nearly 1,000 from 1960 to 1970.

Therefore, we need to reevaluate the bookkeeping policies and interpretations of data we use, especially in those areas still witnessing substantial outmigration. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. BLATNIK, which would provide that no area's designation be terminated after June 1, 1970, or before June 1, 1971.

(Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, nearly 5 years have passed since the Congress authorized the establishment of the Economic Development Administration.

During this period, the achievements of this agency have been noteworthy. And I think the reason is that these programs go directly to the heart of the problem burdening distressed areas of the Nation.

The basic problem, of course, is that in these areas there are too few jobs and too little personal income. Building the foundation necessary for industrial and commercial growth is the fundamental way to solve that problem.

Although pockets of severe poverty often are isolated from the mainstream of the American economy, poverty itself is not an isolated problem.

So it is not enough to say that a man without a job is a man without a future. That is certainly true.

But we also ought to consider the fact that there are millions of Americans living in poverty who are unable to contribute to the overall productivity and strength of the country.

Their names are on welfare rolls instead of payrolls.

Are not the American poor our greatest undeveloped market? I, for one, believe they are.

It is economically sound—if not imperative—to do what we can to help develop this market. At the same time, we are helping those who are most in need of help.

Economic development means different things to different people.

Obviously, for the unemployed man, it means a job that provides decent wages and self-satisfaction.

For the workingman, it means the chance to move ahead by securing a better job.

For the young man, it means a useful education, one that will enable him

to compete on an equal footing for his share of what the Nation has to offer.

For the family man, it means giving his children opportunities he may never have had.

For the businessman, it means success and the prospect of expansion.

For the community, it is all of these things and much more. Without economic health, social health cannot exist.

The Economic Development Administration offers less fortunate areas of America a balanced package of programs designed to deal with all aspects of economic growth.

These programs help distressed communities restore economic vitality in many ways. This aid might involve preparing land for industrial use, or making a business loan to an expanding manufacturing firm, or providing planning funds for a municipal development agency, or determining the best use of an area's resources, or constructing a vocational training school.

The people I represent live in the largest congressional district of California. They live in a 20-county area bigger than many of our States. Many parts of this district are remote. Many parts are rich with natural resources. Some of these counties have high unemployment rates. Some have suffered from excessive outmigration.

Many of these areas are in need of long-range economic development. And these programs are helping to provide the support necessary to stimulate this development.

The EDA has approved more than \$20 million in public works funds, business loans, planning grants and technical assistance to help communities in my district.

I wish to cite a few examples of projects EDO has approved and what their impact will be:

Public works funds totaling \$2.85 million will be used to construct reservoirs and water and sewer systems at Donner Summit, a fine ski resort area in the High Sierras.

These projects are expected to create almost 400 jobs at area resorts and businesses. Skiing and tourism form the major source of jobs and income for residents of this area.

In Madera County, construction of a bottle-manufacturing plant has begun. EDA approved a business loan of \$3 million to help make this venture possible. When operational, the plant is expected to have a work force of at least 325.

A \$435,000 grant was approved to enable the Tahoe City Public Utility District to install sewer lines and pumping stations on the west shore of Lake Tahoe.

Not only will this help curb pollution of the lake, but it will stimulate commercial and tourism growth in Placer County and help protect one of the Nation's outstanding scenic attractions.

Last year, a \$1.27 million grant was approved to build a water treatment plant and extend the Nevada irrigation district's water system north of Grass Valley.

Local officials report that this project will result in the expansion of several industrial firms now operating in the

area and the creation of more than 600 jobs.

Projects in my district also have been approved for airport expansion programs, road construction, local development planning, water and sewer systems, dam and bridge construction, and feasibility studies.

I wish to emphasize that these projects did not originate in Washington. One of the many benefits from this legislation is often overlooked—and that benefit is—that local initiative and participation are strengthened.

As a former mayor of a city in my district, I know from firsthand experience that if the process of long-range economic development is to succeed, it must be spurred by community concern and dedication.

And I can assure you that in my district this concern and dedication are abundant.

I fully support the programs of the Economic Development Administration. It is my conviction that this legislation has proven itself to be a vital step toward balanced national growth.

(Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say I fully support the purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. The EDA has as its purpose to provide Federal help, in cooperation with the States, to assist communities, areas, and regions in the United States which are suffering from excessive unemployment or underemployment by providing financial and technical assistance needed for the creation of new jobs.

However, Mr. Chairman, EDA's grant purpose has been darkened by documented boondoggling since its inception. The history of EDA, in a number of instances, has been more a case of replacing private industry with taxpayers' financed projects than helping local communities. I would like to cite some of these examples.

One such case was when EDA financed a \$650,000 barge which has been fully equipped to freeze and store 500,000 pounds of salmon. The announced purpose of this project was to permit the Alaskan Eskimos to become directly involved in private business. This, certainly, was a commendable objective. However, the fact, as I am told, are that this barge will be in direct crippling competition with an earlier Small Business Administration-financed plant in Alaska that still owes the Federal Government money.

The SBA had granted a \$300,000 loan for an individual to build a freezer plant ashore on the Yukon River. If, however, as it appears, the EDA competition puts this man out of business, then the SBA will sustain a loss, but also private enterprise will suffer, which I happen to believe is an important issue.

Another such case took place in Dillingham, Alaska. In 1968 and 1969, two fisheries companies were contacted by EDA, according to reliable sources, with the suggestion that this Government

agency do something to assist or participate in some way to help get a federally financed fisheries project. Evidently, EDA could not release the funds as nobody in Dillingham seemed qualified to give the necessary assurances or provide the know-how to get the project underway.

So, these private firms were told early in the summer of last year that the lease requirements would be softened somewhat so that it could proceed. This led to a careful investigation by these two firms, to determine if they really wanted to lease such a federally financed project that includes a dock, cold storage warehouse, and freezing plant. These companies made their proposal to lease the new facilities, but in the middle of this, a native fishery co-op was formed, yet no official word was given the two companies. Quickly, the co-op was given the lease, and it is said the co-op received a loan from some Government source to bring them up to the necessary financial responsibility to qualify.

The point is that these private firms did not seek involvement; they were asked by the EDA to do so. Then, EDA turned around and gave the project to the native co-op with the word around Dillingham being that if the co-op did not get it, nobody would. The result is that this is Federal funding of a commercial project to operate in competition with private industry.

There are other cases, I am informed, whereby EDA has made grants in other parts of the country and many without economic feasibility being made so that the projects are not successful.

The question of feasibility of a project is graphically demonstrated in a proposed fisheries freezing plant at Yakutat, Alaska. I related this case to the House on May 13, during debate on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill.

This is the case of the Economic Development Administration going into a small Eskimo community in Alaska and granting a \$1,800,000 loan for the construction of a freezing plant. The purpose, according to EDA, was to provide several hundred jobs for the low-income, high-unemployment area. That is a quote, Mr. Chairman, because the fact is that this town has a native population of 300. Those who either are able to or want to work have employment in a private enterprise freezing plant in that community. Again, the pattern of establishing facilities with Federal funds to operate in competition with private enterprise shows through.

The present facility at Yakutat has been built at considerable cost to its owners. They have invested some \$200,000 of their own money. And, yet, they are faced with being driven out of business by this bureaucratic boondoggle.

The point is that the need has not been proved. Indeed, those familiar with the fishery resources of Alaska, including the Commissioner of that State's Fish and Game Department, say the area will only support one fish freezing plant and, in short, it means that the privately owned, existing plant will not be able to compete with the amount of fish available. No feasible study was made of the

immediately-available supply of fish to accommodate two plants.

I have pursued this particular example deeply within the confines of the Government. The frustration was overwhelming.

On March 2, 1970, I sent a letter to Robert A. Podesta, Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, stating that I was informed the plans for this plant were about to be approved, that I knew no feasibility study had been made, that there were no surplus fish or crabs in adjacent waters, and that the natives themselves were opposed to the project. I urged reconsideration of EDA's plans for approving the project.

Four days later the grant was approved. Although even after I repeated my request for a delay, I was not informed of this approval. It was immediately after my protest that the bureaucracy quietly took control and proceeded.

Let me make my part in this clear. I am speaking as a representative of all the parties concerned. The owners of the present plant have their office in my district, as do not only the lessee of the proposed plant in Yakutat, but also the construction company that would build it. My position is one of criticizing the manner in which this project has been handled, in sheer disregard for the facts. It is being run, Mr. Speaker, to perpetuate a system under which no concern is given as to the effect of projects on local private enterprise.

In the case of Yakutat, Mr. Chairman, I have had a native of that tiny Alaskan town tell me, "If you want to help the natives of Yakutat, grant them loans to improve their fishing fleet. They don't want to work in a plant, they want to fish."

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the committee find out what EDA is doing; to delve into these examples and others so that we can bring a halt to this obvious practice of taking tax dollars to stifle or eliminate private industry.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to announce my support of the Economic Development Administration. The basic objective of this agency is to help communities with economic problems develop long-range industrial and commercial growth programs.

Such a process results in the creation of good, permanent jobs.

Because EDA projects are initiated and implemented on the local level, they meet the specific needs of the people of the community.

Based on my experience in business and banking, I cannot emphasize too much the importance of strong community effort in fostering economic growth. EDA support is linked to this type of effort.

I would like to offer a few examples of projects in my district which have received support from EDA.

First, EDA approved a grant of \$366,000 to help build what is the first ski-flying complex in the Western Hemisphere. Called the Copper Peak Ski-Flying Hill, it was the site of an international meet held in late February with more than 20,000 persons attending. The ski-

flying structure is the world's highest artificial slide—equivalent in height to a 24-story building.

Development resulting from the Copper Peak complex is expected to create at least 400 jobs in the area over a 5-year period.

The nonprofit Gogebic Ski Range Club is the developer of Copper Peak. The cost of the project exceeded \$1 million.

Second. Tourism and recreation are vital to the overall economy of my district. Among the tourism projects EDA has approved recently are the construction of marinas in Marquette and Alpena counties.

The cities of Alpena and Marquette are the applicants for the Federal funds. EDA's share of the cost of these marina projects will total \$368,000. The EDA portion is being matched with State and local funds.

EDA has provided assistance to several communities in Michigan for marina construction to accommodate the resurgence of sport fishing.

Third. At Bessemer, a new wood-products plant began operations in January of this year with the help of an EDA business loan.

The Ironwood Timber & Development Co., received a \$1.9-million loan from EDA to establish the plant. Total project cost exceeded \$2.9 million.

More than 250 persons are expected to be employed at the facility when it is in full production, according to company officials.

Fourth. At Sault St. Marie in Chippewa County, EDA approved more than \$1.5 million to expand a street-and-bridge system to serve two industrial parks, a tourism center, and a waterfront industrial complex. This long-range development will have a significant impact on the local economy.

Fifth. About 200 industrial and service-type jobs will be generated at Baraga in Baraga County because of an \$860,000 project to expand the village water system. EDA has approved a grant of \$499,000 to help the community meet this cost.

Baraga officials report that nine businesses in the area will expand their operations after the EDA project is completed.

Sixth. EDA has approved a grant and loan of \$606,000 to help develop an industrial park at Iron River in Iron County. The project cost will be \$673,000.

Local officials report three industrial firms will locate in the park after it has been developed. These companies estimate that their operations will require a total workforce of about 220.

EDA has approved a total of about \$12 million for projects in the 11th Congressional District. Every program this agency offers has been put to use.

Projects other than those I have mentioned involve airport construction, installation of water and sewer lines, construction of waste-treatment plants, feasibility studies and the supplying of administrative funds for economic development districts.

By helping communities to help themselves, the Economic Development Administration is carrying out a vital

mission. I am confident the value of this agency will continue to grow in future years.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to extend eligibility of those redevelopment areas currently falling under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, from June 1, 1970, to June 1, 1971.

It is imperative that the Economic Development Administration take a closer look at its decision to dedesignate 96 counties across the Nation, including nine Minnesota counties, on the basis of more complete and current statistics. EDA's decision to dedesignate these counties was based on 1969 unemployment figures. In addition to the most current unemployment figures, such a decision should take into consideration out-migration statistics compiled in the 1970 census, which give a more realistic picture of economic conditions. For example, a large number of counties in northern Minnesota have lost population in the last 10 years. These figures indicate that the unemployment problem in these counties is far from being solved, and I am certain that these Minnesota counties are not the only ones which have experienced an outmigration as a result of unemployment.

EDA is in the process of developing a more realistic formula on which to base EDA eligibility. It would seem more logical for EDA to wait to take these counties off the eligibility list until this new formula becomes operational and EDA presents its new legislative program at this time next year.

I must also stress that EDA's decision to move its Duluth office to Chicago is unwise. In announcing this decision EDA has stated:

The communities which have been serviced by the Duluth office have steadily attracted a large number of projects. The office has developed a 5-year total of 543 projects at \$143 million.

Moving the office from Duluth to Chicago might bring a change in emphasis, stressing urban problems vis-a-vis rural development. Also the move itself would be extremely costly. Its location at the head of the Great Lakes is a strategic one for the economic development of not only Duluth and the Iron Range, but the entire region of northern Minnesota, northern Wisconsin and upper Michigan, an area designated under title V of the act that lags behind the Nation.

In light of EDA's objectives of improving the quality of life in nonmetropolitan areas and providing job opportunities on location to encourage people to remain in their home areas, I hope that EDA will reconsider these decisions to drop 96 counties from its eligibility list and to move the Duluth office, which has done such an outstanding job in its present location.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for H.R. 15712, the bill to extend the authorization of funds for titles I through IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, through fiscal year 1971.

I am pleased with and favor the committee amendment which states:

No area designated as a redevelopment area for the purposes of such Act shall have such designation terminated or modified in accordance with such section (sec. 402) after May 1, 1970, and before June 1, 1971, unless the local governing body of the county qualified under existing criteria for designation specifically requests de-designation action.

As one of the original sponsors of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, I have discussed this amendment with members of the Public Works Committee, and am delighted that Chairman FALLON and his committee have agreed to the language of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is important because there are many communities and counties which have completed their overall economic development plans and are in the process of applying for, or have actually submitted applications, for public works grants. It would be disastrous for them now to be cut off from this source of Federal assistance because of de-designation after many months of labor have been put into planning and paperwork.

My own Second Congressional District of Massachusetts experienced sudden rises in unemployment twice within a few months as a result of two disastrous fires, at Bondsville, in the town of Palmer, on October 4, 1968; and in Webster, on January 1, 1969.

As a result of these fires in two industrial complexes hundreds of people were without jobs. I joined with Senators KENNEDY and BROOKE, and then Gov. John A. Volpe, in requesting Federal assistance through the Economic Development Administration. Subsequently, the towns of Palmer, Webster, Charlton, Douglas, Southbridge, Dudley, and Sturbridge were declared eligible by EDA for Federal assistance as a result of high unemployment due to the tragic fires.

I have been notified, in a letter dated May 28, 1970, by Charles A. Fagan III, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, that the towns of Webster, Charlton, Douglas, Southbridge, Dudley and Sturbridge will be de-designated for eligibility on June 30, 1970. I fear that the same notice will be given to the town of Palmer.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be tragic to remove these towns from the EDA eligibility list at this time when their plans and goals for economic development are now within sight. I commend Chairman FALLON and members of his committee for including this amendment, and include Deputy Assistant Secretary Fagan's letter at this point in my remarks:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT  
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1970.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: As required by Section 402 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Economic Development Administration has conducted an annual review of all areas which qualified for designation under the terms of the Act during the current fiscal year.

Based on statistics supplied by the U.S. Department of Labor for the calendar year 1969, it is apparent that some of these areas

no longer fulfill the qualification requirements of either Section 102 or Section 401 of the Act. The qualification or designation of each of these areas, therefore, will be terminated, effective June 30, 1970. In other cases, areas which previously qualified under one of the foregoing Sections, now qualify under the other. These changes will become effective July 1, 1970.

Enclosed are copies of letters sent to officials in areas you represent. We fully realize that some of the areas whose designated status must be terminated may still fall short of their full economic potential. It is hoped, however, that the planning which has been done by committees in local communities will be continued and that additional economic gains will be attained.

At the end of June, we will notify officials in areas which will continue to qualify during the coming fiscal year. Copies of the letters relating to areas you represent will be sent to you at that time. Please feel free to call on us for such advice and assistance as we may be able to render.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. FAGAN III,  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
for Economic Development.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, local involvement is the key to the success of the programs conducted by the Economic Development Administration. This action is assured by the requirement of the Public Works and Economic Development Act that the preparation of an Overall Economic Development program precede approval of Federal funds to assist communities in their efforts to create new jobs and boost personal incomes.

The preparation of the economic development plan, which is referred to as the OEDP, requires community leaders to consider their assets as well as their liabilities. This planning activity brings representatives of all segments of the community together for a single purpose.

It also assures logical investment of public funds in support of community development.

The Economic Development Administration operates a wide range of programs which have the versatility to meet specific local needs.

In one area the need may be an industrial park with facilities to accommodate job-generating private industry. In my neighboring State of Washington, EDA approved a \$2,073,000 public works grant to help Klickitat County develop a major industrial park.

Through its business loan program, the agency approved a \$3,000,000 long-term, low-interest loan to encourage one of the Nation's major chemical companies to locate a plant in the park. This new chemical plant is expected to serve as the nucleus for economic growth throughout the area.

Another outstanding example of the flexibility of programs conducted by the Economic Development Administration is the technical assistance being provided the Lummi Indians in Washington State.

EDA is providing technical assistance funds to help the Lummi Tribe conduct research and demonstration projects in connection with the proposed establishment of a tidelands aquaculture program. This innovative fish and oyster farming operation in the Lummi Bay has the potential for hundreds of new jobs, and new hope for the Lummi Tribe.

For a community in my own district,

the key to economic development proved to be William Shakespeare.

In April 1969 EDA approved an \$896,000 public works grant to help the city of Ashland, Jackson County, build an indoor theater.

In planning and working to create year-round jobs, Ashland and Jackson County officials realized that tourism holds great potential for the area.

The Oregon Shakespearean Festival started in 1935 and has played to capacity audiences throughout the years. It is one of southern Oregon's chief tourist attractions, but it has been limited to the summer months only.

Now, the new theater will enable the festival to operate on a year-around basis and play before larger audiences. This means more jobs and tourist dollars for the area. It means that many of the more than 10,000 persons who were turned away from the theater's west coast ticket offices in 1968 will not have to delay any longer on their plans to attend the festival.

The indoor theater is opening 100 new job opportunities in Ashland. But perhaps more important, it will schedule its plays so visitors will be encouraged to remain more than one night. This will give them time to visit scenic spots throughout the Rogue River Valley.

The theater was dedicated this March—proof that a Federal agency responding to a local need can act quickly.

Ashland raised \$896,000, the local share of the project cost, through a public subscription conducted by the Festival Association. Thus, local involvement was extended from the planning stage to theater patrons throughout Oregon.

Angus Bowmer, the founder of the Shakespearean Festival, was one of the speakers at dedication ceremonies for the indoor theater. He said:

Thanks will come from the young actors who come to Ashland to learn the profession. They will express thanks indeed—by inspired performances in seasons yet to come.

Thanks also will be expressed by the men and women whose livelihood is earned in tourist-related services and businesses.

Another EDA-assisted project is playing a key role in the growth of the Coos Bay and North Bend communities in my district. With the aid of a \$710,000 grant, the Coos-Bay North Bend Water Board developed a new source of fresh water to meet the needs of local industries and residents. The increased water supply enabled two area firms to expand and employ additional workers. It also is making additional business growth possible, thereby strengthening the tax base of the area.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it a privilege to speak in behalf of EDA, whose programs are bringing new hope to our economically lagging areas. I urge extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, H.R. 15712.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 105 of the Public Works and Economic

Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3135) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

(c) Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971".

(d) Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3171) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

Mr. BLATNIK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and be open for amendment at any point under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLATNIK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 2, after line 9, add the following:

"Sec. 2 Notwithstanding section 402 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3162), no area designated as a redevelopment area for the purposes of such Act shall have such designation terminated or modified in accordance with such section after May 1, 1970, and before June 1, 1971, unless the local governing body of the county qualified under existing criteria for de-designation specifically requests de-designation action."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment in effect would declare a moratorium for those 96 counties which have been designated by law under the EDA program passed by the Congress. Those counties have been de-designated based upon figures of the Department of Labor. The validity of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as applied to the EDA counties, particularly the smaller counties, the rural and semirural counties, is questionable. The figures were aimed at the larger metropolitan areas, such as Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Gary, Duluth, and the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. We did not feel the figures are realistic or accurate, particularly as they applied to the situation in recent months with the rapid increase of unemployment that has taken place.

The figures compiled a few months ago are being used to establish the unemployment percentage and, as Members know, an area must reach 6 percent unemployment to be eligible under the program.

Furthermore, underemployment is not given the consideration and the weight it should be given.

Another factor considered hardly at all is outmigration. Counties have lost population. For example, last year St. Louis County lost, I believe, 19,000 in population, mostly because people could not find jobs. They left the county, and as they left, of course, the number of unemployed dropped. So all of a sudden there were no job opportunities, or very

limited job opportunities, and the county found itself dedesignated, which is an injustice to the county which is trying to make an economic comeback and needs more economic assistance to get it over the hump; it will get over the hump with this assistance.

In fairness to those counties we feel we should continue their designation for the balance of the year and into early next year, and that EDA, having prepared a complete review, reappraisal and reevaluation of these areas for the past 5 years, will be in a position to make some very significant recommendations for changes, modifications, alterations, and improvements to the program, or cuts where they may be justified.

Let me, because this amendment is that important, explain it in full detail including the background of events that led to my proposing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in the nature of a committee amendment to the bill. It amends section 402 of the act that provides for an annual review of all areas designated in accordance with the criteria set forth in the previous section and provides for the termination of eligibility of areas on the basis of this annual review. The purpose of this amendment would be to declare a moratorium to those areas about to be redesignated from eligibility to assistance for a period of 1 year to allow the committee sufficient time to improve upon the present criteria establishing eligibility without penalizing the areas about to be dropped from the eligibility status based on unreliable statistics.

#### BACKGROUND

Word reached the committee members on the Memorial Day weekend that notices were being sent to about 96 counties across the Nation advising them of the termination of their status as "redevelopment areas" eligible for assistance under the act, based largely on unemployment data in the affected counties. Recent studies by the committee staff into the subject of estimating unemployment in small labor areas have indicated that the current estimating process is inadequate to establish valid, real workable unemployment rates. In view of these facts and in further consideration of the existing national economic situation and its impact on unemployment on a national basis, the bill scheduled for floor action last Monday was postponed for 1 week.

Last Monday, our chairman, Mr. FALLON, directed a letter to Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans calling for a 9-month moratorium on "dedesignation" of the depressed area counties in the Nation, and scheduled a Public Works Committee meeting for Thursday, June 4, 1970, on the subject of unemployment data in such areas.

The letter to Secretary Stans from Chairman FALLON is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1970.

HON. MAURICE H. STANS,  
The Secretary of Commerce,  
Department of Commerce,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just been informed of action by your Department to

de-designate a number of counties across the Nation as redevelopment areas under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, based largely on unemployment data in the affected counties.

While the de-designations may be justified under criteria established under the statutes, a serious question has been raised in our Committee regarding dependability of these criteria as a true index of current economic and employment conditions in some of these counties. Recent staff studies indicate strongly that complete overhaul of unemployment record-keeping procedures may be needed, and we have long been concerned by the inadequacy of data used to establish out-migration trends and problems.

In view of these questions, and in further consideration of the existing national economic situation and its impact on unemployment on a national basis, I would like to request an immediate moratorium on de-designation of all counties classified as redevelopment areas as of May 1, 1970—this moratorium to remain in effect for a minimum period of 9 months, to March 1, 1971. Of course, should the local government body of any county request de-designation based on present criteria, I would see no objection to de-designation under such circumstances if the criteria now in use appear to justify it.

It would also be my hope that major changes in EDA office locations might be deferred for the same 9 month period in the spirit of the "status quo" agreement on the EDA program recently concluded between our Committee and your Department.

I have scheduled a meeting of our full Committee on Thursday, June 4, 1970, at 10:30 a.m., to consider these matters and to afford to you or your designated representative an opportunity to comment on them. I hope you will find it convenient to meet with the Committee at that time.

With kindest regards, I am  
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,  
Chairman.

#### NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT PICTURE TODAY

Since the beginning of the year the national unemployment picture has shown a steady rise in unemployment across the Nation. Economic indicators prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers for the month of May of this year show that the civilian labor force seasonally adjusted increased by 103,000 in April. Employment decreased by 188,000 and unemployment rose by 291,000. The decrease in employment was concentrated in nonagricultural industries where employment fell by 224,000. The national unemployment rate shown by percent of civilian labor force seasonally adjusted shows that in January it was 3.9 percent; in February it was 4.2 percent; in March it was 4.4 percent; and in April of this year the unemployment rate is 4.8 percent. Figures just released on Friday for the month of May show an increase of .2 percent so that our national unemployment rate has now reached 5 percent.

#### STAFF REVIEW OF ESTIMATING UNEMPLOYMENT IN SMALL LABOR AREAS

Committee staff have inquired into the subject of estimating unemployment in small labor areas and its attendant problems. This detailed staff study leaves us no alternative but to conclude that the current estimating process is inadequate to establish valid, workable unemployment rates which can be used with confidence for the smaller labor areas and

counties to which so much of the EDA effort is directed.

The procedures were designed over 10 years ago for use in large labor areas and are just not applicable to small areas, mainly because of their different composition and small labor force.

The Department of Labor itself, is concerned about the reliability of the estimating methods for these small areas and studies are now underway seeking the necessary improvement.

#### SECTION 401 CRITERIA

Among the criteria set forth for qualifying areas and by far the most important is the unemployment rate of an area established through the U.S. Department of Labor. U.S. Department of Labor assembles, evaluates, and forwards annually, on or before April 1, average unemployment rates for the preceding calendar year to the Economic Development Administration. A recent review disclosed that the unemployment rate was the factor in the qualification of 550 of the 982 redevelopment areas designated by the Economic Development Administration.

An area may qualify under:

Section 401(a) of the act when any one of the following six criteria is met:

First. Unemployment during the most recent calendar year has averaged 6 percent or more, and the rate of unemployment has:

Averaged 6 percent or more and has been at least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years, or;

Average 6 percent or more and has been at least 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 2 years, or;

Average 6 percent or more and has been at least 100 percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 calendar years.

Second. A median family income of 40 to 50 percent of the national average and a population loss of 25 percent or more over the last 10 years—1950-60—as the result of out-migration.

Third. A median family income of 40 percent or less of the national average.

Fourth. Suffered the loss of employment resulting or expected to result in the sudden rise in unemployment during the 3 years past or 3 years in the future exceeding the national average by 50 percent or more.

Fifth. Indian reservations or Indian-owned areas which manifest the greatest degree of economic distress as determined by the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development based on information supplied by the Secretary of the Interior or appropriate State agency.

Sixth. Selected for assistance under the special impact programs of the Economic Opportunity Act or the Secretary of Commerce determines meets that criteria.

Title I only of the act when it has an annual average unemployment rate of 6 percent more during the preceding calendar year. In States where no area can satisfy the criteria listed above, one area which most nearly satisfies the criteria becomes qualified.

From the enumeration of the criteria



which establishes eligibility or assistance under the act it can be readily seen that accurate unemployment figures are vital to locate those areas which have the greatest need for assistance under this legislation. The committee is now convinced that the unemployment figures now in use do not accurately reflect the areas of need as Congress intended.

REPLY OF SECRETARY STANS TO MR. FALLON'S LETTER

The committee met in executive session on Thursday of this past week. At this meeting a reply to Chairman FALLON's letter to Secretary Stans was presented.

This letter reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1970.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,  
Chairman, House Public Works Committee,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter dated June 1, 1970 expressing concern over the de-designation of certain counties as redevelopment areas under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the question of whether changes in EDA office locations should occur during the nine month period beginning May 1, 1970.

On May 5, 1970 Robert A. Podesta, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, delivered a letter from me to you acknowledging the importance of preserving the status quo while your committee and the administration conducted evaluations of the EDA program, including designation criteria standards, with a view toward possible revision of its authorizing legislation. He was assured by your committee, sitting in executive session, that it, too, was concerned with maintaining the status quo. In the spirit of this mutuality of feeling I directed that EDA's so-called 10% bonus program be continued during fiscal 1971 despite a previous decision to discontinue that program.

In your letter you request that de-designations, determined in the ordinary course of business and based on Department of Labor and Bureau of Census statistics in accordance with the present statute, be suspended. You also request that executive decisions on the proper locations of EDA offices for the efficient and effective operation of that Agency by itself and in the overall scheme of the management of the Department of Commerce and the federal government be suspended for a like period.

It has always been the practice of EDA to terminate the eligibility of areas based on an annual review of the qualifications of those areas for designation. As you know, de-designation of redevelopment area does not affect the validity of an application for a project where the application has been filed prior to the effective date of de-designation. Possible changes in the de-designation procedures or in methods of compilation of qualifications statistics are under review in the course of the committee's and the administration's evaluations.

Similarly, I feel that a constant review of office locations is necessary for proper management by me of the Agency. In fact, EDA recently announced a merger of the Portland, Maine and Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania area offices into a single office to be located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

We consider that both the carrying out of annual review and de-designation procedures, and the administration of EDA's offices, are normal actions in the management of EDA in accordance with our authorizing legislation. I would hope, therefore, that you would agree that we should not be inhibited in our efforts to administer this

program in the most effective manner possible.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS,  
Secretary of Commerce.

I have gone into some detail in this particular explanation so that this body will have a full grasp of the problem that faces both the committee and the Congress today in light of what I have previously emphasized—the growing difficulties in our present nationwide economic position. Last Thursday the Committee on Public Works met and heard testimony from representatives of the Economic Development Administration and the Department of Labor which substantiated the points I have previously made.

At that time a reply was also received from Secretary of Commerce Stans as I have indicated. In the light of this situation we now face on the unreliability of some of the factors which are the basis for designation of redevelopment areas and in the light of the pressing economic situation across the Nation, the committee feels that any area which up to now has been eligible for assistance under this program should continue in that category until a firm and full review is made of the criteria both by the administration and by the committee.

For this reason, this amendment is being presented to this body today and I urge its acceptance with the further proviso that when the time comes for the committee to act to meaningfully amend the EDA program any and all Members who have problems affecting their districts that this program covers will be heard and with your assistance and with the work of the committee itself we will be able to develop an even better program than we have at the present time.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, my worthy colleague. I know the problem. My district borders his district. As you know, the Cuyuna Iron Range in this area is to be dedesignated. It seems difficult to understand how such a determination is made. I believe the amendment should be adopted so that the qualifications used in this measure can be brought up to date. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. It is true that the Cuyuna Range, to which the gentleman has referred, has been hard hit, and unemployment in that county and in the State of Minnesota has risen as a result. I know of no other instance where an iron range was totally exhausted and closed. In fact, it is a minuscule or miniature Appalachia Region. How one could explain to people in that area that they are so prosperous that their area should be de-designated I do not know, but that situation shows the type of inequity and injustice that could be carried out by these dedesignations.

Mr. Chairman, to save time and to

allow me time to respond to questions with relation to areas of particular interest or concern to Members, I shall include at this point in my remarks the correspondence of the chairman of the committee (Mr. FALLON) with the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Stans on this question of de-designation. Mr. FALLON's letter to Mr. Stans on the subject and Mr. Stans' reply are the letters I refer to at this time.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from Minnesota has made very clear the reasons for this amendment. I thoroughly and strongly support it.

The gentleman also touched on a point that I think in all fairness should be emphasized. The current administration in a very real sense has considered itself more or less bound by the terms of the statute and the existing practice with regard to dedesignating and the action in dedesignating. Some of these actions actually have been ones they thought more or less were compelled by the previous practices that had been followed and the statute as they interpreted it.

Under the circumstances, I do not believe the enactment of this amendment today should be considered as any kind of critical action or action in direct disagreement with the administration with regard to this fact. I think it is a necessary action that is made sensible by the availability of current census data and realistic reappraisal of what is happening in unemployment and outmigration.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make this point, and I would ask the indulgence of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is it not true the administration has followed the law and the regulations, has followed the letter of this law and the full intent of that law as we drafted the legislation?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have just endeavored to make that point. I think the administration in good faith has been trying to follow the practice of the previous administration both as to designation and dedesignation. We are simply moving into the situation where current data available indicate that if we continue as we have been, we will be doing some real injustice to the people in some counties, and we are trying to avoid that injustice.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman. I wanted to make it abundantly clear the EDA was following the legal requirements of this legislation to the letter, that it was acting in good faith with the committee and the intent of Congress, and was in no way at fault for this situation in which we find ourselves. The EDA has, as a matter of fact, found its hands tied in this respect and until the Congress changes the formula or amends the basic act it will be confronted with this problem.

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

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend and senior member of the Minnesota delegation.

The fact that numerous economically depressed counties in Minnesota alone have been notified that their eligibility for EDA assistance will be withdrawn as of June 30 shows that the whole framework under which eligibility for EDA assistance is determined must be reviewed. It is clear that economically viable areas are included under the EDA umbrella while those that need help are cast out.

The criterion generally used by EDA is the unemployment rate. The trouble with this criterion is that it fails to show what is really going on in a given area. For instance, in a rural area such as Minnesota the unemployment rate does not show marginal or submarginal farmers, seasonal workers, self-employed blue-collar workers, or businessmen—all of whom can and do suffer from near economic starvation without being reflected in the usual unemployment rates. Likewise, the economic state of county or other local governments is not reflected in the rates.

Unemployment rates are particularly suited for urban areas or rural areas where there is substantial economic growth. In urban areas almost everyone works under the umbrella of either a corporation or a union. Thus seasonal work shows up in unemployment statistics as well as occasional unemployment. In rural areas with substantial economic growth, the self-employed generally become employers and there is a general influx of people to the area, almost insuring a higher unemployment rate because of the greater economic potential.

One can readily expect persons without jobs in an economically depressed area to migrate to places where there is greater employment potential and an opportunity to support one's family. This outmigration has long been a primary reason for the loss of economic growth in rural America. A business is not so likely to survive with fewer and fewer people to serve, yet many businesses have tried to hold on in the face of the tremendous outmigration from rural America. The employees have long left the area, but the employer who is barely making a living is not included in the unemployment rate.

One final factor, particularly valid in rural Minnesota, which has a real bearing on the economic well-being of an area but is not considered is the amount of land which is Government owned. Land is the primary tax base of most local governments, but Government-owned land goes off the tax rolls. One county in my congressional district which was recently notified it would be ineligible for EDA assistance as of June 30 has more than 50 percent of its land owned by either the Federal or State Government. This county has no industry other than moderate tourism, and the various county governmental units barely know how they are to support the serv-

ices they are required by law to give. This county is poor—and now EDA wants to deprive it of what little assistance it could get out of that administration.

Mr. Chairman, the two neediest counties are among those scheduled to be deprived of EDA assistance under present criteria. This cannot be allowed to happen. The amendment offered by my Minnesota colleague must be passed so that an appropriate review may be made of this aspect of Federal economic assistance without prejudice to those areas which clearly need assistance but would be deprived of it under current criteria.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am glad the gentleman from Ohio raises that point. I did not have time to stress it. It was inadvertence.

I join the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Oklahoma in making it clear we do not wish to cast any reflection on EDA's operation. They are required by law to make an annual review, and under the regulations of the Department established for some time that review must be undertaken by June 1 of each year.

Under section 402 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act the Secretary is required to conduct an annual review of all areas in accordance with section 401 of this act, and on the basis thereof shall terminate or modify the designation of such areas, in accordance with objective standards he shall prescribe by regulation. By regulation the designation takes place by June 30 with notification usually 30 days in advance.

This in no way reflects any unwarranted action on the part of the Department of Commerce. It does come at a time when these counties are entitled to support and for this reason I am proposing this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about eligibility requirements of counties in my State, particularly in my district. For over 3 years I have been trying to get some changes made that would allow counties to be eligible based on either outmigration or unemployment.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. Is the gentleman offering an amendment?

Mr. PICKLE. I moved to strike the requisite number of words. I have not offered an amendment yet.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. My concern is that there are counties in my district which should be eligible, I would think, for EDA participation, yet in the space of 5 years they have never been able to get under the act.

When I talk with people at the regional office, they are in sympathy that something should be done. When I talk to members of the committee, they are in sympathy that it ought to be changed. When I talk down the street to the EDA offices, they say this is a problem.

I was going to offer an amendment. I want to read it, so that it will be in

the RECORD. It will take only a minute. My amendment would have read as follows:

Section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3171) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act any area within an economic development district designated in accordance with subsection (a) of this section which area is not eligible for designation as a redevelopment area under section 401 of this Act, shall be deemed to be a redevelopment area for the purpose of receiving financial assistance under all titles of this Act for so long as such area is within such economic development district."

The intent and import of that amendment would be to say that if a county has been designated as eligible to receive planning money in an EDA district that county would automatically also be eligible to be considered in line to receive funds under the EDA program.

I will give an example. We have an economic EDA district in Bryan, Tex. Seven counties are in the district but two counties are not eligible for funds. One of those counties happens to be in my district. For 4 years I have been trying to get that little county brought in under this umbrella, yet we are no closer today than we were 4 years ago.

My amendment would say that if a county is eligible to receive planning money it ought to be eligible to be a part of this EDA program. As it is, they cannot participate.

The designations were made many years ago, when we had the old ARA program. The eligibility requirements were rather automatic, and a lot of counties were classified as "poor" counties and they were brought under it, or under the requirements established by law and interpreted down the street, and they would say they could be brought under it.

We have heard a dozen different Members today say that they have counties which have lost a great deal of population or employment yet they cannot be helped. I do not believe this is the intent.

I wanted to offer an amendment. This measure today catches me somewhat by surprise. Last year when it came up it came up under a continuing resolution and in a conference report, and we could not amend it under those circumstances. Now we face, in effect, the same situation.

What does the committee plan to do? What is the intent about trying to bring in the counties which are receiving planning money, so that they would be able to receive EDA funds? Would the chairman of the committee care to comment on that?

Mr. BLATNIK. I shall be pleased to comment.

I want to say at the outset that if anybody deserves an apology it is the gentleman from Texas. No one has been more courteous or more consistent, yet thwarted more often. His patience has exceeded all the limits of frustration.

I can assure the gentleman that certainly the staff of the Public Works Committee and the committee members, and

certainly myself as the chairman of the subcommittee and one of the original authors of the program, not only will give the gentleman's recommendation every consideration, but also will work closely with the EDA to see what recommendations they can come up with, and why these counties to which the gentleman refers cannot be declared eligible.

We thought, in all sincerity, a year ago, that by this March these recommendations would be ready and would be put before us. Had that happened, the gentleman's proposal would have received full consideration. Perhaps action already would have been taken.

Due to circumstances beyond our control, we were unable to get that done. We do ask the gentleman to abide with us for another 6 to 9 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. PICKLE (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

What assurance can we have that the Economic Development Administration will come up with these recommendations? We have been waiting for these things for 3 or 4 years, but we have not moved one bit closer to resolving this problem.

Mr. BLATNIK. All I can say at this point is the gentleman has a very legitimate complaint. I can assure the amendment offered by the gentleman will receive every consideration on the part of the committee and the Economic Development Administration.

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

Mr. PICKLE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. I would like to assure the gentleman that this matter is under study and review by the Economic Development Administration and that they will come up not particularly or specifically with this but with various changes and improvements that they feel are necessary in the law. I will advise the gentleman further that there are a number of other members of the committee who feel sympathetic to his approach to this problem. In addition to that, there are other citizens who have come up with these same problems and who have recommended the same change that the gentleman recommends. I assure the gentleman, also, from the minority point of view on the committee, that we are most sympathetic with his recommendation and will give it every consideration at the proper time when the full committee goes back to review the total program and come up with a recommendation not only on the part of the subcommittee and the full committee studying the problem but also the Economic Development Administration.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I want to state to the gentleman in the well that this

is one of the primary reasons why our committee has made the decision simply to extend this legislation for the one year. In this way we can take into account all the factors such as the one the gentleman is concerned about.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman.

I do hope that the Economic Development Administration will come up with a solution to this matter. Here in this county of my district they have been planning for 4 years and getting ready to do something, but they have never been brought under the program. This ought to be changed. The gentleman recognizes this, I am sure. I want the gentleman to understand that I am not trying to rewrite the eligibility standards. I believe they should be changed. But in this particular instance, if a county is to receive planning money, it ought to be a part of this program. So at the time that this bill is presented in a year from now or when it comes up in the other body, we should get some relief. This does not automatically mean that the county will get the money. It means they will have to still be approved. It means that they will be considered eligible and not necessarily that they will receive the money.

Mr. HARSHA. I hope, with the assurance of the Members on the floor today that we will give your proposition very serious consideration, you will withhold offering any amendment at this time and let us take it up in due course in the full committee.

Mr. PICKLE. In view of the fact that you have asked the Economic Development Administration's office downtown to give you specific recommendations looking toward working this solution, together with the Department of Labor, and the strong assertions made here on the floor, I will not offer the amendment. But I do ask the committee to try to correct this inequity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLACK, 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. 15712) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971, pursuant to House Resolution 1045, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ZION

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ZION. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ZION moves to recommit the bill H.R. 15712 to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND TO REPORT ITS FINDINGS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 976 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved, That*

(1) The Speaker of the House shall appoint a select committee of eleven Members of the House, two from the Armed Services Committee, two from the Foreign Affairs Committee, and seven from the House at large and shall designate one Member to serve as chairman, which select committee shall immediately proceed to Southeast Asia to investigate all aspects of the United States military involvement in Southeast Asia. The select committee shall, within thirty days of the adoption of this resolution, report to the House the results of its investigation.

(2) For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned.

Mr. ROSENTHAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in the resolution according to the copy that has been given out what the Clerk read has been stricken from the resolution, the "whereas" clauses.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that that is a committee amendment. The Chair was about to instruct the Clerk to report the committee amendments after the original resolution had been read.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 1, strike out all of line 1, and insert the following: "committee of twelve Members of the House, six of which shall be from the majority party and six from the minority party, as follows: two from the".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will it be in order under the resolution to attempt to reinstate the "whereas" clauses if it be stricken without objection?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if the committee amendment is voted down then of course the original language will be before the House.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the committee amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the matter now being considered by the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the matter now before the House is the committee amendment to House Resolution 976, page 2, beginning in line 2 and going down to the words "from the" in line 4. That is the committee amendment that is pending at the present time.

The question is on the committee amendment.

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 95, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—227

Abbutt	Annunzio	Betts
Adair	Arends	Bevill
Anderson, Ill.	Ashley	Blester
Anderson, Tenn.	Beall, Md.	Blackburn
Andrews, Ala.	Belcher	Blanton
Andrews,	Bell, Calif.	Blatnik
N. Dak.	Bennett	Boggs
	Berry	Brinkley

Brock	Haley	Pirnie
Broomfield	Hamilton	Poage
Brotzman	Hammer-	Poff
Brown, Mich.	schmidt	Price, Tex.
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Pryor, Ark.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	Purcell
Broyhill, Va.	Harsha	Quie
Buchanan	Harvey	Quillen
Burke, Fla.	Heckler, Mass.	Rarick
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Reid, Ill.
Burlison, Mo.	Hogan	Reifel
Burton, Utah	Horton	Rhodes
Button	Hosmer	Riegle
Byrnes, Wis.	Howard	Roberts
Caffery	Hunt	Rogers, Colo.
Camp	Hutchinson	Rogers, Fla.
Casey	Ichord	Roth
Cederberg	Jarman	Ruppe
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Sandman
Chappell	Johnson, Pa.	Satterfield
Clancy	Jonas	Saylor
Clausen,	Jones, N.C.	Schneebell
Don H.	Kazen	Schwengel
Clawson, Del.	Kee	Scott
Cleveland	Keith	Sebelius
Collier	King	Shriver
Collins	Kleppe	Sikes
Conable	Kluczynski	Sisk
Corbett	Kuykendall	Skubitz
Coughlin	Kyl	Slack
Cramer	Landgrebe	Smith, Calif.
Crane	Langen	Smith, Iowa
Cunningham	Latta	Smith, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	Lennon	Snyder
Davis, Ga.	Lloyd	Springer
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Stafford
de la Garza	Lukens	Stanton
Dellenback	McClory	Steiger, Ariz.
Denney	McCloskey	Steiger, Wis.
Dennis	McClure	Stevens
Devine	McCulloch	Stubblefield
Dickinson	McDade	Stuckey
Duncan	McDonald,	Taft
Dwyer	Mich.	Talcott
Edmondson	McKneally	Taylor
Edwards, Ala.	Madden	Teague, Calif.
Edwards, La.	Mahon	Teague, Tex.
Erlenborn	Mailliard	Thompson, Ga.
Esch	Marsh	Thomson, Wis.
Eshleman	Martin	Udall
Evins, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Vander Jagt
Fallon	May	Waggonner
Feighan	Mayne	Wampler
Findley	Meeds	Watson
Flowers	Melcher	Watts
Flynt	Michel	Whalen
Foreman	Minshall	White
Fountain	Mize	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Mizell	Wiggins
Frey	Montgomery	Wilson,
Fuqua	Morse	Charles H.
Galifianakis	Morton	Winn
Garmatz	Mosher	Wright
Goldwater	Myers	Wyatt
Goodling	Natcher	Wydler
Gray	Nelsen	Wylie
Griffin	O'Neal, Ga.	Wyman
Grover	Pelly	Zion
Gubser	Pettis	Zwach
Gude	Pickle	

NAYS—95

Adams	Gonzalez	O'Hara
Addabbo	Green, Pa.	O'Konski
Albert	Griffiths	Olsen
Anderson,	Gross	Patman
Calif.	Hall	Patten
Biaggi	Hathaway	Perkins
Bingham	Hawkins	Philbin
Boland	Hays	Pike
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Brooks	Helstoski	Randall
Burke, Mass.	Hicks	Rees
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Rodino
Cabell	Hull	Rooney, Pa.
Carey	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Celler	Karth	Rostenkowski
Clark	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Clay	Koch	Ryan
Cohelan	Leggett	Scherle
Corman	Long, Md.	Shipley
Delaney	Lowenstein	Stokes
Dent	McFall	Sullivan
Donohue	Macdonald,	Tierman
Eckhardt	Mass.	Tunney
Edwards, Calif.	Mikva	Ullman
Eilberg	Miller, Ohio	Van Deerin
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Vanik
Flood	Mink	Waldie
Ford,	Monagan	Wolf
William D.	Morgan	Yates
Fraser	Moss	Yatron
Friedel	Murphy, Ill.	Young
Fulton, Pa.	Nedzi	Zablocki
Gibbons	Obey	

NOT VOTING—107

Abernethy	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neill, Mass.
Alexander	Fulton, Tenn.	Ottinger
Ashbrook	Gallagher	Passman
Aspinall	Gaydos	Pepper
Ayres	Gettys	Pollock
Baring	Giaimo	Powell
Barrett	Gilbert	Preyer, N.C.
Bolling	Green, Oreg.	Price, Ill.
Bow	Hagan	Pucinski
Brasco	Halpern	Rallsback
Bray	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Burton, Calif.	Harrington	Rivers
Bush	Hastings	Robison
Carter	Hébert	Roe
Chisholm	Hungate	Rooney, N.Y.
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Roudebush
Conte	Jones, Tenn.	Ruth
Conyers	Kirwan	St Germain
Cowger	Kyros	Schadeberg
Culver	Landrum	Scheuer
Daddario	Lujan	Staggers
Daniel, Va.	McCarthy	Steed
Dawson	McEwen	Stratton
Derwinski	McMillan	Symington
Diggs	MacGregor	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Mann	Vigorito
Dorn	Mathias	Watkins
Dowdy	Meskill	Weicker
Downing	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Dulski	Mills	Whitehurst
Farbstein	Mollohan	White
Fascell	Moorhead	Williams
Fish	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Nichols	Wold
Foley	Nix	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Passman with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Daniel of Virginia with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Gettys.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Preyer of New Jersey with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Farbstein with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Foley.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.

Mr. Kyros with Mr. McMillan.

Messrs. DENT, ALBERT, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, FRIEDEL, EILBERG, MONAGAN, MACDONALD of Massachusetts, and DONOHUE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HALEY and HAMMER-SCHMIDT changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 5, strike out the word "seven" and insert in lieu the word "eight".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 7, after the word "as", strike out "chairman, which" and insert in lieu "chairman. The".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 10, strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu the word "forty-five".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 15, after the word "places", insert "as it deems appropriate".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, following line 16, insert:

"(3) The select committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The select committee is authorized to reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the select committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the select committee held in the District of Columbia.

"(4) The expenses of the select committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the select committee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, at what point did the Speaker put the committee amendment which appears on page 1 to strike out the preamble?

The SPEAKER. That question will come after the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 976 provides for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members, six from each side of the aisle, to go to Southeast Asia as soon as practicable on a high priority fact finding mission and to report back its detailed observations to the full membership of the House within 45 days of the adoption of the resolution. The members of the select committee would be appointed by the Speaker, with two being from the Committee on Armed Services, two from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the remainder from the membership generally.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to elaborate to this body on the acute, urgent responsibilities we all face relative to Southeast Asia—as individual Members and as the legislative body in closest contact with the people. I believe this is an excellent resolution, a very timely resolution, a very important resolution, and one which should be passed by an overwhelming majority this afternoon. To do otherwise, I believe, would be a keen disappointment to most Americans who are so seriously concerned and so very considerably divided over our involvement in the war in Southeast Asia and what the future course of that involvement will be.

I am impressed by the fact that the proposed select committee would not come back with briefcases full of recommendations. Rather, its function would be to report accurate, detailed, objective observations and facts which I believe would be of great value to each individual Member in deciding his own approach to the problems of Southeast Asia. While I am sure the special Presidential task force will do a good job, nothing can replace a firsthand report from one's own colleagues. While each of us may differ very much as to viewpoints, we stand on one great area of common ground in that we each represent and are directly responsible to 470,000 constituent American citizens. Thus, I believe a report from a small committee of the House would be of greater value than a report from any other group.

I am confident that our great Speaker would see that this committee would be composed of Members of varied viewpoints that no one could validly label it a committee of hawks or a committee of doves. He has always been most fair and prudent in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who will say this committee will cost the taxpayers some money. Of course it will, but only a minute amount compared with the more than \$20 billion we are spending on that war.

There are also some who will say, with justification, that the presence of the committee will add to the worries and workload of our commanders out there. This is true, but as one who has in past years been on the receiving end of congressional visits, I believe I can reassure my colleagues that the additional workload and responsibility on the part of the commanders will be welcomed and is more than offset by the appreciation by the troops and others that a committee of Congress has enough interest to come out and talk with them.

The committee would be authorized to appoint and fix compensation for necessary employees and consultants and reimburse them for travel and subsistence, subject to action of the House Administration Committee and approval on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I understand this resolution, or its equivalent, has a bipartisan sponsorship of 71 or more of our colleagues. I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for being its author and chief sponsor and for all the hard work he has put in on it.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of House Resolution 976.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee has explained, House Resolution 976 provides for a select committee of 12 members to be appointed by the Speaker to go to Vietnam and Southeast Asia, and to make a report as to what is going on over there within 45 days. The resolution provides that six Members shall be appointed from each side of the aisle, including two from the Armed Services Committee and two from the Foreign Affairs Committee, the balance to be appointed from the membership at large. I understand that 72 Members have cosponsored this resolution which we are considering this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the resolution provides for a legislative committee to go to Vietnam and Southeast Asia and to make a report to the House. We have a similar committee at the present time that I understand is currently, or at the present moment, returning from Southeast Asia, a committee appointed by the President, which is composed of some Members of the legislative branch of our Government. I do feel that the legislative branch of our Government has very definite responsibilities in this area, and I feel that our branch of the Government should have a committee to go there with adequate time to check into the situation and the various things they find, come back, and make a report—that is all this resolution does.

I was astounded yesterday, if the CBS news reporting was correct, when they showed a picture of the Presidential committee 10 miles inside Cambodia. The comment was that the battalion they inspected was equipped with new uniforms and new boots, and their rifles were all polished up, which I think was more or less a superficial view of what is going on over there.

I trust this select committee, if the resolution is adopted, will be able to make a more objective review of what is going on in South Vietnam than appeared from the CBS broadcast yesterday.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished author and sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question before he starts? Will the gentleman tell us why he wants to strike out the "whereas" clauses of the resolution?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. May I answer the gentleman after I make my remarks? At that time I shall try to answer the gentleman's question.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague from the State of Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) for allowing this time and compliment him on the fine manner in which he has explained the merits of House Resolution 976 to our colleagues.

In my remarks today I will be appealing to the good judgment and commonsense of each Member to consider this measure on the basis of its merits. And this resolution does have merit.

In simple language, House Resolution 976 would pave the way for the Speaker to appoint a select committee of 12 Members to go to Southeast Asia on a high priority factfinding mission. The committee would be equally divided between the majority and minority parties with two coming from the House Armed Services Committee, two from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and eight from the House at large.

This group of 12 colleagues would be representing each one of us. It would be their duty and responsibility to look into many aspects of our involvement in Southeast Asia. I would expect each Member of the House to be given the opportunity to offer suggestions, if they so desire, to the select committee on what to see and what to do. In this way we could accomplish what is logistically impossible to do—that is, send all 435 Members to Southeast Asia.

The select committee would be given 45 days in which to report back their findings to this body from the date of adoption of the resolution. I feel this will allow them ample time to make their pretrip plans, conduct a thorough on-the-site investigation, and draw up their final report for the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one very important point at this time about the objectives of the select committee. It will be their duty to gather as much factual and current information as possible on the situation in Southeast Asia and make a detailed report to their colleagues and only a report. They would supply the information this body needs to reach decisions, and then it would be up to each individual Member to reach his or her own opinions. Each Member will have the facts, the same facts. The conclusions reached from these facts would be at the discretion of each Member.

Earlier I mentioned the merits of

House Resolution 976. One of the first that comes to mind is the fact that the resolution was cosponsored by 71 members representing both parties and the entire spectrum of political philosophies. The select committee possibly should be made up of members with varied opinions on the Far East situation but members who would be open minded on their onsite inspections and observations in Indochina.

One of the most obvious merits to me is that we will be sending 12 Members to Southeast Asia to act as our eyes and ears. My three trips to South Vietnam have convinced me of the importance of seeing for yourself exactly what is taking place in Southeast Asia. Briefings and situation reports such as we receive from time to time are of help, but they are not the complete answer. To use an expression, "You have got to be where the action is."

You have to actually talk to our servicemen in the field, you have to observe the capabilities of the South Vietnamese, you have to talk to national and local Vietnamese leaders in private, you have to get out in the countryside to see our pacification program at work, and you have to talk to American civilians such as missionaries. It is necessary to do these and other things on a firsthand and personal basis if you expect to really learn about American involvement in Southeast Asia.

As I stated earlier, the ideal or utopian situation would be to send all 435 Members to see for themselves. I wish this were possible. But since it is not, the next best choice we have is to send 12 of our colleagues to observe for each of us and have them report back to us in a factual, objective and unbiased manner.

Another merit to House Resolution 976 is the answer it would provide for a small group of critics of the Congress who say we are not exerting the leadership we should as far as the conflict in Vietnam is concerned. I do not wish to dwell on what we have or have not done in the past. We need to look to the future. I want my vote to be cast on the most current and thorough information at my disposal. I want to know that my vote will be cast on the basis of the facts and not an assumption on my part. I believe that my 12 colleagues we will be sending to Southeast Asia will be able to provide me with these facts.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to cover only the high points and the most compelling merits of House Resolution 976. There are others which I am sure my colleagues will be able to ascertain for themselves by reading the resolution.

In closing, I would only hope that the arguments I have presented today will stir the good judgment of my colleagues to vote in the affirmative for House Resolution 976.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman two questions? First, why is it proposed to strike the preamble? Why is it the committee recommends striking the preamble to the resolution as

amended? Second, do the 71 sponsors of this resolution favor the striking of the preamble which apparently states the rationale for the resolution?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, answering the second question, that would have to be left up to the 71 sponsors whether they would agree to support what the Rules Committee has done. I will support the Rules Committee. They acted in their wisdom, I am sure.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Permit me to say first to the gentleman from Illinois and to any other interested parties that so far as I, personally, am concerned, it makes no difference to me whether the preamble is stricken or not stricken. I can only enlighten the gentleman, I hope, by saying that when the Committee on Rules considered this resolution, the question was raised by a member of the committee that the preamble was such that the resolution itself covered all the aspects of it and, therefore, it was not necessary to have the preamble.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield further to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In substantiation of that view let me call the attention of the House to lines 7 through 12 on page 2 of the resolution. That portion of the resolution reads:

The select committee shall immediately proceed to Southeast Asia to investigate all aspects of the United States military involvement in Southeast Asia. The select committee shall, within forty-five days of the adoption of this resolution, report to the House the results of its investigation.

In other words, the resolution itself provides for the investigation of all aspects of the war, whereas the preamble would only point out and emphasize Cambodia.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I ask the gentleman to yield for this purpose: I am the one who moves to strike the whereas clauses on every resolution which ever appears before the Committee on Rules. I have done that since I have been a Member because basically I feel the information as to the matter and the point of the resolution is generally contained in the report.

I merely believe that the whereas clauses are surplusage. This is a traditional position with me and has nothing

to do with anything that might have been used in the whereas clauses.

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

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

Mr. YATES. May I point out the incongruity which exists in the resolution, in view of the statement by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules. The gentleman refers to the language which appears on page 2, lines 7 through 9, which read:

The select committee shall immediately proceed to Southeast Asia to investigate all aspects of the United States military involvement in Southeast Asia.

Then on page 3 the following appears:

Amend the title so as to read: "To authorize a select committee of the House to study firsthand the recent developments in Southeast Asia and then report its findings to the House of Representatives within forty-five days of its adoption."

What is the purpose of the committee? Is it to study all aspects of the war in Southeast Asia as the first provision states, or is it to study what has happened in Southeast Asia following the invasion of Cambodia and the other facts or allegations which are alleged in the whereas clauses? What will the committee be expected to do?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will the gentleman permit me to try to answer the question?

I tried to state that this provides for a fact-finding committee, which will report to the gentleman from Illinois and the Congress. They will come back and report to the gentleman all the information they can get about all aspects of the war, as possible. The gentleman can take the information and handle it in any way he sees fit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I have been listening very carefully to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, because, as the primary author of the resolution, I think his viewpoint on how it should be constructed, as well as that of the committee, is most important to all of us.

The gentleman has indicated the committee should have varied points of view, should be broadly representative of the House, should be openminded and totally unbiased.

I totally support this position. I support the stricken as well as the unstricken whereas clauses, which are an indication of the interpretation of the author of the resolution.

I am trying to bring out that my support of the resolution is in terms of an openminded unbiased committee. I wonder if the gentleman would agree on this point: I should like to serve on this committee the gentleman has authored. I might suggest myself to the Speaker. I

should like to do all I can to get all the facts possible for this House to pass judgment on. However, I happen to be a colonel of infantry in the inactive reserve. I therefore feel my judgment could be colored by my rank in the military, and if chosen on the committee I would resign because of the affiliation with the military, in order to have no problem with respect to my judgment as a member of the military serving in the House.

Would the gentleman believe that this situation might have an effect on anyone serving on this committee?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think the gentleman is aiming at one of the authors of the bill, namely, myself, but if the gentleman has any objection to my serving on this committee that will be selected, I certainly believe he should make his intentions known to the Speaker.

Mr. CAREY. I certainly have no personal objection to the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Speaking for myself, I think I could have an unbiased opinion even though I do hold a commission in the National Guard of the United States. I feel as though I could. In the three trips that I have made over there before I feel as though I gained something.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York for purposes of debate only.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, handling the bill on behalf of the Rules Committee, whether it is true that he has declined to yield to me for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. That is correct. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the procedure, apparently standard procedure of the Committee on Rules is that no amendment to this resolution can be considered or debated. I have prepared to offer an amendment. It was circulated to the membership last Friday, as soon as I heard about this resolution, proposing language to be added to the resolution that the Members to be appointed should be "representative of the varying points of view on the President's actions in Indochina, including both critics and supporters."

Now, with due respect to the Speaker—and I am sure the Speaker would intend to appoint representatives of varying points of view on this matter—a provision like this should be in the resolution. It would assist the Speaker in his task of appointing a representative group. I want to state that I am not personally interested in being appointed to this study team, but I think those who share some of my views should be represented.

There are at least four major different points of view on this subject. There are those who are so strong in their opposition to the Vietnam war that they support the so-called end the war amendment, set forth in House Resolution 1000. There are those who are critical of the Cambodian operation and who were among the 145 who voted on May 7 for an opportunity to vote against extension of the war into Cambodia amendment. There are those who support

the President. The fourth group comprises those who favor much stronger military action than we have taken to date.

If this committee is to be created it ought to include representatives of all these points of view. It should also include Members who will have the inclination to question what they are shown, to look behind it and to make inquiries on their own.

A story in today's New York Times shows the kind of tour that the military in Vietnam likes to arrange for visiting dignitaries, a real Potemkin village type of tour.

How many Members who will be appointed to this committee can speak Vietnamese? Probably none. But there should be some who will at least undertake to get their own interpreters, so they can talk with confidence directly to the Vietnamese people.

In short, there are all kinds of reasons why there should be a representative group on this committee.

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

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

Mr. HOWARD. I want to commend the gentleman from New York for the concern he has shown that the committee shall be representative of all the viewpoints on both sides of the Southeast Asia question. I agree with him, and I would like to state for his information that this has been the declared intent from the inception of the introduction of this resolution. I did not put my name on the resolution until after conferring with the gentleman from Mississippi and having heard that it was his intent that this be broad based. In testimony before the Committee on Rules it was discussed by the Committee on Rules, and everyone who testified that if this was going to be a worthwhile committee and an assignment on behalf of the Congress and the country, it should be broad based. I believe the Speaker has every intention of making it that.

Mr. BINGHAM. I take it that the gentleman from New Jersey shares my viewpoint that the four Members who were appointed to the President's study team from the House were representative of only one point of view on the Vietnam war and did not constitute a representative selection of the membership of the House.

Mr. HOWARD. I would not care to prejudge the President's selection, but I would say to him I feel certain, on the basis of this resolution, that the Speaker will appoint a group to go to Southeast Asia which will be more responsive to the broad-based feelings of the Members of Congress than the group returning at the present time.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for his statement, but I will nonetheless seek an opportunity to offer my amendment. To that end, I will demand a vote on the previous question on the resolution. I urge those who would support an amendment of the character I have offered or who object to the procedure which permits no amendments to

vote down the previous question at the end of the debate so that we can have an opportunity to debate and vote on amendments on their merits.

Mr. HOWARD. I would hope that the gentleman would not seek a vote on that because I believe the legislative history has already been set.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to this debate. I have watched this resolution arise and I certainly have nothing against those who have journeyed to South Vietnam at their own expense and have come back with their own information. I have no inclination to oppose additional information of any type for the Members of the House, but with the one reminder that "information" does not become "intelligence" until it is distilled on the basis of "need to know" in the military, and is truthfully portrayed.

I have nothing against architects exercising oversight and surveillance of the many problems of the Federal Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we need an extra commission or another group of our own or any other going into a theater of operations like South Vietnam, just about as much as we need extra holes in the head.

There have been far too many people who have gone there already. This is an area for invitation into a high-risk area, of foreign speech, by another sovereign nation, primarily. Our armed services are there on this basis and are far too busy to become impressed hosts.

We have just, by action or call of the Chair, voted an open-ended proposition on the resolving clause hereto, and we certainly are subverting and overlapping the powers of the Committee on Armed Services of this House which is properly constituted to exercise section 8, article 1 of the Constitution, to say nothing of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, or the Foreign Operations Committee or the Committee on Government Operations.

The function, Mr. Speaker, of actually running the war and how it can be operated after the policy is set by Congress, for the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the broad policies such as numbers and funding set by the legislative branch of the United States—is that of the executive branch. Congress can set the broad policy as we did in the case of the Fulbright resolution, but the strategic and tactical military procedures and the "how," are constitutionally delegated to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

In my opinion and for a long time, Mr. Speaker, we have had too much congressional quarterbacking and second guessing of the commanders in the theater of operations. To paraphrase, never have so many armchair generals said so much about so little they never should have said in the first place. There is unnecessary duplication.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who the records will show, turned down a position on the present Presidential fact-

finding delegation, on the basis that somebody needed at this time to say "No, take the expense of going over there and back, which is a questionable trip, and apply it on the Federal deficit and let us protect the taxpayers at home." Especially is this applicable here in the legislative body of the people where trade, taxes, tariffs, and levies must originate.

Mr. Speaker, this is unnecessary duplication. It is a waste of the taxpayers' money. It is a chance for a "junket" with a "well-earned stopover in fair Hawaii" for a few days on the way back.

The "hawks" and "doves" are being turned into carrier-pigeons and are mimicking the myna bird.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we should vote this down out of hand, and vote down both the whereas and resolving clauses, and then I think we should vote down the entire resolution.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Missouri and join him in his opposition to this resolution and unjustified junket. It seems to me that the least the House could do would be to postpone action, if that is possible, until the special congressional committee that was this morning in Hawaii gets back here from Vietnam and reports.

This is a further unnecessary expenditure of the taxpayers' money at this time. Again, I agree with the gentleman in his opposition, and I hope the resolution will be voted down.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's contributions. I realize that there are some here who think that that was a window-dressing commission, and all facts will not be ascertained. I doubt if more facts can be obtained in 45 days in canned briefings by the military than were obtained in 7 days. I doubt they could learn more if setting in the ARVN General Assembly in view of the language barrier. Be that as it may, an unofficial but personal count of Representatives of Congress journeying to the theater of operations indicate that over 175 have been there in the last 5 years. I think it is time we quit the feather-merchants touring to the theater of operations, and who subsequently make the convenient stopover in Hawaii on the way back, and let the generals and the buck privates, the seamen and the admirals, the Air Force generals and the airmen, get on with winning the war, and bring our men back home safely.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. GALIFIANAKIS) such time as he may consume.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 976, a resolution to send a select committee of House Members to Southeast Asia.

Surely this is not the time for partisan thoughts, not while American soldiers are dying every hour in Vietnam and in Cambodia. Today is not the occasion for the executive branch and the Congress to sit in opposite corners and sulk instead of joining together to end the war.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of Communist activities in Southeast Asia has now been with us for 25 years and has shadowed the terms of five Presidents and 12 Congresses. And in recent years, as public dissension over the war has increased, the conflict has begun to tear at the foundations of our Government itself.

Because we in the Congress appropriate the funds to continue the war, we have our own constitutional responsibility in military affairs. Under article I, the Congress has the power to declare war, to provide for the common defense, and to raise and support armies—with the provision that no military appropriation shall last longer than 2 years. These are clear constitutional responsibilities. It is time that we met them.

As Congressmen, we must share in the burden which this war has become. And we can—if we do not play the game of obstruction—help the President to achieve his announced goal of ending the war. To do so we must meet our own constitutional obligations.

That is why I support this resolution. It is only a hesitant first step, but it is a beginning toward confronting the problem of ending the war.

This select committee will enable the Congress to reach its own conclusions about American commitment in Southeast Asia based on the facts, not on emotions or dead theories. It is answerable to the Congress and to no one else. I would not predict what information the committee might bring back, of whether that information would sustain, supplement, or differ from the information of other sources.

Mr. Speaker, during his campaign, the President announced that he would try to bring us together. On no issue is it more important that we come together than on the way to end the war. If we do not work for this goal—Congress and President, Republicans and Democrats—then the war will continue like a machine that is beyond our control.

But if we do cooperate, then we can end the war and end it safely and quickly. And we can do much to restore the proper role of the Congress in foreign policy by meeting the constitutional responsibilities which have been evaded for so long.

I urge each of my colleagues to give favorable consideration to this resolution. It is not a partisan attempt to detract from the President. Rather, it is an effort to provide the Congress with the facts to act intelligently—in concert with the administration, and not against it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the same conclusion as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, but I think for somewhat different reasons.

Very candidly, the operative language in the resolution suggests that the select committee shall proceed to Southeast Asia to investigate all aspects of the U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia. I am one of those who believe that Congressmen can learn a great deal from



being out in the field, and I have urged all my colleagues to travel the world over to learn about our military involvement and foreign aid institutions, but in this connection I think we ought to just hesitate for a moment.

The fact of the matter is that we do have committees of Congress constitutionally charged with these responsibilities. I feel personally aggrieved that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is shunted aside while this special committee is raised to stardom to render what could be a very important report, and have a very significant public relations aspect on the American public.

My view of why this would not be useful at this time is that if any Member of the Congress is legitimately interested in all aspects of the U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia, then the way to properly do this is to hold open public hearings on the basis for our involvement in Southeast Asia. There should be a review and analysis of the secret treaties and commitments that the U.S. Government is involved in in Southeast Asia.

If this visit is going to be a quickie military inspection of Cambodia and the caches involved, then may I say it is going to turn into a charade and virtually a whitewash, and then it would do a great disservice to this body that we all have the greatest respect and affection for.

Frankly, I feel aggrieved that more senior members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not see fit to make this argument, but the fact of the matter is that that committee has indeed the responsibility and ability and the wherewithal to conduct this kind of investigation. One military investigation will lead to another. We will find out that we collected  $x$  number of rifles and have reported  $x$  number of dead.

But the American people—and they should be genuinely concerned in what we are doing in Southeast Asia—should listen to all sides of the case, and to what George Ball said before our committee the other day, when he said that he regretted the decisions that the Nixon administration has so far taken with respect to Cambodia, because it is a repeat of the fateful earlier decisions taken by its predecessors. And he said, in leading up to that:

We mistook Tonkinese aggression for Chinese imperialism and, falling to scrutinize the menace in terms of its marginal relevance to the power balance, we committed the power at our command to a terrain where, for both physical and political reasons, it was impossible to use it effectively.

Mr. Speaker, there are political issues and answers to the problem of Southeast Asia and until those political issues can be settled the involvement of the United States will not be terminated. For that reason, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in times of emergency and in times of pressure, there is often made poor law by those having the responsibility of decision. This House of Representatives should take the time to debate

extensively and in depth what is meant by this resolution, House Resolution 976. It is amazing to find such broad cosponsorship by Members, and such disagreement as to what the resolution means. For example, to strike the preamble from the resolution, strikes the reason for the resolution, the area of reference and constitutional responsibilities of the Congress, as well as the need for Congress to have accurate and detailed information, from the bill. Is this expedition of House Members to set out to Southeast Asia with the general instruction "to investigate all aspects of the United States military involvement in Southeast Asia," as a line and a half on page 2 of the resolution provides? One half of line 8, and line 9 on page 2 of the bill are the only authority for a world-shaking investigation officially made on behalf of the House of Representatives. Imagine making the investigation in depth for the purpose of U.S. official congressional action, with no hearings, no witnesses, no sources, no checking of briefings by military personnel of our own, or any other country, with the requirement of report shall be made within 45 days of adoption of the resolution. Queen Isabella did better in her instructions to Columbus.

The House of Representatives has formally set up standing committees that have jurisdiction of the military policy in this House, the Armed Services Committee, and we have a committee on the relations with foreign countries, the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. The House has given jurisdiction of obligation and expenditure of Federal funds to the Committee on Appropriations, with the particular appropriation subcommittees, who have jurisdiction of these various elements of U.S. monetary and financial commitments abroad, stemming from everything from U.S. aid of a military type to peacetime economic and development aid, even to education and cultural welfare programs.

I raise a question on what is meant by the vague generality on page 2, line 9, "in Southeast Asia." Our study committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee went to nine countries in South and East Asia: Vietnam, Thailand, Philippines, Formosa, Okinawa, Japan, South Korea, India, and Pakistan, and also Hong Kong. We were unable to cover Australia, New Guinea, New Zealand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Burma. How can South Korea with 47,000 troops fighting in South Vietnam be ignored? Seoul is certainly not in Southeast Asia, nor is Tokyo, and so forth.

What countries comprise the term "Southeast Asia"? This can be any number of countries. It is not just a few countries. Does this just include North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia? Of course not. Such a limited view and such a limited study, as proposed, is not only impossible, imbecilic, but dangerous. "Facts" based on this study can very adversely affect the carrying on of the war, but our U.S. relations around the world, our many U.S. treaty commitments, and cause disruption of well-founded and longtime friendly relations with many countries.

Second, is this resolution meant to be limited to authorization for an investigation of facts? What kind of facts? Or is it an investigation of U.S. policy? Is that U.S. military policy? Is it U.S. foreign relations policy? Economic or trade policy? Is it U.S. foreign aid policy? Is it CIA policy?

When the resolution says "all aspects" that, of course, includes military policy all around the world because any of the great powers and their allies, even non-aligned countries, have some influence in Southeast Asia. The world is such an untidy place, and this resolution is such a small broom. We Members on the Foreign Affairs Committee who have studied, read volumes of history, heard thousands of witnesses on world conditions, causes, and probabilities, peoples, customs, and wars and disruptions, can hardly wait for this report in 45 days with the "true facts." When this report is made, it may disagree with the investigators who are just now on their way back, the President's factfinding commission. If the reports are each unanimous then no member of the investigations is thinking very much, or very deeply. If these reports disagree with the State Department, the CIA, in what position does this put the Members of Congress who have already served on the regularly constituted and standing committees of the U.S. House of Representatives who have jurisdiction in these very fields and what is more, the responsibility for action, and not just debate?

What does the President of the United States, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, do with the "facts" found by the President's own current factfinding commission, if there is a disagreement?

Should the U.S. Congress have the responsibility for the day-to-day running of a war 10,000 miles away in an area that most Members have never been nor had any experience? My answer is the answer of the U.S. Constitution, "No." I have spent almost a year in the Orient after my graduation from Harvard Law School, have been a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee almost 20 years, have visited these countries from time to time, and have studied, listened to experienced witnesses, read volumes of history and current events, but I would refuse to serve on any such select committee with such little time, shallow investigation, and forced quick judgment.

I strongly believe we should have some considered answers before the House quickly sponsors another "study" committee with no legislative jurisdiction but which is simply to make a quick report in 45 days.

I would ask the managers of the resolution specifically—Is it facts that the select committee is looking for or is it policy that they are looking for?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I know that my friend is sincere in his remarks, but I just heard that the factfinding committee to which he alluded is on its way back after 2 days. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania really believe that a searching inquiry

could be made in a small time period of 48 hours?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. You are right; I do not. I do not believe a conducted military tour or State Department tour of House Members is going to come up with very many facts, upon which the judgment of the Members of the House should rest, in decisions involving the very lives and security of the men in our U.S. Armed Forces, as well as the freedom and security of the citizens of the countries of Southeast Asia. Here we have a committee such as this select committee which goes to Southeast Asia really with no specific instructions as what to do and they are just taken around, and shown fragments, and preordered spots. Who makes the decisions why they may be taken to certain places?

In 1965, with the Asian Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, we made a long and serious study of the Asian situation at first hand, visiting nine countries, including Vietnam. We studied to prepare for the trip, consulted with heads of state, foreign ministers, military leaders, members of parliaments, business and labor leaders, religious members of many faiths, studied when we came back, and made recommendations against escalation of U.S. military forces in Vietnam at that time, 1965. Our study committee report was filed as House Report No. 1345 of the 89th Congress, second session. It contains 89 pages and much reference material. I would strongly advise the Members generally, as well as the select committees, to study this excellent source material.

The question is this: Is the House to have this committee come back and comment on escalation or on deescalation on further U.S. involvement in Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand? On immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces, Vietnamization?

I have always opposed committing U.S. ground troops to a land war in Asia. I have studied the strategy carefully and will give the basis of my opinion, through statements and studies by most competent U.S. officials.

I read into my comments the warnings of our U.S. military leaders from the U.S. News & World Report issue of April 26, 1966, in the article "Should United States Fight a Land War in Asia? Views of Military Leaders," as follows:

SHOULD UNITED STATES FIGHT A LAND WAR IN ASIA? VIEWS OF MILITARY LEADERS

The question of U.S. troops' fighting a land war in Asia is up for debate again. In the past, most U.S. military men have opposed getting tied down with ground forces so far from home. Now, as the number of Americans in South Vietnam increases, military observers are giving the problem a new look.

Below is what some prominent officials have had to say on the subject in the two decades since World War II.

Douglas MacArthur, late General of the Army:

"No man in his right mind would advocate sending our own ground forces into continental China."—Address to Congress, April 19, 1951.

Omar Bradley, General of the Army, former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff:

"I do not believe we should get involved in a land war in Asia if we can possibly

avoid it. . . . It of course depends on the circumstances at the time, but right now I feel as I said in my statement here, I think we would be fighting a wrong war at the wrong place and against a wrong enemy."—Congressional Hearings, May, 1951.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President: "I told my associates in January of 1954 that I could not at that moment see the value of putting United States ground forces in Southeast Asia. . . . If the United States were, unilaterally, to permit its forces to be drawn into conflict in Indo-China and in a succession of Asian wars, an end result would be to drain off our resources and to weaken our overall defensive position.

"If we, without allies, should ever find ourselves fighting at various places all over the region, and if Red Chinese aggressive participation were clearly identified, then we could scarcely avoid, I said, considering the necessity of striking directly at the head instead of the tail of the snake, Red China itself."—From President Eisenhower's book, "Mandate for Change," which was published by Doubleday and Company, Inc., in 1963.

Maxwell D. Taylor, General, former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and former Ambassador to South Vietnam:

"I have been among the officers who have said that a large land war in Asia is the last thing we should undertake. I was slow in joining with those who recommended the introduction of ground forces in South Vietnam."—Interview published in "U.S. News & World Report" on Feb. 21, 1966.

I am also reading into my comments the excellent study by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress of July 13, 1965, entitled "Land War in Asia: views of Generals MacArthur, Bradley, and Eisenhower," by Thomas C. Lyons, Jr., Analyst in Military Affairs and World Demography of the Foreign Affairs Division.

This study impressed me strongly after our study trip to Southeast Asia in 1965.

LAND WAR IN ASIA: VIEWS OF GENERALS MACARTHUR, BRADLEY, AND EISENHOWER

In light of the present situation in Vietnam, it has been stated on a number of occasions, especially in the American newspapers, that three well-known and respected American generals, one of whom is a former President of the United States, had warned of the inadvisability of placing large numbers of American ground troops in Asia for the purpose of fighting a land war. The purpose of this brief paper is to present those views in the context in which they were given.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR<sup>1</sup>

Senator McMAHON. . . . General, your recommendations for operations in China would still be a limited war. We would not commit American ground forces to the operation in China under any circumstances, as I understand it.

General MACARTHUR. I would not advise it; no sir. That is, of course, with the general limitation of the contingencies of campaign.

I believe it would be master folly to contemplate the use of United States ground troops in China. I do not believe it would be necessary. (p. 103)

Senator KEFAUVER. But you said, General MacArthur, you nor no one else had recommended that American troops actually en-

gage in any part of the ground warfare on the continent, in China proper; that it be limited to blockade and bombing by air and reconnaissance by air.

I wondered if any substantial number of technicians actually went along with Chiang's troops, what kind of situation that puts us in.

General MACARTHUR. I see no objection to it at all, Senator. It is common practice. We have had our advisers with them in the past. We have had missions there. We had a mission in Greece. We have got missions in a great many countries. They go and advise, but it does not commit us beyond the technicality of the assistance that the individuals can render.

I don't think it would be material one way or another whether they went in with them or not, as far as the efficacy of the forces is concerned. I can see no reason why if our Air and our Navy are engaged against the Red Chinese, and our troops in Korea are engaged against the Red Chinese why the use of a few hundred technicians would be a matter of any serious import.

My recommendation that ground troops should not be committed to China was not on the basis of avoiding any concept that we were not utilizing our force to the maximum. It was because of the sacrifice that would be involved in our forces because of our inability with our bases 10,000 miles away to maintain large units of ground troops there.

I had nothing to do with anything except a military decision that ground troops should not be committed in force—our ground troops.

Senator KEFAUVER. As I understand, your conception was based upon our inability to get enough troops there, and that you have no feeling that if we had sufficient ground troops, that we shouldn't use them on the continent of Asia, on the mainland of China proper.

General MACARTHUR. I believe that as a strategic conception it is an impossible one, sir. I do not believe . . .

Senator KEFAUVER. Your conception is based upon the feeling that we do not have sufficient troops to accomplish that purpose; is that correct?

General MACARTHUR. That is one of the reasons. Another reason is that the manpower of those countries is sufficient; if we aid and assist them in their training and in their supply features, they do not need the assistance of our ground forces. They would need assistance probably from the Air and the Navy. (pp. 106-107)

Senator CAIN. General MacArthur, Morgan Beatty of the National Broadcasting Co. said in a recent hook-up that on the 26th day of last June, General MacArthur himself made the following statement to Ambassador Dulles and to accredited news reporters:

Anybody who commits the land power of the United States on the continent of Asia ought to have his head examined. May I inquire if you recall having made such a statement to Ambassador Dulles?

General MACARTHUR. I don't know whether I made the statement, but I confirm absolutely the sentiments involved.

Senator CAIN. This reference to Morgan Beatty was made by a colleague of mine, who thought that you, General MacArthur, had made that statement to Beatty on June 26, and at a later date had said something different.

The Senator to whom I refer went on to say that, with reference to the Beatty statement:

"I say that I not only agree with that, but I believe that any man in a responsible position in our military forces who would do that, which would amount to committing our land forces against Red China on the mainland of China, not only ought to have his physical

<sup>1</sup> All MacArthur quotations from: Military Situation in the Far East. Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Part I, Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. (May 3 through May 14, 1951.)

head examined, but ought to have his official head cut off."

May I inquire if, in your opinion, there is any legitimate reference to any attitude of yours, or any kind, character or description, in that comment made on the 11th day of April, on the floor of the United States Senate?

General MACARTHUR. None whatsoever; and the other comments—all I can say as to them—"Amen." (pp. 156-157)

\* \* \* \* \*  
OMAR BRADLEY<sup>2</sup>

Senator BRIDGES. What about Korea—when we entered the Korea conflict a day or two after June 25, 1950, did the Joint Chiefs of Staff take into consideration all of the potential risks at that time militarily?

General BRADLEY. Yes sir. We had always hoped we would not have to fight in Korea, and that's why we were in favor of getting out of Korea as far as our occupation was concerned. Because strategically it is a poor place to fight. And we did consider these things at the time the question of interceding in Korea was taken.

Senator BRIDGES. Now you are of the theory that has been expressed here that we should not get involved in a land war on the mainland of Asia?

General BRADLEY. Yes. I do not believe we should get involved in a land war in Asia if we can possibly avoid it.

Senator BRIDGES. Then you do not agree with a certain United States Senator who said the other day that in case Communist China or Russia attacked India we would be in war in an hour, or something like that?

General BRADLEY. I did not hear the statement. I still repeat that I would hate very much to see us involved in a land war in Asia.

Senator BRIDGES. Then what I am getting at, you are consistent whether it is China, Indochina, India, or Siam or what not, you have a basic thought for considering all factors that we should not be involved with our own troops on the mainland of Asia.

General BRADLEY. It of course depends on the circumstances at the time, but right now I feel as I said in my statement here, I think we would be fighting a wrong war at the wrong place and against a wrong enemy. (p. 753)

\* \* \* \* \*  
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER<sup>3</sup>

General Eisenhower's views on Viet Nam are clearly defined and explained in Chapter XIV of his book, *Mandate for Change*. The Chapter gives the reader a clear insight into how one President tried to cope with the diplomatic and military situation during the time of the French fighting in Indochina.

Early in 1954, Eisenhower wrote that he had the following thoughts on the war on Viet Nam:

"Another consideration in any conceivable intervention was the type of forces which might be employed. There seemed to be no dearth of defensive ground strength in Indochina. I told my associates in January of 1954 that I could not at that moment see the value of putting United States ground forces in Southeast Asia.

"One possibility was to support the French with air strikes, possibly from carriers, on Communist installations around Dien Bien

Phu. There were grave doubts in my mind about the effectiveness of such air strikes on deployed troops where good cover was plentiful. Employment of air strikes alone to support French forces in the jungle would create a double jeopardy; it would comprise an act of war and would also entail the risk of having intervened and lost. Air power might be temporarily beneficial to French morale, but I had no intention of using United States forces in any limited action when the force employed would probably not be decisively effective." (p. 341)

Throughout early 1954 Eisenhower and Dulles tried to sell the idea abroad that any American intervention in the fighting would have to meet at least two qualifications: One, there would have to be approval from Congress, and two, American ground troops would be committed to Viet Nam only if there were several Allied countries joining simultaneously in the fighting.

On April 4, 1954, President Eisenhower wrote to Winston Churchill explaining his ideas of a "regional grouping" of several countries, who would come to the aid of the French forces. Near the end of the letter, the following sentences appear: "The important thing is that the coalition be strong and it must be willing to join the fight if necessary. I do not envisage the need of any appreciable ground forces on your or our part. . . ." [Emphasis added.] (p. 347)

As events at Dien Bien Phu were coming to a devastating conclusion and the meetings in Geneva were starting to go into high gear, President Eisenhower wrote to General Gruenther at NATO headquarters:

"As you know, you and I started more than three years ago trying to convince the French that they could not win the Indochina war and particularly could not get real American support in that region unless they would unequivocally pledge independence to the Associated States upon the achievement of military victory. Along with this—indeed as a corollary to it—this Administration has been arguing that no Western power can go to Asia militarily, except as one of a concert of powers, which concert must include local Asiatic peoples." (p. 352)

As the situation at Dien Bien Phu became hopelessly lost, Eisenhower commented in the following way:

"We discussed once more the possibility of United States intervention by an air strike in Indochina. Although the three service chiefs—Army, Navy, Air Force—had recommended against this course, there was some merit in the argument that the psychological effect of an air strike would raise French and Vietnamese morale and improve, at least temporarily, the entire situation.

"During the course of this meeting I remarked that if the United States were, unilaterally, to permit its forces to be drawn into conflict in Indochina and in a succession of Asian wars, the end result would be to drain off our resources and to weaken our over-all defensive position. If we, without allies should ever find ourselves fighting at various places all over the region, and if Red Chinese aggressive participation were clearly identified, then we could scarcely avoid, I said, considering the necessity of striking directly at the head instead of the tail of the snake, Red China itself." (p. 354)

Throughout this chapter there are a number of inferences that Eisenhower had serious reservations about engaging the Communists with all-out military force in Indochina.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, you see my name on this resolution, and I do not cavalierly or casually sign anything in this House.

I became a signer of this particular resolution for three reasons—the first because I appreciate and understand the beliefs of the American people. The American people believe that Congress ought to have a balance of power with the President. The American people have just learned that the President has sent his group out to back up or to bring a report on the basis of his action. They think, and they question in my district and I suspect some in your districts, are questioning and wondering what the Congress is doing.

I think the fact that the President did name this commission on his behalf is even more strongly an argument why the House should take the action suggested by this resolution. You may say that what people believe is wrong, and you may be right. Beliefs are often operative facts. I remind Members of the story of Othello. We as readers know that none of the things Othello believed about his wife are true, but she is just as dead in the third act as if they were true. That is the operative effect of belief.

The American people believe that the American Congress ought to be more active in terms of the problems in Vietnam. I think we ought to back up that belief by an examination to find out what the facts are and the answers to questions that have been raised and especially to those that have not yet been raised.

Some Members have spoken about a military review. I am not interested, and I hope that the committee will not be interested in jawboning or justifying what has been done. The important question to us is, What has happened to the options for our policy in Vietnam? We have to have an assessment of those options that is independent so that we can take our stand on the basis of our power as an independent branch of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have two other reasons for backing this resolution. The next reason is the House needs to have enlightenment on the status of our existing options.

Third, because of the need of the House to find alternatives to our military involvement in Vietnam, we ought to support the resolution. When we take out 500,000 men, we are going to be doing something to the economy of that country which must be balanced out. When we begin to remove our troops, we leave our installations, and I am anxious to know where the \$3 to \$6 billion of investment in installations is going. The House should have the answer to such questions. I hope the House will go out and find the answer to these questions.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the resolution, I rise in support of the resolution and commend the gentleman from Mississippi for taking the initiative in sponsoring the legislation. I subscribe to most of the reasons that have already been stated for supporting the resolution.

I would like to make a couple of addi-

<sup>2</sup> The Bradley quotation is from: *Military Situation in the Far East*. Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess. Part 2. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. (May 15 through May 31, 1951.)

<sup>3</sup> All Eisenhower quotations from: *Mandate for Change*. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963. Chapter XIV, "Chaos in Indochina."

tional comments. I find it strange indeed that some of the people who are opposing the resolution on the floor of the House are echoing the same sentiments, and are talking about getting all sides of the spectrum represented. I have great confidence in the leadership of this House that it will be fair in selecting this committee. But those gentlemen who are questioning this resolution are precisely akin to some people who have been coming into my office day after day after day for the last 45 days, and they have been saying, "Oh, is it not terrible? Is it not terrible? The President is too powerful. The Congress should take action but they are not doing anything."

Here is a chance for Congress to do something. I commend the gentleman from Mississippi for taking the initiative in doing something. The point many people are missing in discussing the balance of power between the Executive and Congress is the fact that if an imbalance exists, and I think it does, a contributing factor is the failure of Congress to reform its procedures as a first step toward redressing that imbalance.

The other point I wish to make in support of this resolution is that although it is perfectly true that there are other committees of this House which may have jurisdiction in this general area, the sad fact of the matter is that for the time being, at least, those committees do not appear to be acting in this area. I commend the gentleman from Mississippi for taking the initiative.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Just because someone happens to oppose this resolution is no sign they are all in the category you are talking about.

Mr. CLEVELAND. If I made that implication, I take it back. I said "some of them." That is what I really meant to say. I did not mean to include the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not feel that either the Armed Services Committee of the House or the Foreign Affairs Committee has slackened in any way in its attention to matters having to do with Southeast Asia or any part of that area. This resolution to my mind is not in response to that kind of situation or anything of that nature. These two regular standing committees have general longtime jurisdiction of all kinds in the area of their definition, and to have a select committee to find facts with respect to a particular ad hoc situation has long been the practice of this body.

That is all that is being sought by the resolution before us. It is in response to the fact that there is in this country a tremendous interest at this point in the military affair in Southeast Asia. Many people have come to Washington not only to make their views and concerns about this war known to the President

of the United States, but, as each Member of this body well knows, they have also come to Capitol Hill to make their views known to their elected representatives in the legislative branch of this Government of ours.

To ignore a responsibility in respect to the war and to state that it is a matter solely in the jurisdiction of the executive branch is to ignore the very basic division of powers and responsibilities of our Government which are shared by the three branches and which this legislative branch has, since the beginning of the situation in Southeast Asia, had to assume considerable responsibility.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. I want to express the prayerful hope that those who are appointed to go to South Vietnam and to Southeast Asia do not come back brainwashed as many did who have been over there.

I have been on the Defense Appropriation Committee for years. I have had all kinds of glowing promises made about the war. At one time we were told by our former Secretary of Defense that the boys would be home by Christmas. The next year he said that now we see the end of the tunnel. The next year he said that we have stopped losing the war. Then the next year he said that we are winning the war. I am threadbare with these glowing pictures painted by those who go over there. Again I say, my prayerful hope is that those who go will not be brainwashed by certain people in South Vietnam.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama. I think what the gentleman has said is quite important.

It is quite important also that this body have its own independent judgment and knowledge with respect to such recent developments as the Vietnamization program and how good it is, and how fast the armed forces of Vietnam are coming along in order to assume the burden of that war, and how well pacification is coming along, and how realistic is the pace of withdrawal that has been announced by the executive branch of the Government. What can we tell the people we represent about these things? They ask us. They expect us to know. We have a responsibility to find out for ourselves.

Further, I hope if it is at all possible that the select committee might be able to turn up facts which would be helpful in the prisoners-of-war problem.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment relative to the committee appointed by President Johnson at the time of the elections in South Vietnam, when I had suggested a committee such as the one being suggested today. The committee was appointed and went

out. I did not serve as a member of that committee, but I went out there on my own, and strangely enough the committee appointed by the President viewed the elections from the Caravelle Hotel and had very little time in the countryside.

I think an important point was an observation made by one of the gentlemen before, that if this committee goes out, it must have some Vietnamese interpreters, so the members can understand what is going on and not be led around by the nose as the previous committees have been.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments about the previous committee that went there to observe the election several years ago. It triggers my mind to state what the relationship might be between this proposed select committee and the committee sent to Vietnam by the President.

In the first place, that is an executive committee. Its itinerary and its actions and its makeup were determined by the executive department. It functions under and serves that branch of Government.

I would hope that the select committee, if formed, would give due consideration to whatever facts are determined by that Presidential committee, use whatever information it found available from it, but would cover the bases which had not been covered by that committee and would cover the bases which needed to be covered more thoroughly than it has covered during its short existence.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. I presume the gentleman from California is speaking in support of the resolution? Does he have any information as to the accuracy of the figures given by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) who said 173 Members of Congress had made factfinding trips to Vietnam? Does the gentleman know whether the number has been 175 or 200 or more?

Mr. HOSMER. I do not have the figure. I know many of the Congressmen, in response to their responsibility as high officials of the U.S. Government, to handle whatever questions the Congress has to handle, have felt it wise to go out there. I know that the gentleman himself has taken the time and trouble to do so.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, you will recall we were in Vietnam, you as a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and myself as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I recall we were there together in January 1968 just prior to the Tet offensive of that year. Does the gentleman feel that our trip was completely successful and we were able to get all the facts we would hope or preferred to have come home with? I cannot speak for the gentleman from California but the only time I felt I was really learning anything or not being led about to see only what we should see, was when I managed to separate myself from our escorts on two different afternoons. I learned more on those two days than

all the other time combined. The reason was I was not in company with the military, and without an escort. During those hours, I saw and learned much more than when I was guided and directed where to go and what to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have no way to know by what vote of the Rules Committee this resolution comes to the floor today. Like other Members, I can observe that House Resolution 976 has portions struck through and other portions printed in italics which indicate it is a much changed resolution from that which was submitted by the joint sponsor of the resolution.

There are several reasons why I cannot support this resolution. The foremost reason is that some portions of the resolutions are inconsistent with other portions. In other words it is incongruous within itself. It is an incongruous document. To emphasize such a charge one has only to look at page 2, line 7, where it is stated the select committee is to proceed immediately to Southeast Asia to investigate all aspects of our involvement there. Then on page 3, after line 3, the title has been amended to state that the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the select committee of the House to study the recent developments of Southeast Asia. Thus while on page 2, the committee is charged to investigate all aspects of our involvement; on page 3 they are excused from such strenuous duties and permitted to investigate only recent developments. Perhaps that was a well taken afterthought because no committee, no matter how efficient or no matter how large a staff, can accomplish a very thorough investigation of all aspects of our involvement and proceed to write any kind of a report on the results of their investigation within 45 days. It is just not humanly possible. Yet that is what the committee is required to do under the language of line 10 on page 2 of the resolution.

The second reason that prompts me to oppose this resolution is that the preamble which should serve as a guideline to the select committee has been stricken. That preamble contained three paragraphs, the first of which is not factually true but the second and third paragraphs should have been retained to serve as directions of the House to the select committee which it is creating by this resolution.

Mr. HOSMER. Everyone has his own techniques for obtaining and evaluating information.

I may say to the gentleman, until one gets to the Congress itself, even, one really does not understand what this great institution really is and its manifold implications. That is an indication of the value of personally taking a look at things which you should know about if you are to deal with them responsibly.

And, I would like to respond to whoever brought up the matter of a reservist being unable to function fairly on this select committee. The purpose of the committee is to ascertain facts, not whitewash anybody and it could not do so if it wanted to. It appears to me that a person with some past or present mili-

tary experience might better be able to determine the facts than someone else. At least, he would understand the lingo.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. In answer to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) said that there were about 175 Members who had been to Vietnam during the war years. We have been over there about 6 years. If we divide six into 175 we get an average of less than 30 Members per year who have been over there.

Mr. HOSMER. Which averages 2½ per month.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. It seems to me that less than 30 Members a year going to Vietnam is certainly not too many.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I should like to ask a question, but first I should like to make a statement.

The men in Vietnam are doing their duty in winning that aspect of the war. We are losing it back here. What earthly reason could we have to go there and investigate policy formulated here in the State Department, here at the White House and here at the Pentagon? What could we learn about policy at the battlefield in Vietnam?

Mr. HOSMER. I am going to regard the gentleman's words as entirely a statement rather than in part a question.

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

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this resolution.

With relation to the question of economy I believe this is a poor time to permit such a minuscule sum of money to interfere with any action that would aid in resolving the overriding problem of our Nation—the war in Southeast Asia.

Intelligence comes in many and varied forms. If the select committee is properly apportioned and selected, Congress and the Nation can only benefit.

However, my relationship with military investigation has been extensive and enlightening. I can assure the gentleman that if the committee follows the prescribed route I would suggest very strongly it would result in an exercise and be nothing more than a futile effort.

My productivity increased when I ceased to inform the military of my presence on military installations in the course of conducting investigations of abuses on the various bases throughout the country.

I suggest strongly that this committee be sent. However, before they embark they should uncover or develop sources of information so that they will have contacts when they get there. The opponents of this resolution bewilder me in the light of hue and cry across the Nation seeking an end to the war and greater participation by Congress. This is Congress' constitutional prerogative and duty. Hence it ill behooves anyone to

deny Members of the House any source of information. This source may well be received with greater creditability than some have been provided to date, and is oft contradictory.

Mr. HOSMER. If the gentleman will permit me to say this, I believe we can find 12 Members in this House who are not about to be conned by anybody, who can come back with facts upon which their colleagues can rely.

Let me say further that, after listening to the copious words of tribute to the Speaker only a week or two ago, I think we can feel full confidence in his ability and determination to form a balanced committee which will do its job in a balanced way.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I would like to make a suggestion. Since it is going to take a couple of battalions to protect these 12, and since the gentleman from Mississippi thinks that everybody wants to take a look, I do not want to go, but I think the other 422 plus the 12 should be sent over and give them all a rifle, and in that way we can release the two battalions from having to give protection to them.

Mr. HOSMER. Let me say, having been there a couple of times, that the gentleman's statement is an exaggeration by at least two battalions.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of the proposal, I urge my colleagues to lend their support to House Resolution 976, a bill to authorize a 12-man select committee to go to Southeast Asia, study firsthand recent developments in the area, and within 30 days from its inception report its findings to the House. In this connection, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for his dedicated and tireless efforts which have been instrumental in bringing this proposal before the House today.

In my judgment, the need for this committee is in no way diminished by the fact that the President's Special Fact-finding Commission is in the process of compiling a report on its trip to the battle zone. I believe the House should act to provide a balance to the President's Commission because although the fact-finding group certainly will provide a valuable service to the country by virtue of its activities and report, I believe the situation in Southeast Asia to be so complex that more than 96 hours would be needed to be spent in the area if any individual or group were to obtain the most functional perspective.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House would provide a 30-day investigation and report period. This would be far more appropriate a time frame to operate under. I say this based on personal experience, for 2 years ago I spent approximately 1 week touring the embattled area of South Vietnam. In the course of my travels I achieved a much greater understanding of the forces at work in Vietnam and the progress we were making in the war; however, I believe my

perception and judgments would have been even more acute had I been able to spend more time in the country itself.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this select committee would provide an extremely valuable internal factfinding instrument for the House of Representatives. As such it would provide a needed balance in the present reporting mix on the status and level of our current involvement in Southeast Asia. This balance would be enhanced by the Speaker's insuring that the 12 Members appointed to the committee will be of varying points of view with regard to present policies in Southeast Asia. This issue is far too important for its resolution to be affected by partisan politics, or political ambitions.

I urge the passage of House Resolution 976.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, if adopted, will create something that cannot possibly work. For 15 years, I have chaired investigating committees of this House. One of them has gone out to Vietnam at least three times in the last 4 years and it has taken literally months of careful and diligent work in advance of the committee going out in order to have information showing where investigative effort should be concentrated to produce any meaningful results. This contemplates immediate departure upon adoption. It will take 45 days to find a competent staff. Yet the committee must go out, investigate, and report back. I can assure you, again speaking from a great deal of experience, that you cannot do it. It just is not within the realm of possibility. You can have 45 men who will go out and look and see and learn something, but they will not make a comprehensive investigation of even the activity in Vietnam much less the involvement in Cambodia, in Laos, or in Thailand. This is self-delusion.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge that the House not indulge in it. Let us, if we are going to have a committee, give them the time, give them the staff, and let them go out and do the kind of a job that this Congress is worthy of producing. Let us not give an inferior product hastily put together to the American people.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, with many reservations I will support this resolution on the chance that it will produce even one iota of information that will be helpful in bringing about a peaceful solution and in preventing future Vietnams. Properly, it would be preferable for the Foreign Affairs Committee to have acted to provide the background on present, past, or future foreign policy aspects of the problem, with other standing committees making appropriate inquiries within their jurisdictions.

But my feeling is that these committees do not seem to have handled the problem comprehensively to date, nor have executive factfindings done so.

It is essential that the Congress, and especially the House, strengthen its role

in factfinding and policy formation in foreign affairs. Perhaps the proposed commission can help do that. If so it will be worth the effort.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to confirm what the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) said earlier in the debate; that is, it is the policy of the Committee on Rules to eliminate all "whereases" in the resolutions that are reported out of the Committee on Rules. This has been a standard practice for many years, and that is the reason why, as the gentleman from California explained, the "whereases" in the preamble of this resolution were eliminated. It was to follow out the general policies of the Committee on Rules over the past many years.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY).

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I am convinced we can do no more than profit by all of the information we get in any manner on what is going on in Southeast Asia. I rise because I support the integrity of every Member of this body and the belief that they will go out and do a fair factfinding job and come back with valuable knowledge, and, of course, all knowledge has some value.

Moreover, I support the resolution because the only place I can find this House is on record in terms of the President's policies in Southeast Asia refers back to the date when we voted over my opposition for the resolution which the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) presented, which, in a sense, subscribed to all that the President was doing in Southeast Asia. That resolution was so interpreted by the minority leader (Mr. FORD) as an endorsement, a vote of confidence, in President Nixon's policies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the record is clear in this resolution that we think we had better take a second look and send a select committee over there to take that second look. Evidently, we are less confident in the undertakings of the executive branch.

So, I look upon this resolution as a repealer of the Wright resolution and I shall, therefore, support it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, there is no man in this House that I admire more as a friend and as a legislator than I do the author of this resolution. But, I must rise in opposition to it.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress wants to do something about the affair in Southeast Asia, then why not fall in behind our Executive leadership in fighting this war to a successful conclusion. There can be no political negotiations as long as we are dealing from weakness. Let us get the military advantage which we must have. Let us unite behind our leadership. Let us show the people of America that we are not yellow dogs and run with our tail between our legs at every sign of opposition. Let us get the military superiority and prove it and then they

will come to the conference table. We can deal from strength and not from weakness and we can get this thing over.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on our side to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the only way to make our dreams come true is to stay awake. We have before us a resolution that is going to provide us with information so we can go home and talk to our constituents between now and November about what the Congress, the House of Representatives that is charged with passing all appropriation bills first is doing about Vietnam, about Cambodia, and about the way we are spending money for the defense of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleagues that I am a little bit surprised that we have opposition to this resolution, much less what the consequences will be if you vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, we are the elected Representatives of the people. If we are not even willing to find out from Members of our own body as to what is really going on in Southeast Asia, how can we be spokesmen for our people? If you heard a burglar outside your door would you call someone downtown to come and find out what the noise is or would you go see for yourself?

Let us determine for ourselves what is going on and then maybe we can speak with a little bit of authority. I have before me a copy of the Thursday, June 4, issue of the southern Illinoisan newspaper with two Associated Press dispatches. One headline reads "Objectives Won, Nixon Tells United States." Then, on the same page in daring headlines "Senior Military Officers on Cambodia Say, 'It's Too Early To Tell.'"

Mr. Speaker, if the President and the top military people in the field fighting the war are in disagreement about what is going on, how can we possibly know? I hope the President is right, but I want the Congress to report, then we can make a better judgment on what to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished friend from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for allowing me to join with him in cosponsoring this important proposal and also to commend him for his hard work in bringing out the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I came here with an open mind and have listened to this debate.

It appears to me that this resolution, if it passes, will accomplish nothing. They will come back with varying opinions and muddy the water. I agree with the gentleman from Texas who spoke a moment ago to the effect that I have full faith and confidence in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the Committee on Armed Services, and above all in the Commander in Chief. I do not think we should cloud the picture any further as it has already been clouded by the varying pronouncements of the approximately 175 Members who have already visited Southeast Asia. This proposed

trip indicates lack of confidence in the two great committees of the House: Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

I supported President Johnson and I strongly support President Nixon, our one and only Commander in Chief. I am going to vote against this resolution for those reasons. To do otherwise is to prolong the war because of the various political viewpoints which the committee members will express and can only lead the enemy to believe we have no guts to see this struggle through to a successful conclusion. The news media will really have a field day exploiting this foolish trip.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 976, a resolution to immediately send a select committee of 12 Members of the House of Representatives to Southeast Asia to investigate the aspects of U.S. military involvement in that area.

I am cosponsoring this resolution with my good friend and colleague, Mr. Montgomery of Mississippi, and many other Members of the House in a bipartisan effort to obtain the facts regarding past and present developments in Southeast Asia.

The use of military forces in Vietnam and now in Cambodia has been the subject of intense concern and debate across the Nation and in Congress. I am very concerned about the many conflicting reports on the factual situation in Southeast Asia, which seem to be coming from a number of different sources.

I certainly think that the people of our Nation and the Members of Congress would greatly benefit from the proposed committee's accounting of the facts surrounding our involvement in Southeast Asia, particularly in view of recent developments.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting House Resolution 976.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against House Resolution 976, a bill to establish a 12-member select committee to study the recent developments in Southeast Asia.

We have been over and over this ground. The central question that we face is: When are we going to extricate ourselves from this Southeast Asian "quagmire"? I have constantly fought to have our military commitments in Southeast Asia ended. As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I have studied these issues in depth. My conclusion has been consistent. We should get out now.

The central question, Mr. Speaker, is whether we have enough information to make a reasoned decision. I feel that the correct congressional response is not further "study" but a positive assertion of congressional authority.

This is an unnecessary bill and should be defeated.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose House Resolution 976. One portion of the resolution states that there shall be an investigation of all aspects of our involvement. This is completely incongruous with another portion of the resolution which relieves the commit-

tee after they have studied only the recent developments in Southeast Asia. It is quite obvious and apparent that two sections of the resolutions fly in the face of each other. They tend to pull the committee in opposite directions. Maybe that portion which holds the committee only to the study of recent developments is a more reasonable commission because the resolution requires not only that all facts be investigated about our military involvement but that a detailed report be prepared and submitted to the House all within 45 days following the adoption of this resolution. I submit this is impossible to accomplish.

Most of us would gladly support this resolution if it were not a fact that there have already been an overwhelming number of investigations by Members of the Congress in the past. I suppose it would take quite a bit of book work to find out exactly how many Members of Congress have visited Vietnam since the commencement of hostilities. One Member has said facetiously that the body count of the Members of Congress who have served in Vietnam runs over 175 and is approaching the 200 mark. Yes, Vietnam has been investigated and investigated and investigated. Some valuable information has been brought back but along with this has been a lot of misinformation.

I will not support this resolution today because one committee recently appointed by the executive branch had Members from both bodies of Congress. It is my understanding that this committee worked somewhat over 3 days but less than a total of 4 days and are now on their way home. Certainly this House should weigh and consider the report of this committee before we indulge in the formation of another select committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of the paramount reasons that we should defeat this resolution today is that the House and Senate have established regularly constituted committees to do this job. It should be done with the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee or the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. What are these regular committees for if it is not to investigate our involvement in Southeast Asia?

This resolution seems to leave the implication or the innuendo that the Congress is not now possessed of the facts about our military involvement in Southeast Asia. The adoption of this resolution would be an admission that all we have done about Vietnam and all that has been approved by the standing committees and then once again approved on the floor of both bodies of Congress had been done without any knowledge or any investigation of the facts of our involvement. Of course, such an innuendo or implication is not only inaccurate, it is ridiculous.

To oppose this resolution today is not to ignore any responsibility of the Congress or to turn anything over to the executive branch. Our standing committees have worked long and diligently to get the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why the preamble of this resolution was stricken. I could not have supported

the resolution if the first paragraph alone had been retained and the last two stricken because the first paragraph alleges that the Cambodian incursion has added a new dimension to the war. Many of us do not believe this to be the fact. The second paragraph is harmless and inoffensive. We all know that deployment of our military forces has been the subject of intense debate in the Congress. That is a truism. But why was the third paragraph stricken? The Congress needs as much accurate and detailed information as possible to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities. If this resolution is to mean anything then this paragraph of the preamble should have been retained as a guideline for the select committee. In other words, the preamble itself is somewhat like the content of the body of the resolution. Part of it is untrue, part of it is unnecessary and meaningless, and an important part that should have been retained has been stricken out.

Now I am not suggesting that if this resolution is approved and if this committee is appointed by the Speaker that it will be weighted by those members who would prejudice before they investigate, or develop preconceived conclusions before the report was written. I am not suggesting that there would be a white-wash in any sense of the term. I do not believe that it would be fair to say this would be just another junket for about a dozen members. I do suggest that this is no way to investigate our involvement. Our fighting men are trying to do their duty. If there is any failure of policy it is not in Vietnam but right here in Washington. Our military personnel are trying hard to achieve their objective. Someone has said it would take nearly a battalion of our troops to protect this committee. That may be exaggeration, but I think the Members of Congress should keep out of the way of our men.

If we pass this resolution today, it means we will telegraph ahead that another committee had been formed and when it will arrive in Vietnam. All the window dressing will be ready upon arrival. Another committee is not needed. It will not accomplish a thing. It will cost a substantial sum of money after all the experts, consultants, technicians, clerks, and stenographic assistance called for on page 2 have been paid and then reimbursed for their travel and subsistence. While the expense will be substantial there is no assurance of a productive result or even any possible forecast of the consequences such a report might produce.

This resolution should never have been brought to the floor at this time. It should be defeated.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Chair entertain a motion to recommit with an amendment to the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The

Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that a motion to recommit is not in order on a resolution from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 80, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—246

Abbutt	Devine	McClory
Adair	Dickinson	McCloskey
Albert	Donohue	McClure
Anderson, Calif.	Dowdy	McCulloch
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan	McDonald, Mich.
Anderson, Tenn.	Dwyer	McFall
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, Ala.	McKneally
Andrews, N. Dak.	Erlenborn	Madden
Annunzio	Eshleman	Mahon
Arends	Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard
Beall, Md.	Feighan	Marsh
Belcher	Findley	Martin
Bell, Calif.	Flowers	Matsunaga
Bennett	Flynt	May
Berry	Foreman	Mayne
Betts	Fountain	Melcher
Bevill	Frelinghuysen	Michel
Biaggi	Frey	Miller, Ohio
Blackburn	Friedel	Minish
Blanton	Fuqua	Minshall
Blatnik	Gallifanakis	Mize
Boggs	Garmatz	Mizell
Boland	Gibbons	Montgomery
Bow	Goldwater	Morton
Brinkley	Gray	Myers
Brock	Griffin	Natcher
Brooks	Gross	Neisen
Brotzman	Grover	O'Neal, Ga.
Brown, Mich.	Gubser	Pelly
Brown, Ohio	Haley	Perkins
Broyhill, N.C.	Hall	Pettis
Broyhill, Va.	Hamilton	Philbin
Buchanan	Hammer-schmidt	Pickle
Burke, Fla.	Hanna	Pirnle
Burleson, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Poage
Burlison, Mo.	Harsha	Poff
Burton, Utah	Harvey	Price, Tex.
Byrne, Pa.	Hastings	Pryor, Ark.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays	Pucinski
Cabell	Hébert	Purcell
Caffery	Henderson	Quie
Camp	Hogan	Quillen
Casey	Holifield	Randall
Cederberg	Hosmer	Rarick
Celler	Howard	Reid, Ill.
Chamberlain	Hull	Reifel
Chappell	Hunt	Roberts
Clancy	Hutchinson	Robison
Clark	Ichord	Rodino
Clausen, Don H.	Jarman	Roe
Clewson, Del.	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Cleveland	Johnson, Pa.	Rostenkowski
Collier	Jonas	Roth
Collins	Jones, Ala.	Ruppe
Colmer	Jones, N.C.	Sandman
Conable	Kazen	Satterfield
Corbett	Kee	Saylor
Corman	Keith	Scherle
Coughlin	King	Schneebeli
Cramer	Kleppe	Schwengel
Daniels, N.J.	Kluczynski	Scott
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Sebelius
Davis, Wis.	Kyl	Shriver
de la Garza	Landgrebe	Sikes
Delaney	Langen	Skisk
Dellenback	Latta	Skubitz
Denney	Lennon	Slack
Dennis	Lloyd	Smith, Calif.
Dent	Long, La.	Smith, Iowa
	Long, Md.	Smith, N.Y.
	Lukens	Snyder
		Springer

Stafford  
Stanton  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stevens  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Sullivan  
Taft  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.

Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, Wis.  
Udall  
Waggonner  
Wampler  
Watts  
White  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams

Wilson, Charles H.  
Winn  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wyllie  
Wyman  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach

Mr. Kyros with Mr. Crane.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Bush.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lujan.  
Mr. Fascell with Mr. McEwen.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reid of New York.  
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Ruth.  
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Schadeberg.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Watson.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Roudebush.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Mathias.  
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Whitehurst.  
Mr. Mann with Mr. Wold.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Mollohan.  
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.  
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Preyer of North Carolina.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Passman.  
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Vigorito.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.  
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Burton of California.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Kirwan.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Gettys.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Daniel of Virginia.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Harrington.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Mills.  
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Symington.  
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Gilbert.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ottinger.  
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Nix.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Gaydos.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Rhodes.

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

Mr. BROOKS and Mr. YOUNG changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 101, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

YEAS—224

NAYS—80

Adams  
Addabbo  
Ashley  
Blester  
Bingham  
Brademas  
Broomfield  
Burke, Mass.  
Button  
Carey  
Clay  
Cohelan  
Cunningham  
Eckhardt  
Edwards, Calif.  
Elberg  
Esch  
Evans, Colo.  
Flood  
Foley  
Ford,  
William D.  
Fraser  
Fulton, Pa.  
Gonzalez  
Green, Pa.  
Griffiths  
Gude

Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Heckler, Mass.  
Helstoski  
Hicks  
Horton  
Burke, Mass.  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Koch  
Leggett  
Lowenstein  
McDade  
Macdonald, Mass.  
Meeds  
Mikva  
Mink  
Monagan  
Morgan  
Morse  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, Ill.  
Nedzi  
Obey  
O'Hara

O'Konski  
Olsen  
Patman  
Pike  
Podell  
Rees  
Riegler  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Roybal  
Ryan  
Shipley  
Stokes  
Tiernan  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Waldie  
Whalen  
Wolf  
Wydler  
Yates  
Yatron

NOT VOTING—103

Abernethy  
Alexander  
Ashbrook  
Aspinall  
Ayres  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bolling  
Brasco  
Bray  
Brown, Calif.  
Burton, Calif.  
Bush  
Carter  
Chisholm  
Conte  
Conyers  
Cowger  
Crane  
Culver  
Daddario  
Daniel, Va.  
Dawson  
Derwinski  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dorn  
Downing  
Dulski  
Edmondson  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fascell  
Fish  
Fisher

Ford, Gerald R.  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Gallagher  
Gaydos  
Gettys  
Gaimo  
Gilbert  
Goodling  
Green, Oreg.  
Hagan  
Halpern  
Hanley  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harrington  
Hungate  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kirwan  
Kyros  
Landrum  
Lujan  
McCarthy  
McEwen  
McMillan  
MacGregor  
Mann  
Mathias  
Meskill  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills  
Mollohan  
Moorhead  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Nichols  
Nix  
O'Neill, Mass.

Ottinger  
Passman  
Pepper  
Pollock  
Powell  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Rallsback  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Rivers  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Roudebush  
Ruth  
St Germain  
Schadeberg  
Scheuer  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stratton  
Symington  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tunney  
Vigorito  
Watkins  
Watson  
Weicker  
Whalley  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Wilson, Bob  
Wold

Abbutt	Camp	Fraser
Adair	Carey	Frelinghuysen
Adams	Cederberg	Frey
Addabbo	Chamberlain	Friedel
Albert	Chappell	Fuqua
Anderson, Calif.	Clancy	Gallifanakis
Anderson, Tenn.	Clausen,	Garmatz
Andrews, Ala.	Don H.	Gibbons
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cleveland	Goldwater
Annunzio	Collins	Gonzalez
Arends	Colmer	Gray
Ashley	Corbett	Green, Pa.
Bell, Calif.	Corman	Griffin
Bennett	Coughlin	Grover
Bevill	Cramer	Gubser
Biaggi	Daniels, N.J.	Gude
Blester	Davis, Ga.	Haley
Blackburn	Dellenback	Hamilton
Blanton	Dennis	Hammer-schmidt
Blatnik	Donohue	Hanna
Boggs	Dowdy	Hansen, Idaho
Brademas	Duncan	Harsha
Brotzman	Dwyer	Hastings
Brown, Mich.	Edmondson	Hathaway
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, La.	Hechler, W. Va.
Broyhill, N.C.	Elberg	Heckler, Mass.
Broyhill, Va.	Erlenborn	Henderson
Burke, Fla.	Esch	Hogan
Burke, Mass.	Eshleman	Holifield
Burlison, Mo.	Evins, Tenn.	Hosmer
Button	Feighan	Howard
Byrne, Pa.	Findley	Hunt
Caffery	Flowers	Ichord
	Foley	Jacobs
	Foreman	
	Fountain	

So the previous question was ordered. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ayres.  
Mr. Downing with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Gaimo with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Goodling.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Meskill.  
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Rallsback.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Watkins.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Weicker.  
Mr. Baring with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ashbrook.



Jarman	Melcher	Roybal
Johnson, Calif.	Michel	Ruppe
Johnson, Pa.	Miller, Ohio	Sandman
Jonas	Minish	Satterfield
Jones, Ala.	Mink	Saylor
Jones, N.C.	Mizell	Scott
Kazen	Montgomery	Sebellius
Kee	Mosher	Shriver
Keith	Myers	Sikes
King	Natcher	Sisk
Kleppe	Nelsen	Skubitz
Kluczynski	Obey	Slack
Koch	Olsen	Smith, Iowa
Kuykendall	O'Neal, Ga.	Snyder
Kyl	Patten	Springer
Landgrebe	Perkins	Stafford
Langen	Pettis	Stanton
Latta	Pickle	Steiger, Ariz.
Lennon	Pike	Stephens
Lloyd	Pirnie	Stubblefield
Long, La.	Poage	Stuckey
Long, Md.	Podell	Taft
Lukens	Poff	Taylor
McCloskey	Price, Tex.	Teague, Tex.
McClure	Pryor, Ark.	Udall
McCulloch	Pucinski	Ullman
McDade	Purcell	Van Deerlin
McDonald,	Quile	Vander Jagt
Mich.	Quillen	Waggonner
McFall	Rarick	Wampler
McKneally	Rees	Watts
Macdonald,	Reid, Ill.	White
Mass.	Reifel	Widnall
Madden	Riegle	Wiggins
Mahon	Roberts	Williams
Mailliard	Robison	Winn
Marsh	Rodino	Wolf
Martin	Roe	Wright
Matsunaga	Rogers, Fla.	Wyatt
May	Rostenkowski	Wydler
Meeds	Roth	Zwach

## NAYS—101

Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Calif.	O'Konski
Beall, Md.	Evans, Colo.	Patman
Belcher	Flood	Pelly
Berry	Flynt	Philbin
Betts	Ford	Randall
Bingham	William D.	Rhodes
Boland	Fulton, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Bow	Griffiths	Rooney, Pa.
Brinkley	Gross	Rosenthal
Brock	Hall	Ryan
Brooks	Harvey	Scherie
Broomfield	Hawkins	Schneebell
Buchanan	Hays	Shibley
Burleson, Tex.	Helstoski	Smith, Calif.
Burton, Utah	Hicks	Steiger, Wis.
Byrnes, Wis.	Horton	Stokes
Cabell	Hull	Sullivan
Casey	Hutchinson	Talcott
Celler	Karsh	Teague, Calif.
Clark	Kastenmeier	Thompson, Ga.
Clawson, Del	Leggett	Thomson, Wis.
Clay	Lowenstein	Tierman
Cohelan	McClory	Vanik
Collier	Mayne	Waldie
Conable	Mikva	Whalen
Cunningham	Minshall	Wilson,
Davis, Wis.	Mize	Charles H.
de la Garza	Monagan	Wyman
Delaney	Morgan	Yates
Denney	Morse	Yatron
Dent	Morton	Young
Devine	Moss	Zablocki
Dickinson	Murphy, Ill.	Zion
Eckhardt	Nedzi	
Edwards, Ala.	O'Hara	

## NOT VOTING—104

Abernethy	Dorn	Landrum
Alexander	Downing	Lujan
Ashbrook	Dulski	McCarthy
Aspinall	Fallon	McEwen
Ayres	Farbstein	McMillan
Baring	Fascell	MacGregor
Barrett	Fish	Mann
Bolling	Fisher	Mathias
Brasco	Ford, Gerald R.	Meskill
Bray	Fulton, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Gallagher	Mills
Burton, Calif.	Gaydos	Mollohan
Bush	Gettys	Moorhead
Carter	Gialmo	Murphy, N.Y.
Chisholm	Gilbert	Nichols
Conte	Goodling	Nix
Conyers	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill, Mass.
Cowger	Hagan	Ottinger
Crane	Halpern	Passman
Culver	Hanley	Pepper
Daddario	Hansen, Wash.	Pollock
Daniel, Va.	Harrington	Powell
Dawson	Hungate	Preyer, N.C.
Derwinski	Jones, Tenn.	Price, Ill.
Diggs	Kirwan	Railsback
Dingell	Kyros	Reid, N.Y.

Reuss	Smith, N.Y.	Watson
Rivers	Staggers	Weicker
Rooney, N.Y.	Steed	Whalley
Roudebush	Stratton	Whitehurst
Ruth	Symington	Whitten
St Germain	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson, Bob
Schadeberg	Tunney	Wold
Scheuer	Vigorito	Wylie
Schwengel	Watkins	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ayres.  
Mr. Downing with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Goodling.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Meskill.  
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Railsback.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Watkins.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Weicker.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Crane.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Bush.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lujan.  
Mr. Fascell with Mr. McEwen.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reid of New York.  
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Ruth.  
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Schadeberg.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Watson.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Roudebush.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Mathias.  
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Whitehurst.  
Mr. Mann with Mr. Wold.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Mollohan.  
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.  
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Preyer of North Carolina.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Passman.  
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Vigorito.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Burton of California.  
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Kirwan.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Gettys.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Daniel of Virginia.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Harrington.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Mills.  
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Symington.  
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Gilbert.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ottinger.  
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Nix.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Gaydos.  
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Schwengel.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wylie.

Messrs. JACOBS and DUNCAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Whereas the use of United States troops in Cambodia and increased air activity over North Vietnam have added a new dimension to the war in Southeast Asia, and

Whereas such use of military forces of the United States has become the subject of intense debate in the Congress, and

Whereas the Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities should have accu-

rate and detailed information regarding the extent of the United States involvement in Southeast Asia: Now, therefore, be it

## COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO PREAMBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, strike out the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment to the preamble.

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 85, not voting 132, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—212

Abbutt	Edmondson	McKneally
Adair	Edwards, Ala.	Madden
Albert	Edwards, La.	Mahon
Anderson, Ill.	Erlenborn	Mailliard
Anderson,	Eshleman	Marsh
Tenn.	Feighan	Martin
Andrews, Ala.	Findley	Matsunaga
Andrews,	Flood	May
N. Dak.	Flowers	Mayne
Annuzio	Flynt	Melcher
Arends	Foreman	Michel
Beall, Md.	Fountain	Miller, Ohio
Belcher	Fuqua	Minshall
Bell, Calif.	Galifianakis	Mize
Bennett	Garmatz	Mizell
Berry	Gibbons	Montgomery
Betts	Goldwater	Morse
Bevill	Gray	Morton
Blackburn	Griffin	Myers
Blanton	Grover	Natcher
Bow	Gubser	Patten
Brinkley	Gude	Pelly
Brooks	Haley	Perkins
Brotzman	Hall	Pettis
Brown, Mich.	Hamilton	Philbin
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-	Pickle
Broyhill, N.C.	schmidt	Pirnie
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Poage
Buchanan	Harsha	Poff
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	Price, Tex.
Burleson, Tex.	Hastings	Pryor, Ark.
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	Pucinski
Burton, Utah	Hogan	Purcell
Button	Hosmer	Quillen
Byrne, Pa.	Howard	Rarick
Byrnes, Wis.	Hunt	Reid, Ill.
Cabell	Hutchinson	Rhodes
Caffery	Ichord	Roberts
Camp	Jarman	Rogers, Colo.
Casey	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Rostenkowski
Chamberlain	Jonas	Roth
Chappell	Jones, Ala.	Ruppe
Clancy	Jones, N.C.	Sandman
Clausen,	Kazen	Satterfield
Don H.	Kee	Saylor
Clawson, Del	Keith	Scherie
Cleveland	King	Scott
Collier	Kleppe	Sebellius
Collins	Kluczynski	Sikes
Colmer	Kuykendall	Sisk
Conable	Kyl	Skubitz
Corbett	Landgrebe	Slack
Cramer	Langen	Smith, Calif.
Cunningham	Latta	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Smith, N.Y.
Davis, Wis.	Lloyd	Snyder
de la Garza	Long, La.	Springer
Dellenback	Long, Md.	Stafford
Denney	Lukens	Steiger, Ariz.
Dennis	McCloskey	Steiger, Wis.
Devine	McCulloch	Stephens
Dickinson	McDonald,	Stubblefield
Dowdy	Mich.	Stuckey
Duncan	McFall	Sullivan

Taft Waggonner  
Talcott Wampler  
Taylor Watts  
Teague, Calif. White  
Thompson, Ga. Widnall  
Thomson, Wis. Williams  
Udall Winn  
Vander Jagt Wright

**NAYS—85**

Adams Griffiths  
Addabbo Gross  
Anderson, Calif. Hathaway  
Ashley Hays  
Biaggi Hechler, W. Va.  
Biester Heckler, Mass.  
Bingham Helstoski  
Blatnik Hicks  
Brademas Horton  
Broomfield Hull  
Burke, Mass. Jacobs  
Carey Karth  
Cohelan Koch  
Corman Leggett  
Coughlin Lowenstein  
Daniels, N.J. McDade  
Donohue Macdonald,  
Dwyer Mass.  
Eckhardt Meeds  
Eilberg Mikva  
Esch Minish  
Evans, Colo. Mink  
Foley Monagan  
Fraser Morgan  
Friedel Mosher  
Fulton, Pa. Moss  
Gonzalez Murphy, III.  
Green, Pa. Nedzi

**NOT VOTING—132**

Abernethy Ford,  
Alexander William D.  
Ashbrook Frelinghuysen  
Aspinall Frey  
Ayres Fulton, Tenn.  
Baring Gallagher  
Barrett Gaydos  
Boggs Gettys  
Boland Gialmo  
Bolling Gilbert  
Brasco Goodling  
Bray Green, Oreg.  
Brock Hagan  
Brown, Calif. Halpern  
Burton, Calif. Hanley  
Bush Hanna  
Carter Hansen, Wash.  
Celler Harrington  
Chisholm Hébert  
Clark Hollifield  
Clay Hungate  
Conte Jones, Tenn.  
Conyers Kastenmeier  
Cowger Kirwan  
Crane Kyros  
Culver Landrum  
Daddario Lujan  
Daniel, Va. McCarthy  
Dawson McClory  
Delaney McClure  
Dent McEwen  
Derwinski McMillan  
Diggs MacGregor  
Dingell Mann  
Dorn Mathias  
Downing Meskill  
Dulski Miller, Calif.  
Edwards, Calif. Mills  
Evins, Tenn. Mollohan  
Fallon Moorhead  
Farbstein Murphy, N.Y.  
Fascell Nelsen  
Fish Nichols  
Fisher Nix  
Ford, Gerald R. O'Neal, Ga.

Wyatt  
Wydler  
Wyman  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach  
Obey  
O'Hara  
O'Konski  
Olsen  
Patman  
Pike  
Podell  
Randall  
Rees  
Riegler  
Robison  
Rodino  
Rooney, Pa.  
Roybal  
Ryan  
Schneebeli  
Shipley  
Stanton  
Stokes  
Tiernan  
Tunney  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Walde  
Whalen  
Wolf  
Yates  
Yatron  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Ottinger  
Passman  
Pepper  
Pollock  
Powell  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Quie  
Rallsback  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reifel  
Reuss  
Rivers  
Roe  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rosenthal  
Roudebush  
Ruth  
St Germain  
Schadeberg  
Scheuer  
Schwengel  
Shriver  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stratton  
Symington  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Vigorito  
Watkins  
Watson  
Welcker  
Whalley  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Wiggins  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Wold  
Wylie  
Young

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Weicker.  
Mr. Baring with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Crane.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Bush.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lujan.  
Mr. Fascell with Mr. McEwen.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reid of New York.  
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Ruth.  
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Schadeberg.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Watson.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Roudebush.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Mathias.  
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Whitehurst.  
Mr. Mann with Mr. Wold.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Mollohan.  
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.  
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Preyer of North Carolina.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Passman.  
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Vigorito.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.  
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Burton of California.  
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Kirwan.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Getty.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Daniel of Virginia.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Harrington.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Mills.  
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Symington.  
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Gilbert.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ottinger.  
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Nix.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Gaydos.  
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Boland.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Nelsen.  
Mr. Delaney with Mr. McClure.  
Mr. Dent with Mr. Schriver.  
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Clay.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Stanton.  
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Frey.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. McClory.  
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Quie.  
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Reifel.  
Mr. Roe with Mr. Schwengel.  
Mr. Young with Mr. Wiggins.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Brock.  
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Wylie.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kastenmeier.  
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. ASHLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
The doors were opened.

**TITLE AMENDMENT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, the amendment to the title is agreed to.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—to the amendment to the title, I would simply like to point out that today we have had many rollcalls on matters of very little importance under the same rules that deny and prevent rollcalls on major issues such as the ABM, the SST, water pollution, the nuclear carrier and a great many other vital issues. I think this points out one of the important needs for revising and improving the rules of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment to the title.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize a select committee of the House to study firsthand the recent de-

velopments in Southeast Asia and then report its findings to the House of Representatives within 45 days of its adoption."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

**AUBURN FINDS ROAD TO PEACEFUL DISSENT**

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, colleges and universities throughout the country have been plagued with violence and disruptions during the past few weeks. Almost every institute of higher learning has had some type of disturbance, but the great majority of our campuses have remained peaceful.

Auburn University is an excellent example of school officials handling a touchy situation in such a way as to avoid violence and to promote understanding between the students and the administration.

Auburn President Dr. Harry Philpott spent 6 hours on a park bench outside his office talking with individuals and groups of students. This action countered a proposed day-long strike called for by a liberal student group to protest U.S. involvement in Cambodia.

The following article from the May 24 edition of the Birmingham News outlines the peaceful dissent at Auburn University recently:

[From the Birmingham News, May 24, 1970]

**NO VIOLENCE: AUBURN FINDS ROAD TO PEACEFUL DISSENT**

(By Charles Nix)

The longest day had ended very late on the Auburn campus. It had ended without a single reported violent incident. Students, faculty and administrators—many bone-weary, some exhausted—were quietly jubilant that Auburn had found the way to air disagreement and dissent within a framework of mutual respect and orderliness.

The substance of violence had been on the campus Thursday, but what seemed like an overwhelming spirit of restraint prevailed.

The Human Rights Forum had called for a strike to protest U.S. involvement in Cambodia, the war in Vietnam and the deaths of students, black and white, across the nation.

The forum had brought in speakers. Some of the speakers urged the students to "recognize your enemies," "get in step" with other university students and to "push for what you believe."

Then there was a change that put a night meeting into the day's schedule, and calls for a candlelight march on the university president's home.

Tension built. People got tired.

The conditions were never better at Auburn University than Thursday for student violence to mar the unblemished record that

So the committee amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ayres.  
Mr. Downing with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Goodling.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Meskill.  
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Rallsback.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Watkins.

has set the college apart from many across the nation.

But when it was over, student leaders and administrators could call it a day of "intelligent, rational discussion of the issues."

"I was proud of Auburn today," said Dr. Harry M. Philpott, president of the university, at the most tense moment of the day.

He urged the students gathered on his lawn at midnight to continue the peaceful action that had marked the day.

But he was not the only one who had counseled for peace. The ranks of peacekeepers had been filled by Student Government Association marshals, students in the bare-foot, long-haired uniform of protesters, conservative students, ministers and speech-makers.

There was a conspicuous absence of policemen, except for the ever present campus Police Chief M. E. Dawson.

And yet, the protesters could claim a victory of sorts. The Rev. Carl Jones of St. Dunstan's Episcopal Church could tell students, "You have won the hearts of administrators... teachers..."

But with the hardening of attitudes that has become apparent across the nation in the last few weeks, probably the most important thing was the respect those on each side of the issues had for those of the opposite stance.

Bob Douglas, Student Government Association president, said most students were "upset" by the call for a strike. The call mustered little support.

Yet, students with free time between classes stopped in largest classroom building on campus, to hear speakers.

In the same area, tables had been set up where students could sign petitions backing President Nixon on his Southeast Asian actions or backing a McGovern amendment to end the war in Vietnam.

Students wearing black armbands mingled with those wearing armbands with the American flag and the statement: "Fly your flag proudly."

And a crowd listened attentively as a veteran of two tours of duty in Vietnam rationally discussed the war with a liberal minister.

Even the debaters of the Cooper-Church amendment that would bar American soldiers from Cambodia, admitted the faults of their arguments in a question-and-answer period, seemingly in an honest effort to give the students a better understanding of the amendment.

And there was applause for members of the audience who stood up and expressed opposite views.

Dr. Philpott spent six hours in front of Samford Hall, which contains most of the administrative offices, to talk with students. The unusual move won much respect among the student body.

Philpott was met with a burst of applause as he strolled across his front lawn at midnight to meet 500 students, some of them chanting "We want Harry. We want Harry."

"You got him, what do you want?" Philpott said. The students had marched several blocks to demand an end to curfews on women students.

Philpott said he made no decision at that time of night.

"The only thing I can advise you, if you are subject to regulations in the dormitories, I suggest you go back there."

The minority of women students in the crowd were already out past the 11:30 p.m. curfew.

"What you are doing tonight will not get you anywhere," he said.

"Your opinion is vital and important, but it's not the only one. We've reasoned today, and that is the only way we're going to get anything going," Philpott said.

He reminded the students that "practically

all your speakers urged you to work in the system."

As the crowd began shouting back at the president, one student hollered, "Why don't y'all be reasonable, he's done everything he can do in one day." Later another student shouted to the crowd, "There is no order here, you're staging a circus and you know it."

The students speaking were what the protesters call "straight," but there were those in the protester's uniform that called for peace, like Bill Lloyd, who jumped up on the concrete railing being used as a speaker's stand at the president's lawn, and urged peace.

Another went through the crowd outside a women's dormitory later and told male students to leave. Girls were standing on top of the multistoried dormitory shouting to students below.

"Get out of here. Let the girls handle it," the student pleaded.

And across a ditch, a large group of boys sent up a chant, "Boys come back."

The day ended without a reported violent incident. This can be attributed only to the understanding of students of both sides of the issues, their understanding of administrative stumbling blocks to change and the actions of Dr. Philpott, Rev. Jones and other members of the university community.

#### "CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE"

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 4, I advised my colleagues that the latest edition of the Government-wide "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance" was available. Since then, I have carefully studied the information contained in the latest catalog and must conclude that many of our tax dollars are being wasted by needless duplication and overlapping of Federal assistance programs.

While no one can deny that some special needs necessitate the duplication of a few programs—that is, veterans and military hospitals—unnecessary proliferation siphons off national resources which are already in short supply. I believe that this catalog, if utilized properly, could help both the Members of this body and the President in maximizing service to the people while minimizing the manpower and money power required to implement needed programs.

As I indicated Thursday, the new catalog has included a functional index which groups the Federal domestic assistance programs according to their primary function. Although this index is designed to help potential applicants sort their way through the maze of Federal programs, it also vividly illustrates the duplication and overlap which now exists in our Federal Government. This may be the reason the information was not forthcoming in the past. Some of the areas of duplication reflected in the catalog include: 25 rural community development programs administered in five agencies; 33 elementary and secondary education programs administered by seven agencies; 23 agricultural production and operations programs administered by five agencies; and 54 education

resource development and support programs administered by seven agencies.

Since these are but four of the many examples of duplication revealed by the catalog's index, I am attaching the index to the text of my statement to show the full extent of possible overlap and duplication. I have indicated in this index how many Federal agencies are involved in the administration of each category of programs.

In making these observations, I want to emphasize that all duplication and overlapping is not per se undesirable. However, it is imperative that maintenance of any such duplication be strongly justified in light of current needs and only for special purposes.

It is apparent that in most areas there has been little progress in the consolidation of programs since I spoke to the Members on June 25, 1968. In fact, in some areas, the number of programs has proliferated alarmingly. For example, my original listing of operating Federal assistance programs, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 25, 1968, indicated there were, on a rough count, 74 economic and business development programs spread among 10 separate departments and agencies. My 1969 listing indicated that there were 79 business and economic development programs—including small business—spread among at least 14 Federal agencies. And the latest official governmentwide catalog lists 78 such programs administered in 18 different Federal agencies.

In my 1969 listing, I listed 28 transportation—excluding maritime—programs in five separate agencies. The latest 1970 catalog includes 31 programs administered in seven separate agencies.

In my 1969 listing, I list 11 outdoor recreation programs administered in four agencies. The latest governmentwide catalog lists 16 programs for recreation planning and land and facility acquisition administered in six agencies.

My original 1968 listing indicated there were 56 water conservation and control programs administered by seven separate agencies. The latest 1970 catalog, in its index in the back, lists at least 53 programs under the various items referring to water pollution and control administered in at least nine Federal agencies, and those index items under "water" refer to at least nine additional possible items such as "flood prevention and control," and "sewage facilities and treatment." The prospects for consolidation are not totally without hope, however.

I was heartened this weekend to note an article in the Washington Post stating that the President plans to merge our existing pollution programs into a single independent agency. Although there has been no official confirmation of the article, it appears to be an important step in the right direction. I heartily applaud such efforts on the part of the administration. I believe the Congress could also greatly help consolidation efforts by acting in a variety of ways.

As you know, President Nixon has called for passage of the Grant Consolidation Act, H.R. 10954. If passed, this law would grant the President freedom to clarify and consolidate the confusing

multiplicity of administrative channels required to accomplish the same goals. The President would take the initiative in this area, while Congress would maintain its traditional prerogative of advise and consent.

We must remember, however, that the Grant Consolidation Act will not in itself fulfill our goal of spending the tax dollar with minimum waste. Now and in the future, we must carefully consider whether programs—either existing or proposed—are truly necessary. The consolidation of superfluous programs would be a shocking incongruity. In order to properly evaluate existing and proposed programs, more than 160 of my colleagues have cosponsored my bill to establish a Hoover-type body, the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization. As presently envisioned, the Commission would be charged with finding more imaginative solutions for our present problems. In addition to the traditional functions of a Hoover Commission, the proposed body would be required to study our Federal programs from the ground up. Too frequently, we here in Washington organize our Government to suit administrators and not recipients. While line charts of government organization are very important, they do little to help a bewildered mayor who is seeking Federal assistance in the solution of his community's problems. We should carefully study the effects of Federal programs on the interrelationships of Federal, State, and local governments, especially with a view to preserving and strengthening our decentralized system of government. We should also attempt to organize the Federal Government so that local officials can treat it as a single entity. As the new catalog demonstrates, a mayor who needs assistance in the improvement of his city's elementary and secondary education programs is required to select from among 33 programs and deal with seven different agencies. Such variety hardly seems necessary or desirable, and the Hoover-type commission which I have proposed would deal specifically with such problems as this.

However, a few days after the other body scheduled hearings on such Hoover-type commissions, President Nixon announced a presidentially appointed "Ash Council" to study and recommend changes in the organization of Federal Government. I applauded that action, but at the same time, I believe that all of these efforts—the Program Information Act to require periodic listing of all Federal domestic assistance programs; the Grant Consolidation Act to require consolidation of Federal domestic assistance programs; and the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization to require a "bottom-up" restructuring of Federal domestic assistance programs—require immediate and continuing attention. Thus far, we have taken but one small step by promulgating the new 1970 catalog of Federal domestic assistance. This catalog can be used in a variety of ways to help us increase the efficiency of our Government. I trust that the overlap and duplication which the catalog reveals will

impress you, as it has me, with the pressing need for prompt action. I hope that it will be utilized by the Ash Commission in analyzing and improving Federal Government, and I hope that it will be utilized by congressional committees proposing or altering legislation. Most of all, I hope that it will spur the Congress to press for prompt enactment of the Program Information Act. The publication of this catalog should signal a true beginning in the providing of meaningful information to the public and the Congress. Although the catalog is an accomplishment, there remains much to be done to insure the continuing success of efforts like this.

The material follows:

#### FUNCTIONAL INDEX

(NOTE.—The following is the Functional Index to the catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, April 1970, compiled for the Executive Office of the President by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Added to this, in parentheses after each functional heading, is the number of programs listed and the number of agencies which administer them. This catalog is available from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20401 for \$6.75.)

#### AGRICULTURE

*Resource conservation and development (see also Natural Resources) (21 programs by three agencies)*

10.054 Emergency Conservation Measures.  
10.050 Agricultural Conservation Programs.  
10.901 Resource Conservation and Development.

10.414 Resource Conservation and Development Loans.

10.900 Great Plains Conservation.  
23.007 Appalachian Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control.

10.902 Soil and Water Conservation.  
10.416 Soil and Water Loans.

10.508 Extension Program for Soil and Water Conservation.

10.409 Irrigation, Drainage and other Soil and Water Conservation Loans.

10.419 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Loans.

15.501 Irrigation and Drainage Systems Loans.

15.503 Small Reclamation Projects.  
15.502 Irrigation Systems Rehabilitation and Betterment.

10.903 Soil Survey.  
10.650 State and Private Forestry Cooperation.

10.501 Extension Programs for Forestry Production and Marketing.

15.119 Indian—Range Management.  
15.126 Indian—Soil and Moisture Conservation.

15.106 Indian—Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of Irrigation Projects and Related Power Systems.

15.112 Indian—Forestry Development.

*Production and operations (23 programs by five agencies)*

10.406 Farm Operating Loans.  
10.402 Economic Opportunity Farm Resource Loans.

10.401 Economic Opportunity Farm Operating Loans to Cooperatives.

10.407 Farm Ownership Loans.  
64.112 Veterans Farm Loans.

10.404 Emergency Loans.  
10.408 Grazing Association Loans.

14.143 Property Improvement Loan Insurance—Construction of Nonresidential Farm Structures.

10.056 Storage Facilities and Equipment Loans.

17.209 Farm Labor Contractor Registration.  
10.405 Farm Labor Housing Loans and Grants.

10.051 Commodity Loan and Purchase.  
10.450 Crop Insurance.  
62.001 Fertilizer Development.  
10.052 Cotton Production Stabilization.  
10.055 Feed Grain Direct Payments.  
10.058 Wheat Direct Payments.  
10.057 Sugar Program.  
10.059 Wool and Mohair Payments.  
10.002 Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control.

15.601 Animal Damage Control.  
10.501 Extension Program for Forestry Production and Marketing.

15.603 Farm Fish Pond Management.

*Marketing (17 programs by one agency)*

10.505 Extension Program for Marketing and Distribution.

10.156 Marketing Service—Matching Fund Grants.

10.155 Marketing Agreements and Orders.  
10.154 Market Supervision.

10.401 Economic Opportunity—Farm Opportunity Loans to Coops.

10.153 Market News.  
10.158 Plentiful Foods.

10.150 Agricultural Product Grading.  
10.800 Livestock and Poultry Market Supervision.

10.053 Dairy Indemnity Payments.  
10.157 Meat and Poultry Inspection.

10.151 Assistance to States for Intra-State Meat and Poultry Inspection Programs.

10.501 Extension Program for Forestry Production and Marketing.

10.600 Foreign Market Development and Promotion.

10.300 CCC Export Credit Sales Program.  
10.152 Export Payments on Agricultural Products.

10.301 Export Payments.

*Research (five programs by two agencies)*

10.001 Agricultural Research—Basic and Applied Research.

10.201 Research Facilities.  
10.250 Agricultural Economic Research.

10.200 Contracts and Grants for Scientific Research.

15.607 Pesticide Appraisal and Monitoring.

*General Information and Services (see also Information and Statistics) (11 programs by two agencies)*

10.502 Extension Program for Improved Family Living.

10.504 Extension Programs for Improving Farm Income.

10.504 Extension Program for Soil and Water Conservation.

10.506 Extension Program for Pesticides Safety and Rural Civil Defense.

15.101 Indian Agricultural Extension.  
10.350 Technical Assistance to Cooperatives.

10.002 Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control.

10.509 4-H Youth Development.  
10.750 Information on Agricultural Activities.

10.950 Agricultural Statistical Reports.  
10.700 National Agricultural Library.

#### ARTS AND HUMANITIES

*Arts (17 programs by five agencies)*

45.001 Promotion of the Arts—Architecture and Design.

45.002 Promotion of the Arts—Dance.  
45.003 Promotion of the Arts—Education.

45.004 Promotion of the Arts—Literature.  
45.005 Promotion of the Arts—Music.

45.006 Promotion of the Arts—Public Media.

45.007 Promotion of the Arts—State and Community Operations.

45.008 Promotion of the Arts—Theater.  
45.009 Promotion of the Arts—Visual Arts.

19.100 Cultural Presentations—Foreign Tours.

13.474 Research and Development—Arts and Humanities.

60.010 Smithsonian Associates.

60.016 Smithsonian Special Foreign Currency Grants for Museum Programs and Related Research.

60.007 Museums—Assistance and Advice.  
60.008 Authentication and/or Repair of Oriental Objects and Translations of related Inscriptions.

60.008 Reglstral Programs.  
15.850 Indian Arts and Crafts Development.

*Humanities (Nine programs by three agencies)*

45.100 Promotion of the Humanities—Afro-American Fellowships.

45.101 Promotion of the Humanities—Education.

45.103 Promotion of the Humanities—Senior Fellowships—Faculty Development Grants.

45.106 Promotion of the Humanities—Senior Fellowships.

45.102 Promotion of the Humanities—Fellowships and Summer Stipends.

45.104 Promotion of the Humanities—Public Programs.

45.105 Promotion of the Humanities—Research and Publication.

13.474 Research and Development—Arts and Humanities.

60.006 International Exchange of Scientific and Literary Publications and Governmental Documents.

**BUSINESS AND COMMERCE**

*Small Business Development (23 programs by nine agencies)*

59.012 Small Business Loans.

59.003 Economic Opportunity Loans for Small Businesses.

59.004 Lease Guarantees for Small Business.

59.005 Management Assistance to Small Business.

12.602 Small Business Prime Contracting.

12.603 Small Business Subcontracting.

59.011 Small Business Investment Companies.

59.009 Procurement Assistance to Small Business.

11.800 Minority Business Enterprise.

59.007 Minority Enterprise—Technical Assistance.

59.006 Minority Business Development.

10.403 Economic Opportunity Non-Farm Enterprise Loans.

64.108 Veterans Business Loans—Guaranteed and Insured Loans.

59.013 State and Local Development Company Loans.

59.001 Displaced Business Loans.

59.002 Economic Injury Disaster Loans.

14.001 Flood Insurance.

36.001 Consumer and Business Protection.

59.010 Product Disaster Loans.

59.008 Physical Disaster Loans.

39.001 Business Services.

44.001 Federal Credit Union Charter Examination and Supervision.

39.007 Sale of Federal Surplus Personal Property.

*Economic Development (see also Community Development) (27 programs 11 agencies)*

11.303 Economic Development—Technical Assistance.

12.600 Community Economic Adjustment.

12.601 Contracting with Labor Surplus Area Concerns.

14.002 Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance.

59.013 State and Local Development Company Loans.

61.002 Trade Adjustment Assistance—Firms.

61.003 Trade Adjustment Assistance—Workers.

61.001 Tariff Adjustment (Industry).

35.003 Wholesale Natural Gas Service.

35.001 Water Resources Development.

41.001 Interstate Commerce—Cooperative Enforcement Agreements with States.

41.002 Interstate Commerce—Investigation of Complaints.

15.901 Domestic Travel Promotion.

11.102 Foreign Investment Development in the United States.

11.950 Visitor Services.

15.802 Minerals Discovery Loan Program.

15.303 Minerals Research—Grants and Contracts.

15.117 Indian—Industrial and Tourism Development.

15.124 Indian—Revolving Fund for Loans.

15.123 Indian—Revolving Fund for Export Assistance Loans.

15.120 Indian—Real Estate Appraisal.

15.129 Indian—Tribal Accounting Services.

15.118 Indian—Investment of Indian Tribal Trust Funds and Individual Indian Monies.

*Commercial fisheries (11 programs by two agencies)*

15.003 Commercial Fisheries Research and Development.

15.005 Fisheries Loan Fund.

15.002 Commercial Fisheries Disaster Assistance.

15.004 Fishermen—Reimbursement of Losses.

15.006 Fishery Marketing Assistance.

15.007 Fishery Products Inspection and Certification.

15.008 Fishing Statistics and Market News.

15.009 Fishing Vessel Mortgage and Loan Insurance.

19.201 Protection of Ships from Foreign Seizure.

15.600 Anadromous Fish Conservation.

15.001 Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation.

*Maritime, General (11 programs by three agencies)*

11.501 Development and Promotion of Ports and Intermodal Transport Systems.

11.500 Construction—Differential Subsidies.

11.504 Operating—Differential Subsidies.

33.001 Shipping—Investigation of Complaints.

11.505 Ships Exchange and Sales.

11.502 Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance.

19.201 Protection of Ships from Foreign Seizure.

11.503 Maritime War Risk Insurance.

11.507 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

11.506 State Marine Schools.

11.401 Nautical Charts and Related Data.

*International (17 programs by five agencies)*

11.101 Export Trade Promotion.

11.100 Export Licensing Service and Information.

11.103 International Commercial Information.

10.600 Foreign Market Development and Promotion.

31.001 Medium-Term Guarantees to Commercial Banks.

19.004 Foreign Investment Guaranties.

19.005 Foreign Investment Insurance.

19.001 Foreign Currency Loans.

19.006 Institutional Centers To Aid Foreign Development.

19.007 Technology Applications for Less-Developed Countries.

19.002 Foreign Housing Investment Guaranties.

19.003 Foreign Housing Investment Guaranty Program—Latin America.

11.102 Foreign Investment Development in the United States.

37.001 Claims Against the Government of Bulgaria.

37.002 Claims Against the Government of Italy.

37.003 Claims Against the Government of Rumania.

19.200 Claims Against Foreign Governments.

*Statistics, general (see also information and statistics) (11 programs by three agencies)*

11.001 Census and Statistical Reports.

11.005 Census Special Tabulations and Services.

11.003 Census Geography.

11.700 Measures and Analyses of the United States Economy.

17.003 Prices and Cost of Living Data.

17.004 Productivity, Technology, and Growth Data.

17.005 Wages and Industrial Relations Data.

17.002 Manpower and Employment Data.

17.001 Foreign Labor Data.

15.008 Fishing Statistics and Market News.

15.304 Mineral Research and Resource Information.

*Special technical services (21 programs by seven agencies)*

11.200 Business Assistance, Services, and Information.

11.002 Census Data Access and Use Laboratory.

11.603 National Standard Reference Data System.

11.604 Standard Reference Materials.

11.900 Patent and Trademark Technical Information Dissemination.

24.003 Granting of Patent Licenses.

11.605 State Invention Program.

11.601 Calibration and Testing Services.

11.606 Weights and Measures Service.

15.801 Map Information.

15.803 Topographic Surveys and Mapping.

15.800 Geologic and Mineral Resource Surveys and Mapping.

11.400 Geodesy.

24.001 Access Permits.

24.029 Uranium Industry Workshops.

24.030 Work Experience.

41.001 Interstate Commerce—Cooperative Enforcement Agreements With States.

32.001 Communications — Information, Regulation, and Investigation of Complaints.

50.004 Telecommunications Management.

11.800 Minority Business Enterprise.

12.309 Civil Defense—Industrial Participation.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

*Planning, research, training (see also housing and facilities subcategories of education and health) (56 programs by 16 agencies)*

14.203 Comprehensive Planning Assistance.

14.208 New Communities Supplementary Grants.

14.214 Urban Systems Engineering Demonstration Grants.

14.215 Workable Program for Community Improvement.

14.207 New Communities—Loan Guarantees.

14.125 Mortgage Insurance—Land Development and New Communities.

14.602 Community Renewal Planning Grants.

14.504 Urban Planning Research and Demonstration.

13.604 Planning for Human Resources Development.

15.200 Land Lease for Airports.

13.491 University Community Service—Grants to States.

20.504 Urban Mass Transportation—Research, Development, and demonstration.

20.503 Urban Mass Transportation—Managerial Training.

20.400 Transportation Planning Information—Environmental and Urban Systems.

20.211 Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety.

20.210 State and Community Highway Safety Program.

13.700 Aging—Grants to States for Community Planning and Services.

16.200 Community Relations Service.

15.400 Outdoor Recreation—Financial Assistance.  
 49.002 Community Action Operations.  
 49.012 Volunteers in Service to America.  
 49.011 Special Impact.  
 47.027 Science Planning and Policy Studies.  
 14.201 City Planning and Urban Studies Fellowships.  
 14.202 Community Development Training Grants.  
 14.205 HUD Clearinghouse Service.  
 11.302 Economic Development—Planning Assistance.  
 11.303 Economic Development—Technical Assistance.  
 12.600 Community Economic Adjustment.  
 35.003 Wholesale Natural Gas Service.  
 35.002 Wholesale Electric Power Service.  
 35.001 Water Resources Development.  
 23.011 Appalachian State Research Technical Assistance and Demonstration.  
 15.702 Water Pollution Control Data Publications Service.  
 15.703 Water Pollution Control—Direct Training.  
 15.951 Water Resources Research—Assistance to States for Institutes.  
 15.952 Water Resources Research—Matching Grants to State Institutions.  
 15.804 Water Resources Investigations.  
 15.801 Map Information.  
 15.803 Topographic Surveys and Mapping.  
 11.400 Geodesy.  
 11.600 Building Code (Regulation) Assistance to States.  
 24.026 Payments in Lieu of Property Taxes.  
 51.001 Intergovernmental Relations and Liaison.  
 22.001 Intergovernmental Relations Advisory Service.  
 25.001 Spanish Surnamed Americans Assistance.  
 56.001 Youth Opportunity.  
 11.950 Visitors Services.  
 49.007 Federal Information Exchange System.  
 11.004 Census Intergovernmental Services.  
 11.005 Census Special Tabulations and Services.  
 11.001 Census and Statistical Reports.  
 11.003 Census Geography.  
 12.312 Civil Defense—National Fallout Shelter Survey.  
 12.304 Civil Defense—Community Shelter Planning.  
 12.303 Civil Defense—Community Involvement.  
*Construction, Renewal, Operations (see also Housing) (26 programs by five agencies)*  
 14.200 Basic Water and Sewer Facilities Grants.  
 11.300 Economic Development—Grants and Loans for Public Works and Development Facilities.  
 15.700 Construction Grants for Wastewater Treatment Works.  
 15.201 Leases, Permits and Easements for Public Works.  
 15.701 Water Pollution Control—Comprehensive Basin Planning Grants.  
 14.609 Urban Renewal Projects.  
 14.601 Code Enforcement Grants.  
 16.603 Demolition Grants.  
 14.606 Neighborhood Development.  
 14.608 Relocation Assistance and Payments.  
 14.605 Interim Assistance for Blighted Areas Grants.  
 14.300 Model Cities Supplementary Grants.  
 14.206 Neighborhood Facilities Grants.  
 14.210 Public Facility Loans.  
 14.505 Urban Renewal Demonstration Grants.  
 14.607 Public Housing—Modernization of Projects.  
 14.502 Mortgage Insurance—Experimental Projects Other Than Housing.  
 14.123 Mortgage Insurance—Housing in Older Declining Areas.  
 14.122 Mortgage Insurance—Homes in Urban Renewal Areas.

14.109 Major Home Improvement Loan Insurance—Rental Housing in Urban Renewal Area.  
 14.107 Major Home Improvement Loan Insurance—Homes in Urban Renewal Areas.  
 14.106 Interest Subsidy—Purchase of Rehabilitated Homes by Lower Income Families.  
 20.501 Urban Mass Transportation Capital Improvement Loans.  
 20.500 Urban Mass Transportation Capital Improvement Grants.  
 20.101 Federal-Aid Airport Program.  
 11.301 Economic Development Loans—Loans for Business and Development Companies.  
*Urban beautification, open spaces (see also Recreation) (six programs by two agencies)*  
 14.212 Urban Beautification and Improvement Grants.  
 14.213 Urban Parks and Open Space in Built-Up Urban Areas.  
 14.209 Open Space Land Acquisition and Development Grants.  
 20.204 Highway Beautification—Landscaping and Scenic Enhancement.  
 20.203 Highway Beautification—Control of Outdoor Advertising.  
 20.202 Highway Beautification—Control of Junkyards.  
*Historic preservation (six programs by three agencies)*  
 14.204 Historic Preservation Grants.  
 15.904 Historic Preservation.  
 39.006 National Historical Sources Grants.  
 15.903 Historic American Buildings Survey.  
 15.202 Public Land for Recreation, Public Purposes, and Historic Monuments.  
 39.002 Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property.  
*Rural (25 programs by five agencies)*  
 10.418 Water and Waste Disposal Systems for Rural Communities.  
 10.901 Resource Conservation and Development.  
 10.414 Resource Conservation and Development Loans.  
 10.400 Comprehensive Area-Wide Water and Sewer Planning Grants.  
 15.501 Irrigation and Drainage Systems Loans.  
 15.502 Irrigation Systems Rehabilitation and Betterment.  
 10.904 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention.  
 10.903 Soil Survey.  
 15.126 Indian—Soil and Moisture Conservation.  
 10.413 Recreation Facility Loans.  
 10.412 Recreation Association Loans.  
 10.850 Rural Electrification Loans.  
 10.851 Rural Telephone Loans.  
 13.246 Migrant Health Grants.  
 13.245 Migrant Health—Technical Assistance.  
 49.009 Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Assistance.  
 10.350 Technical Assistance to Cooperatives.  
 10.403 Economic Opportunity Non-Farm Enterprise Loans.  
 10.500 Extension Program for Assisting in Community Development.  
 10.507 Extension Programs for Recreation, Wildlife, and Natural Beauty.  
 14.144 Property Improvement Loan Insurance—Construction of Non-residential Non-Farm Structures.  
 14.143 Property Improvement Loan Insurance Construction of Non-residential Farm Structures.  
 14.121 Mortgage Insurance—Homes in Outlying Areas.  
 14.108 Major Home Improvement Loan Insurance—Housing Outside Urban Renewal Areas.  
 15.301 Control of Fires in Inactive Coal Deposits.

*Indians (see also as subcategory of Welfare) (27 programs by two agencies)*

15.113 Indian—General Assistance.  
 15.104 Indian—Community Development.  
 13.229 Indian Sanitation Facilities.  
 15.106 Indian—Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of Irrigation Projects and Related Power Systems.  
 15.127 Indian—Transfer of Federally-Owned Buildings, Improvements, and/or Facilities.  
 15.107 Indian—Engineering Technical Assistance.  
 15.122 Indian—Reservation Roads and Bridges.  
 15.125 Indian—Roads Maintenance.  
 15.130 Indians—Assistance to Non-Federal Schools.  
 15.128 Indian—Transfer of Indian School Properties.  
 15.105 Indian—Contracts with Indian School Boards.  
 15.109 Indian—Federal School Facilities—Dormitory Operations.  
 15.102 Indian—Aid to Tribal Governments.  
 15.131 Indian—Law and Order.  
 15.129 Indian—Tribal Accounting Services.  
 15.123 Indian—Revolving Fund for Expert Assistance Loans.  
 15.124 Indian—Revolving Fund for Loans.  
 15.118 Indian—Investment of Indian Tribal Trust Funds and Individual Indian Monies.  
 15.117 Indian—Industrial and Tourism Development.  
 15.850 Indian—Arts and Crafts Development.  
 15.115 Indian—Housing Development.  
 15.116 Indian—Housing Improvement.  
 15.120 Indian—Real Estate Appraisal.  
 15.121 Indian—Real Property Management.  
 15.119 Indian—Range Management.  
 15.112 Indian—Forestry Development.  
 15.101 Indian—Agricultural Extension.

*Regional, specific (20 programs by eight agencies)*

23.001 Appalachian Regional Development.  
 23.002 Appalachia—Supplements to Federal Grant-In-Aid.  
 23.011 Appalachian State Research, Technical Assistance, and Demonstration.  
 23.012 Appalachian Vocational Educational Facilities.  
 23.003 Appalachian Development Highway System.  
 23.004 Appalachian Health Demonstrations.  
 23.005 Appalachian Housing Fund.  
 23.006 Appalachian Housing Technical Assistance.  
 23.007 Appalachian Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control.  
 23.008 Appalachian Local Access Roads.  
 23.009 Appalachian Local Development District Assistance.  
 23.010 Appalachian Mine Area Restoration.  
 10.900 Great Plains Conservation.  
 62.002 Tennessee Valley Region—General Resources Development.  
 62.003 Tennessee Valley Region—Water Resources Development.  
 28.001 Coastal Plains Regional Economic Development.  
 38.001 Four Corner Regional Economic Development.  
 48.001 New England Regional Economic Development.  
 52.001 Ozarks Regional Economic Development.  
 63.001 Upper Great Lakes Regional Economic Development.

*Federal surplus property (nine programs by five agencies)*

39.002 Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property.  
 39.007 Sale of Federal Surplus Personal Property.  
 39.003 Donation of Federal Surplus Personal Property.

13.606 Surplus Property Utilization.  
 15.202 Public Land for Recreation, Public Purposes, and Historic Monuments.  
 15.204 Real Property Sales for Residential, Commercial, Agricultural, Industrial, or Public Uses or Development.  
 14.211 Surplus Land for Community Development.  
 12.308 Civil Defense—Surplus Personal Property Donation.  
 15.203 Public Land for Rights-of-Way.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PERSONAL SAFETY

*Consumer protection (see also Legal Services) (eight programs by four agencies)*

52.500 Consumer Affairs.  
 36.001 Consumer and Business Protection.  
 10.503 Extension Program for Improved Nutrition.  
 10.154 Market Supervision.  
 10.150 Agricultural Product Grading.  
 10.800 Livestock and Poultry Market Supervision.  
 15.007 Fishery Products Inspection and Certification.  
 15.607 Pesticide Appraisal and Monitoring.

*Personal safety (six programs by four agencies)*

17.304 Workers Safety and Labor Standards.  
 13.010 Occupational Health Research Grants.  
 13.011 Occupational Health Training Grants.  
 15.300 Coal Mine Health and Safety.  
 15.302 Mine Health and Safety Counseling.  
 10.506 Extension Programs for Pesticides Safety and Rural Civil Defense.

DISASTER PREVENTION AND RELIEF

*Emergency preparedness, civil defense (30 programs by six agencies)*

50.003 State Plans for Disaster Assistance to Individuals.  
 50.001 Continuity of Government and Management of Resources in Emergencies.  
 50.004 Telecommunications Management.  
 39.003 Donation of Federal Surplus Property.  
 11.402 River and Flood Forecasts.  
 11.403 Seismological Investigations.  
 11.404 Weather Forecasts and Warnings.  
 24.027 Radiation Control—Training Assistance and Advisory Counseling.  
 12.312 Civil Defense—National Fallout Shelter Survey.  
 12.311 Civil Defense—Marking and Stocking Public Shelters.  
 12.309 Civil Defense—Industrial Participation.  
 12.307 Civil Defense—Exhibits.  
 12.305 Civil Defense—Emergency Operating Centers.  
 12.304 Civil Defense—Community Shelter Planning.  
 12.303 Civil Defense—Community Involvement.  
 12.302 Civil Defense—Community Action.  
 12.300 Civil Defense—Architect and Engineering Faculty Development.  
 12.308 Civil Defense—Surplus Personal Property Donation.  
 12.301 Civil Defense—Architect and Engineering Professional Development.  
 12.400 Construction Program, Army National Guard.  
 13.404 Civil Defense Education.  
 12.310 Civil Defense—Inspection, Maintenance, and Calibration of Civil Defense Radiological Equipment.  
 12.320 Civil Defense—University Extension.  
 12.319 Civil Defense—Survival Supplies and Equipment.  
 12.314 Civil Defense—Staff College.  
 12.318 Civil Defense—Shelter Information.  
 12.317 Civil Defense—Radiological Equipment Donation.  
 12.316 Civil Defense—Radiation Shielding Design and Advisory Services.  
 12.315 Civil Defense—Personnel and Administrative Expense.

12.313 Civil Defense—National Organization Liaison.

*Flood prevention and control (10 programs by four agencies)*

10.904 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention.  
 10.419 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Loans.  
 15.503 Small Reclamation Projects.  
 14.001 Flood Insurance.  
 12.104 Flood Plain Management Services.  
 12.103 Flood Fighting and Rescue Operations, and Emergency Protection of Coastal Protective Works Federally Authorized.  
 12.105 Protection of Essential Highways, Bridge Approaches, etc.  
 12.108 Snagging and Clearing for Flood Control.  
 12.106 Small Flood Control.  
 12.101 Beach Erosion Control.

*Emergency Health Services (see also Health) (six programs by three agencies)*

13.214 Emergency Health—Community Preparedness.  
 13.216 Emergency Health—Medical Stockpile.  
 13.215 Emergency Health—Hospital and Ambulance Services.  
 13.213 Emergency Health—Civil Defense Medical Self-Help.  
 49.005 Emergency Food and Medical Services.  
 24.028 Radiological Safety Assistance.

*Disaster relief (20 programs by eight agencies)*

50.002 Disaster Relief to States.  
 12.306 Civil Defense—Emergency Water Supply Equipment.  
 12.103 Flood Fighting and Rescue Operations, and Emergency Protection of Coastal Protective Works Federally Authorized.  
 12.102 Flood Control Works and Federally Authorized Coastal Protection Works, Rehabilitation.  
 13.709 Emergency Welfare Assistance.  
 14.002 Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance.  
 14.119 Mortgage Insurance—Homes for Disaster Victims.  
 20.200 Federal-Aid Highways—Emergency Relief.  
 15.111 Indian—Forest Fire Suppression and Emergency Rehabilitation.  
 10.054 Emergency Conservation Measures.  
 10.404 Emergency Loans.  
 10.450 Crop Insurance.  
 10.550 Commodity Distribution.  
 10.650 State and Private Forestry Cooperation.  
 10.506 Extension Programs for Pesticides Safety and Rural Civil Defense.  
 59.002 Economy Injury Disaster Loans.  
 59.008 Physical Disaster Loans.  
 59.010 Product Disaster Loans.  
 11.503 Maritime War Risk Insurance.  
 15.004 Fishermen—Reimbursement of Losses.

EDUCATION

*Facilities and equipment (22 programs by six agencies)*

13.477 School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas—Construction.  
 13.456 Higher Education Academic Facilities—State Comprehensive Planning.  
 13.458 Higher Education Academic Facilities Construction—Public and Private Colleges and Universities.  
 13.459 Higher Education Academic Facilities Construction—Public Community Colleges and Technical Institutes.  
 13.457 Higher Education Academic Facilities Construction—Interest Subsidization.  
 13.369 Schools of Nursing—Facilities Construction.  
 47.011 Graduate Science Facilities.  
 47.031 Specialized Research Facilities and Equipment.  
 13.445 Handicapped Innovative Programs—Deaf-Blind Centers.

13.408 Construction of Public Libraries.  
 13.413 Educational Broadcasting Facilities.  
 13.479 School Equipment Loans to Non-profit Private Schools.  
 14.101 College Housing Direct Loans.  
 14.100 College Housing Debt Service.  
 13.483 Strengthening Instruction Through Equipment and Minor Remodeling.  
 24.021 Nuclear Education and Training—University Reactor Sharing.  
 24.022 Nuclear Education and Training—Used Nuclear-Type Equipment Grants.  
 39.002 Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property.  
 39.003 Donation of Federal Surplus Personal Property.  
 36.606 Surplus Property Utilization.  
 15.128 Indian—Transfer of Indian School Properties.  
 15.109 Indian—Federal School Facilities—Dormitory Operations.

*General research (15 programs by three agencies)*

13.422 Educational Research and Development—General Education (Project) Research.  
 13.411 Educational Research and Development Centers.  
 13.476 Research and Development—Regional Research.  
 13.412 Educational Research and Development—Regional Education Laboratories.  
 13.423 Educational Research Dissemination—ERIC System.  
 13.487 Supplementary Educational Centers and Services.  
 13.498 Vocational Education—Research.  
 13.447 Handicapped Physical Education and Recreation Research.  
 13.443 Handicapped—Research and Demonstration.  
 47.029 Social Sciences Research Project Support.  
 13.474 Research and Development—Arts and Humanities.  
 13.401 Adult Basic Education—Special Projects.  
 47.028 Scientific Conference Grants.  
 60.016 Smithsonian Special Foreign Currency Grants for Museum Programs and Related Research.  
 13.481 Special Foreign Currency Program—Training, Research, and Study.

*Resource development and support (54 programs by seven agencies)*

13.486 Strengthening State Departments of Education Grants to States.  
 13.485 Strengthening State Departments of Education—Grants for Special Projects.  
 13.484 Strengthening School Administration—Training Grants.  
 13.425 Educational Staff Training—School Personnel Utilization.  
 13.421 Educational Personnel Training Grants—Career Opportunities.  
 13.426 Educational Staff Training—Teacher Leadership Development.  
 13.417 Educational Classroom Personnel Training—Special Education.  
 13.416 Educational Classroom Personnel Training—Early Childhood.  
 13.415 Educational Classroom Personnel Training—Black Colleges.  
 13.419 Educational Personnel Development—Support Personnel.  
 13.490 Trainers of Teacher Trainers.  
 13.414 Educational Classroom Personnel Training—Basic Studies.  
 13.402 Adult Basic Education—Teacher Education.  
 13.430 Educationally Deprived Children—State Administration.  
 13.451 Handicapped Teacher Education.  
 13.448 Handicapped Physical Education and Recreation Training.  
 13.452 Handicapped Teacher Recruitment and Information.  
 13.450 Handicapped Regional Resource Centers.  
 13.473 Preschool, Elementary, and Second-

- ary Personnel Development—Grants to States.
- 13.504 Vocational Education Personnel Training—State Professional Development.
- 13.503 Vocational Education Personnel Training—Fellowships.
- 13.455 Higher Education Academic Facilities—State Administration.
- 13.454 Higher Education—Strengthening Developing Institutions.
- 13.453 Higher Education—Land Grant Colleges and Universities.
- 13.461 Higher Education Personnel Development—Institutes, Short-Term Training, and Special Projects.
- 13.462 Higher Education Personnel Fellowships.
- 13.407 College Teacher Graduate Fellowships.
- 13.489 Teacher Corps—Operations and Training.
- 13.491 University Community Service—Grants to States.
- 19.102 Educational Exchange—University Lectures (Professors) and Research Scholars.
- 19.101 Educational Exchange—Graduate Students.
- 13.438 Fulbright-Hays Training Grants—Faculty Research Study.
- 13.437 Fulbright-Hays Teacher Exchange.
- 13.439 Fulbright-Hays Training Grants—Foreign Curriculum Consultants.
- 13.440 Fulbright-Hays Training Grants—Foreign Studies Extension.
- 13.436 Foreign Languages and World Affairs—Language and Area Research.
- 13.435 Foreign Languages and World Affairs—Language and Area Centers.
- 19.006 Institutional Centers to Aid Foreign Development.
- 13.405 Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training.
- 13.420 Educational Personnel Development—Drug Abuse Education.
- 13.424 Educational Research Training.
- 47.032 Undergraduate Instructional Personnel Development.
- 47.019 Pre-College Instructional Personnel Development.
- 60.002 Academic Appointments.
- 47.035 University Science Development.
- 47.004 Departmental Science Development.
- 47.012 Institutional Grants for Science.
- 11.201 Importation of Duty-Free Educational and Scientific Materials.
- 47.014 International Cooperative Science Activities.
- 60.019 Visiting Research Appointments in Astrophysics, Geodesy, Meteorites and Space Sciences.
- 45.103 Promotion of the Humanities—Fellowships—Faculty Development Grants.
- 12.300 Civil Defense—Architect and Engineering Faculty Development.
- 47.022 Sea Grant Institutional Support.
- 13.468 Library Training Grants.
- Handicapped (14 programs by two agencies)*
- 13.427 Educationally Deprived Children—Handicapped.
- 13.444 Handicapped Early Childhood Assistance.
- 13.449 Handicapped Preschool and School Programs.
- 13.445 Handicapped Innovative Programs—Deaf-Blind Centers.
- 13.443 Handicapped—Research and Demonstration.
- 13.467 Library Services to the Physically Handicapped.
- 42.001 Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.
- 13.446 Handicapped Media Services and Captioned Films.
- 13.450 Handicapped Regional Resource Centers.
- 13.451 Handicapped Teacher Education.
- 13.448 Handicapped Physical Education and Recreation Training.
- 13.447 Handicapped Physical Education and Recreation Research.
- 13.452 Handicapped Teacher Recruitment and Information.
- 13.733 Rehabilitation Training.
- Vocational (see also Job Training subcategory of Employment) (15 programs by four agencies)*
- 13.493 Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States.
- 13.500 Vocational Education—State Advisory Councils.
- 13.497 Vocational Education—Planning and Evaluation.
- 13.498 Vocational Education—Research.
- 13.496 Vocational Education—Curriculum Development.
- 13.495 Vocational Education—Cooperative Education.
- 13.502 Vocational Education—Innovation.
- 13.499 Vocational Education—Special Needs.
- 13.501 Vocational Education—Work Study.
- 13.504 Vocational Education Personnel Training—State Professional Development.
- 13.503 Vocational Education Personnel Training—Fellowships.
- 13.494 Vocational Education—Consumer and Homemaking.
- 23.012 Appalachian Vocational Education Facilities.
- 64.116 Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans.
- 12.001 Machine Tool Loan to Educational Institutions.
- Elementary and secondary (33 programs by seven agencies)*
- 13.432 Elementary and Secondary Education—State Planning and Evaluation.
- 13.478 School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas—Maintenance and Operation.
- 60.005 Educational Services, Elementary and Secondary Education.
- 13.600 Child Development—Head Start.
- 13.601 Child Development—Technical Assistance.
- 13.473 Preschool, Elementary, and Secondary Personnel Development—Grants to States.
- 13.487 Supplementary Educational Centers and Services.
- 13.430 Educationally Deprived Children—State Administration.
- 13.431 Educationally Deprived Children in Institutions for the Neglected or Delinquent.
- 13.429 Educationally Deprived Children—Migrants.
- 13.428 Educationally Deprived Children—Local Educational Agencies.
- 13.410 Dropout Prevention.
- 13.433 Follow Through.
- 13.400 Adult Basic Education—Grants to States.
- 13.401 Adult Basic Education—Special Projects.
- 13.422 Guidance, Counseling, and Testing.
- 13.472 Nonpublic School Testing.
- 13.488 Talent Search.
- 47.019 Pre-College Instructional Personnel Development.
- 47.021 Pre-College Student Development.
- 47.020 Pre-College Instructional Program Development.
- 16.100 Desegregation of Public Education.
- 13.405 Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training.
- 13.403 Equal Bilingual Education.
- 13.420 Educational Personnel Development—Drug Abuse Education.
- 13.479 School Equipment Loans to Non-profit Private Schools.
- 20.100 Aviation Education.
- 55.006 Physical Fitness Program Development.
- 55.005 Physical Fitness Demonstration Center Schools.
- 55.007 Presidential Physical Fitness Award.
- 15.105 Indian—Contracts with Indian School Boards.
- 15.110 Indian—Federal Schools.
- 15.100 Indian—Adult Education.
- Higher education, general (55 programs by 11 agencies)*
- 13.456 Higher Education Academic Facilities—State Comprehensive Planning.
- 13.454 Higher Education—Strengthening Developing Institutions.
- 13.453 Higher Education—Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.
- 13.455 Higher Education Academic Facilities—State Administration.
- 13.459 Higher Education Academic Facilities Construction—Public Community Colleges and Technical Institutes.
- 13.457 Higher Education Academic Facilities Construction—Interest Subsidization.
- 13.488 Talent Search.
- 13.442 Guidance, Counseling, and Testing.
- 13.472 Nonpublic School Testing.
- 13.492 Upward Bound.
- 13.463 Higher Education Work-Study.
- 13.482 Special Services in Institutions of Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students.
- 13.418. Educational Opportunity Grants.
- 13.460 Higher Education Act Insured Loans—Guaranteed Student Loan Program.
- 13.471 National Defense Students Loans—Direct Loan Contributions.
- 13.469 National Defense Education Act Loans to Institutions.
- 13.470 National Defense Student Loans Cancellations for Teachers.
- 64.111 Veterans Educational Assistance.
- 64.117 War Orphans and Widows Educational Assistance.
- 13.409 Cuban Education—Student Loans.
- 16.504 Law Enforcement Education Program—Student Financial Aid.
- 20.003 Student Shipboard Opportunities Program.
- 20.002 Coast Guard Cooperative Marine Sciences Program.
- 11.506 State Marine Schools.
- 11.507 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.
- 13.489 Teacher Corps—Operations and Training.
- 47.034 Undergraduate Student Development.
- 47.033 Undergraduate Instructional Program Development.
- 60.002 Academic Appointments.
- 13.462 Higher Educational Personnel Fellowships.
- 13.461 Higher Educational Personnel Development—Institutes, Short-Term Training, and Special Projects.
- 13.740 Social Work Manpower—Training Grants.
- 47.013 Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to Problems of Our Society.
- 47.005 Doctoral Dissertation Research in the Social Sciences.
- 13.006 Community Environmental Management Fellowships.
- 47.009 Fellowships and Traineeship Programs.
- 47.010 Graduate Instructional Program Development.
- 13.424 Educational Research Training.
- 17.218 Manpower Research—Doctoral Dissertation Grants.
- 20.208 Highway Safety Research Fellowships.
- 12.300 Civil Defense—Architect and Engineering Professional Development.
- 16.505 Law Enforcement Research and Development—Graduate Research Fellowships.
- 16.508 Law Enforcement Research and Development—Visiting Fellowships.
- 13.002 Air Pollution Fellowships.
- 15.706 Water Pollution Control Research Fellowships.
- 13.407 College Teacher Graduate Fellowships.
- 13.434 Foreign Languages and World Affairs—Fellowships.
- 13.441 Fulbright-Hays Training Grants—Graduate Fellowships.
- 45.100 Promotion of the Humanities—Afro-American Fellowships.



45.102 Promotion of the Humanities—Fellowship and Summer Stipends.

45.106 Promotion of the Humanities—Senior Fellowships.

45.103 Promotion of the Humanities—Fellowships—Faculty Development Grants.

16.100 Desegregation of Public Education.

13.114 Indian—Higher Education.

13.110 Indian—Federal Schools.

Dental Education and Training (Eight programs by one agency)

13.325 Dental Research—Grants.

13.326 Dental Research—Training Grants.

13.324 Dental Research—Fellowships.

13.322 Dental Health—Research Grants.

13.323 Dental Health—Research Training Grants.

13.321 Dental Health—Fellowships.

13.320 Dental Health—Continuing Education Training Grants.

13.319 Dental Auxiliary Utilization Training Grants.

Medical Education and Training (Thirty-one programs by one agency)

13.365 Physician and Allied Health Manpower Research Grants.

13.367 Research Resources—Fellowships.

13.368 Research Resources—Training Grants.

13.371 Special Research Resources.

13.300 Allergy and Infectious Diseases—Fellowships and Research Career Development Awards.

13.302 Allergy and Infectious Diseases—Training Grants.

13.307 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases—Fellowships.

13.308 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases—Graduate Training Grants.

13.309 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases—Research Grants.

13.311 Cancer—Clinical Training.

13.313 Cancer Research Fellowships.

13.314 Cancer Research Grants.

13.315 Cancer Research Training Grants.

13.330 Eye Research—Fellowships.

13.331 Eye Research—Grants.

13.332 Eye Research—Training Grants.

13.334 General Medical Sciences—Fellowships.

13.335 General Medical Sciences—Research Grants.

13.336 General Medical Sciences—Training Grants.

13.344 Heart and Lung Research—Fellowships.

13.345 Heart and Lung Research—Graduate Training Grants.

13.346 Heart and Lung Research—Grants.

13.347 Heart and Lung Research—Undergraduate Training Grants.

13.354 Neurological Diseases and Stroke—Fellowships.

13.355 Neurological Diseases and Stroke—Graduate Training Grants.

13.356 Neurological Diseases and Stroke—Research Grants.

13.357 Neurological Diseases and Stroke—Training Grants.

13.238 Mental Health—Hospital Staff Development Grants.

13.244 Mental Health—Training Grants.

13.241 Mental Health—Fellowships.

13.011 Occupational Health Training Grants.

Health education and training (29 programs by two agencies)

13.208 Comprehensive Health Planning—Training, Studies, and Demonstrations.

13.225 Health Services Research and Development—Fellowships and Training.

64.003 Education and Training of Health Service Personnel.

13.343 Health Sciences Advancement Awards.

13.342 Health Professions—Student Loans.

13.341 Health Professions—Scholarships.

13.339 Health Professions—Educational Improvement Grants.

13.338 Graduate Training in Public Health—Project Grants.

13.366 Professional Public Health Personnel—Traineeships.

13.370 Schools of Public Health—Formula Grants.

13.337 General Research Support Grants.

13.303 Allied Health Professions—Advanced Traineeship Grants.

13.304 Allied Health Professions—Basic Improvement Grants.

13.305 Allied Health Professions—Developmental Grants.

13.316 Child Health and Human Development—Fellowships.

13.317 Child Health and Human Development—Research Grants.

13.318 Child Health and Human Development—Training Grants.

13.310 Biomedical Sciences Support Grants.

13.203 Communicable Diseases—Training Public Health Workers.

13.717 Mental Retardation Hospital Improvement and Inservice Training (HIST).

13.238 Mental Health—Hospital Staff Development Grants.

13.244 Mental Health—Training Grants.

13.301 Allergy and Infectious Diseases—Research Grants.

13.012 Radiological Health—Research Grants.

13.013 Radiological Health—Training Grants.

13.214 Emergency Health—Community Preparedness.

13.327 Environmental Health Sciences—Fellowships.

13.328 Environmental Health Sciences—Research Grants.

13.329 Environmental Health Sciences—Training Grants.

Nursing (eight programs by one agency)

13.369 Schools of Nursing—Facilities Construction.

13.361 Nursing Research Grants.

13.362 Nursing Research Training Grants.

13.364 Nursing Student Loans.

13.358 Nurse Traineeships.

13.363 Nursing Scholarships.

13.359 Nurse Training—Project Improvement Grants.

13.360 Nursing Fellowships.

Nuclear Education and Training (21 programs by one agency)

24.022 Nuclear Education and Training—Used Nuclear-Type Equipment Grants.

24.021 Nuclear Education and Training—University Reactor Sharing.

24.006 Nuclear Education and Training—Faculty-Student Experiments.

24.005 Nuclear Education and Training—Faculty-Student Conference.

24.004 Nuclear Education and Training—Faculty Research Participation.

24.007 Nuclear Education and Training—Faculty Training Institutes.

24.008 Nuclear Education and Training—Faculty Workshops.

24.009 Nuclear Education and Training—Honors Program for Senior Science Majors.

24.010 Nuclear Education and Training—Laboratory Graduate Fellowships.

24.011 Nuclear Education and Training—Loan of Material to Nonprofit Institutions.

24.012 Nuclear Education and Training—Medical Radioisotope Course.

24.013 Nuclear Education and Training—Mobile Radioisotope Laboratory.

24.014 Nuclear Education and Training—Nuclear Medical Technology Course.

24.015 Nuclear Education and Training—Radioisotope Techniques Training Courses.

24.016 Nuclear Education and Training—Reactor Fuel Cycle Assistance.

24.017 Nuclear Education and Training—Special Fellowships in Nuclear Science and Engineering.

24.018 Nuclear Education and Training—

Special Fellowships in Radiation Science and Protection.

24.019 Nuclear Education and Training—Summer Student Training.

24.020—Nuclear Education and Training—Traineeships for Graduate Students in Nuclear Engineering.

24.030 Work Experience.

24.027 Radiation Control—Technical Assistance and Advisory Counseling.

Libraries and Technical Information Services (26 programs by six agencies)

13.468 Library Training Grants.

13.475 Research and Development—Library Research.

13.480 School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.

13.406 College Library Resources.

13.466 Library Services—State Institutional Library Services.

13.465 Library Services—Interlibrary Cooperation.

13.423 Educational Research Dissemination—ERIC System.

13.464 Library Services—Grants for Public Libraries.

13.408 Construction of Public Libraries.

13.467 Library Services to the Physically Handicapped.

42.001 Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

13.446 Handicapped Media Services and Captioned Films.

40.001 Depository Libraries for Government Publications.

42.007 Research and Referral Services in Science and Technology.

42.005 Library of Congress Publications.

42.006 Library of Congress Reference and Bibliographic Services.

42.003 Distribution of Library of Congress Catalog Cards.

60.012 Smithsonian Institution Libraries.

60.015 Smithsonian Publications.

60.013 Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service.

60.009 Science Information Exchange.

60.006 International Exchange of Scientific and Literary Publications and Governmental Documents.

39.004 National Archives Reference Services.

39.005 National Audiovisual Center.

13.413 Educational Broadcasting Facilities.

16.400 Citizenship Education and Training.

#### EMPLOYMENT

Planning, Research, and Demonstration (Eight programs by two agencies)

17.205 Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System.

17.217 Manpower Experimental and Demonstration Projects.

49.011 Special Impact.

17.214 Labor Mobility Demonstration Projects.

17.220 Manpower Research and Evaluation.

17.221 Manpower Research Project Grants.

17.219 Manpower Research—Institutional Grants.

17.218 Manpower Research—Doctoral Dissertation Grants.

Job Training (see also Vocational subcategory of Education) (12 programs by three agencies)

17.211 Job Corps.

17.215 Manpower Development and Training—Institutional Training.

17.216 Manpower Development and Training Act—On-the-Job Training Program.

17.200 Apprenticeship Outreach.

17.201 Apprenticeship Training.

17.213 Journeyman Training.

17.212 Job Opportunities in the Business Sector.

17.222 Neighborhood Youth Corps.

13.720 New Career Opportunities for the Handicapped.

18.001 Postal Academy Program.

13.745 Vocational Rehabilitation Training Services Grants.

13.721 New Career Opportunities in Vocational Rehabilitation.

*Comprehensive Training, Development (Six programs by three agencies)*

17.204 Concentrated Employment Program.

17.223 Operation Mainstream.

17.226 Work Incentive Program—Training and Allowances.

13.748 Work Incentive Program—Child Care.

13.730 Rehabilitation Services Expansion—Contracts with Industry.

15.108 Indian—Employment Assistance.

*Placement and Referral Services (see also Employment Rights and Labor Relations in Legal Services) (11 programs by five agencies)*

17.210 Job Bank.

17.224 Public Service Centers.

25.001 Spanish Surnamed Americans Assistance.

27.003 Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth—Part-time.

27.004 Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth—Summer.

27.006 Federal Summer Employment.

27.005 Federal Employment for the Handicapped.

27.002 Federal Employment Assistance for Veterans.

27.001 Federal Civil Service Employment.

18.001 Postal Academy Program.

15.108 Indian—Employment Assistance.

*Bonding and Certification (Five programs by one agency)*

17.206 Employment Bonding Assistance.

17.208 Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates.

17.209 Farm Labor Contractor Registration.

17.203 Certification for Immigrant Non-agricultural Workers.

17.202 Certification of Foreign Workers for Seasonal Agricultural Employment.

*Special Promotional Services (five programs by four agencies)*

53.001 Handicapped Employment Promotion.

11.800 Minority Business Enterprise.

17.224 Public Service Centers.

30.003 Job Discrimination—Technical Assistance to Employers, Unions, and Employment Agencies.

30.002 Job Discrimination—Special Project Grants.

*Unemployment Support (four programs by four agencies)*

17.225 Unemployment Insurance—Grants to States.

57.001 Social Insurance for Railroad Workers.

61.003 Trade Adjustment Assistance—Workers.

12.601 Contracting with Labor Surplus Area Concerns.

*Assistance to State and Local Governments (five programs by three agencies)*

17.207 Employment Services—Grants to States.

27.009 Training Assistance to State and Local Governments.

27.008 Recruiting and Staffing Assistance to State and Local Governments.

27.007 Personnel Management Assistance to State and Local Governments.

13.605 State Personnel Merit System—Technical Assistance.

*Statistics (see also Information and Statistics) (six programs by one agency)*

17.002. Manpower and Employment Data.

17.003. Prices and Cost of Living Data.

17.005 Wages and Industrial Relations Data.

17.004 Productivity, Technology, and Growth Data.

17.101 Labor Organization Reports.

17.001 Foreign Labor Data.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT

*Water Pollution Control (15 programs by one agency)*

15.713 Water Quality Management Technical Planning Assistance.

15.706 Water Pollution Control Research Fellowships.

15.705 Water Pollution Control Research, Development and Demonstration.

15.701 Water Pollution Control—Comprehensive Basin Planning Grants.

15.707 Water Pollution Control—State and Interstate Program Grants.

15.704 Water Pollution—Interstate Cooperation and Uniform Laws.

15.709 Water Pollution Control—Technical Assistance and Pollution Surveillance.

15.708 Water Pollution Control—State and Local Manpower Development.

15.710 Water Pollution Control Training Grants.

15.711 Water Quality and Pollution Control Data.

15.712 Water Quality and Pollution Control Orientation and Training Seminars.

15.703 Water Pollution Control—Direct Training.

15.702 Water Pollution Control Data Publications Services.

15.700 Construction Grants for Wastewater Treatment Works.

15.503 Small Reclamation Projects.

*Air Pollution Control (seven programs by three agencies)*

13.004. Air Pollution Research Grants.

13.001 Air Pollution Control Program Grants.

13.005 Air Pollution Survey and Demonstration Grants.

13.003 Air Pollution Manpower Training Grants.

13.002 Air Pollution Fellowships.

15.301 Control of Fires in Inactive Coal Deposits.

11.404 Weather Forecasts and Warnings.

*Solid Waste Management (four programs by one agency)*

13.016 Solid Wastes Research Grants.

13.015 Solid Wastes Planning Grants.

13.014 Solid Wastes Demonstration Grants.

13.017 Solid Wastes Training Grants.

*Research, Education, Training (25 programs by five agencies)*

47.008 Environmental Sciences Research Project Support.

15.902 Environmental Study Areas.

13.009 Environmental Control Training Institute—Direct Training.

15.905 National Environmental Education Development.

13.007 Community Environmental Management Research Grants.

13.008 Community Environmental Management Training Grants.

13.006 Community Environmental Management Fellowships.

60.004 Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies.

13.328 Environmental Health Sciences—Research Grants.

13.329 Environmental Health Sciences—Training Grants.

13.327 Environmental Health Sciences—Fellowships.

15.705 Water Pollution Control Research, Development and Demonstration.

15.706 Water Pollution Control Research Fellowships.

15.708 Water Pollution Control—State and Local Manpower Development.

13.018 Water Hygiene Research Grants.

13.019 Water Hygiene Training Grants.

13.004 Air Pollution Research Grants.

13.005 Air Pollution Survey and Demonstration Grants.

13.003 Air Pollution Manpower Training Grants.

13.002 Air Pollution Fellowships.

13.016 Solid Wastes Research Grants.

13.017 Solid Wastes Training Grants.

13.014 Solid Wastes Demonstration Grants.

10.507 Extension Programs for Recreation, Wildlife, and Natural Beauty.

60.018 Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute.

#### FOOD AND NUTRITION

*Children (five programs by one agency)*

10.553 School Breakfasts.

10.554 School Lunch Program—Non-Food Assistance.

10.555 School Lunches.

10.552 Non-School Food.

10.556 Special Milk Program for Children.

*Individuals, general (seven programs by three agencies)*

10.551. Food Stamps.

10.550 Commodity Distribution.

49.005 Emergency Food and Medical Services.

10.158 Plentiful Foods.

10.503 Extension Program for Improved Nutrition.

10.153 Market News.

13.494 Vocational Education—Consumer and Homemaking.

*Food inspection (five programs by one agency)*

10.151 Assistance to States for Intra-State Meat and Poultry Inspection Programs.

10.157 Meat and Poultry Inspection.

10.800. Livestock and Poultry Market Supervision.

10.150 Agricultural Product Grading.

10.154 Market Supervision.

*Research (two programs by one agency)*

13.100 Food and Drug Research Project Grants.

13.248 Regional Medical Programs—Nutrition.

#### HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES

*Facility planning and construction (20 programs in four agencies)*

13.340 Health Professions—Facilities Construction.

13.223 Health Facilities Construction—Technical Assistance.

13.221 Health Facilities Construction—Long-Term Care Facilities.

13.220 Health Facilities Construction—Hospitals and Public Health Centers.

13.219 Health Facilities Construction—Diagnostic and Treatment Centers.

13.222 Health Facilities Construction—Rehabilitation Facilities.

13.236 Mental Health—Construction of Community Mental Health Centers.

13.240 Mental Health—Staffing of Community Mental Health Centers.

13.716 Mental Retardation Community Facilities Construction.

13.715 Mental Retardation—Initial Staffing of Community Facilities.

13.235 Mental Health—Community Assistance Grants for Narcotic Addiction.

64.005 Grants to States for Construction of State Nursing Home Care Facilities.

13.333 General Clinical Research Centers.

13.369 Schools of Nursing—Facilities Construction.

14.123 Mortgage Insurance—Non-Profit Hospitals.

14.116 Mortgage Insurance—Group Practice Medical Facilities.

14.129 Mortgage Insurance—Nursing Homes and Intermediate Care Facilities.

39.003 Donation of Federal Surplus Personal Property.

39.002 Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property.

13.606 Surplus Property Utilization.

*Health services planning and technical assistance (13 programs by two agencies)*

13.207 Comprehensive Health Planning—Grants to States.

13.206 Comprehensive Health Planning—Area-Wide Grants.

13.208 Comprehensive Health Planning—Training Studies and Demonstrations.

13.209 Comprehensive Health Services—Standard Setting and Resource Developments.

13.226 Health Services Research and Development—Grants and Contracts.

13.249 Regional Medical Programs—Operational and Planning Grants.

13.223 Health Facilities Construction—Technical Assistance.

13.370 Schools of Public Health—Formula Grants.

13.717 Mental Retardation Hospital Improvement and Inservice Training.

13.245 Migrant Health—Technical Assistance.

13.200 Communicable Disease Prevention and Control—Consultation and Technical Assistance.

13.227 Health Statistics Analysis and Technical Assistance.

11.201 Importation of Duty-Free Educational and Scientific Materials.

*Research, general (see also education subcategories on dental, medical, health and nursing) (26 programs by three agencies)*

13.335 General Medical Sciences—Research Grants.

13.337 General Research Support Grants.

13.365 Physician and Allied Health Manpower Research Grants.

13.371 Special Research Resources.

13.226 Health Services Research and Development—Grants and Contracts.

64.001 Biomedical Research.

47.002 Biomedical Sciences Research Projects Support.

13.301 Allergy and Infectious Diseases—Research Grants.

13.309 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases—Research Grants.

13.312 Cancer Research Centers.

13.314 Cancer Research Grants.

13.317 Child Health and Human Development—Research Grants.

13.231 Maternal and Child Health Research.

13.202 Communicable Diseases—Research Grants.

13.322 Dental Health Research Grants.

13.325 Dental Research—Grants.

13.328 Environmental Health Sciences—Research Grants.

13.331 Eye Research—Grants.

13.346 Heart and Lung Research—Grants.

13.356 Neurological Diseases and Stroke—Research Grants.

13.361 Nursing Research Grants.

13.012 Radiological Health Research Grants.

13.010 Occupational Health Research Grants.

13.100 Food and Drug Research—Project Grants.

13.018 Water Hygiene Research Grants.

13.333 General Clinical Research Centers.

*General health and medical services (11 programs by two agencies)*

49.003 Comprehensive Health Services.

13.210 Comprehensive Public Health Services—Formula Grants.

13.224 Health Service Development—Project Grants.

13.714 Medical Assistance Program.

13.246 Migrant Health Grants.

13.725 Refugees in the United States—Health Services.

49.001 Alcoholic Counseling and Recovery.

49.004 Drug Rehabilitation.

13.215 Emergency Health—Hospital and Ambulance Services.

13.800 Health Insurance for the Aged—Hospital Insurance.

13.801 Health Insurance for the Aged—Supplementary Medical Insurance.

*Communicable diseases (six programs by one agency)*

13.202 Communicable Diseases—Research Grants.

13.200 Communicable Disease Prevention and Control—Consultation and Technical Assistance.

13.204 Communicable Diseases—Tuberculosis Control.

13.205 Communicable Diseases—Venereal Disease Control.

13.203 Communicable Diseases—Training Public Health Workers.

13.201 Communicable Diseases—Laboratory Improvement.

*Maternity, infants, children (12 programs by two agencies)*

49.006 Family Planning.

13.217 Family Planning Projects.

13.234 Maternity and Infant Care Projects.

13.230 Intensive Infant Care Projects.

13.232 Maternal and Child Health Services.

13.218 Health Care of Children and Youth—Special Projects.

13.211 Crippled Children's Services.

13.212 Dental Health of Children.

13.600 Child Development—Head Start.

13.601 Child Development—Technical Assistance.

13.233 Maternal and Child Health Training.

13.231 Maternal and Child Health Research.

*Mental health (18 programs by two agencies)*

13.242 Mental Health Research Group.

13.236 Mental Health—Construction of Community Mental Health Centers.

13.240 Mental Health—Staffing of Community Health Centers.

13.238 Mental Health Hospital Staff Development Grants.

13.237 Mental Health Hospital Improvement Grants.

13.244 Mental Health Training Grants.

13.241 Mental Health Fellowships.

13.235 Mental Health—Community Assistance Grants for Narcotic Addiction.

13.239 Mental Health—Narcotic Addict Treatment.

13.243 Mental Health Scientific Communications and Public Education.

13.734 Repatriated United States Nationals Assistance.

13.603 Mental Retardation Coordination and Information.

13.719 Mental Retardation Research.

54.001 Mental Retardation Evaluation.

13.718 Mental Retardation Rehabilitation Service Projects.

13.717 Mental Retardation Hospital Improvement (HIP) and Inservice Training (HIST).

13.716 Mental Retardation Community Facilities Construction.

13.715 Mental Retardation—Initial Staffing of Community Facilities.

*Physical fitness (seven programs by one agency)*

55.001 Governor's Councils on Physical Fitness.

55.006 Physical Fitness Program Development.

55.005 Physical Fitness Demonstration Center Schools.

55.004 Physical Fitness Clinics.

55.002 National Summer Youth Sports Program.

55.003 Physical Fitness and Sports Information.

55.007 Presidential Physical Fitness Awards.

*Veterans (see also as subcategory of WELFARE) (nine programs by one agency)*

64.115 Veterans Information and Assistance.

64.116 Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans.

64.011 Veterans Outpatient Care.

64.012 Veterans Prescription Service.

64.009 Veterans Hospitalization.

64.007 Rehabilitation of Blind Veterans.

64.013 Veterans Prosthetic Appliances.

64.006 Prosthetics Research.

64.008 Veterans Domiciliary Care and Restoration.

*Indians (see also as subcategory of Welfare) (two programs by one agency)*

13.228 Indian Health Service.

13.229 Indian Sanitation Facilities.

*Information and Education Services (see also Information and Statistics) (17 programs by five agencies)*

64.004 Exchange of Medical Information.

13.250 Regional Medical Programs—Smoking and Health.

13.247 Regional Medical Programs—Kidney Disease Control.

13.248 Regional Medical Programs—Nutrition.

13.243 Mental Health Scientific Communications and Public Education.

13.603 Mental Retardation Coordination and Information.

54.001 Mental Retardation Evaluation.

15.300 Coal Mine Health and Safety.

15.302 Mine Health and Safety Counseling.

13.213 Emergency Health—Civil Defense Medical Self-Help.

13.214 Emergency Health—Community Preparedness.

13.227 Health Statistics Analysis and Technical Assistance.

55.003 Physical Fitness and Sports Information.

13.351 Medical Library Assistance—Research Grants.

13.348 Medical Library Assistance—Library Resources Grants.

13.350—Medical Library Assistance—Regional Medical Libraries.

13.349 Medical Library Assistance—Publications Support Grants.

*HOUSING*

*Homebuying, homeownership (20 programs by three agencies)*

14.147 Public Housing—Home Ownership.

10.410 Low to Moderate Income Housing Loans.

14.604 Housing Rehabilitation Loans and Grants.

14.131 Mortgage Insurance—Purchase of Rehabilitated Homes by Low Income Families.

14.106 Interest Subsidy—Purchase of Rehabilitated Homes by Lower Income Families.

14.120 Mortgage Insurance—Homes for Low and Moderate Income Families.

14.105 Interest Subsidy—Homes for Lower Income Families.

14.140 Mortgage Insurance—Special Credit Risks.

14.123 Mortgage Insurance—Housing in Older, Declining Areas.

14.130 Mortgage Insurance—Purchase by Homeowners of Fee Simple Title from Lessors.

14.117 Mortgage Insurance—Homes.

14.110 Mobile Home Loan Insurance—Financing Purchase of Mobile Homes as Principal Residence.

14.112 Mortgage Insurance—Construction or Rehabilitation of Condominium Projects.

14.113 Mortgage Insurance—Conversion of Below Market Rate Rental Housing to Condominium Ownership.

14.122 Mortgage Insurance—Homes in Urban Renewal Areas.

14.119 Mortgage Insurance—Homes for Disaster Victims.

64.113 Veterans Housing—Direct Loans and Advances.

64.114 Veterans Housing—Guaranteed and Insured Loans.

14.118 Mortgage Insurance—Homes for Certified Veterans.

64.106. Specially Adapted Housing for Disabled Veterans.

*Home improvements—Homeowner (six programs by two agencies)*

10.417 Very Low-Income Housing Repair Loans.

10.410 Low to Moderate Income Housing Loans.

14.142 Property Improvement Loan Insurance—All Existing Structures.

14.107 Major Home Improvement Loan Insurance—Homes in Urban Renewal Areas.

14.109 Major Home Improvement Loan Insurance—Rental Housing in Urban Renewal Areas.

14.001 Flood Insurance.

*Cooperatives (seven programs by one agency)*

14.103 Interest Reduction Payments—Rental and Cooperative Housing for Lower Income Families.

14.114 Mortgage Insurance—Conversion of Below Market Rate Rental Housing to Cooperative Ownership.

14.124 Mortgage Insurance—Investor Sponsored Cooperative Housing.

14.115 Mortgage Insurance—Development of Sales Type Cooperative Projects.

14.132 Mortgage Insurance—Purchase of Sales Type Cooperative Housing Units.

14.126 Mortgage Insurance—Management Type Cooperative Projects.

14.150 Supplemental Loan Insurance—Management Type Cooperative Projects.

*Rural (14 programs by five agencies)*

10.411 Mutual and Self-Help Housing Loans.

14.121 Mortgage Insurance—Homes in Outlying Areas.

10.407 Farm Ownership Loans.

64.112 Veterans Farm Loans.

10.410 Low to Moderate Income Housing Loans.

10.417 Very Low-Income Housing Repair Loans.

14.108 Major Home Improvement Loan Insurance—Housing Outside Urban Renewal Areas.

14.143 Property Improvement Loan Insurance—Construction of Nonresidential Farm Structures.

14.144 Property Improvement Loan Insurance—Construction of Nonresidential or Non-farm Structures.

10.415 Rural Rental Housing Loans.

10.405 Farm Labor Housing Loans and Grants.

49.009 Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers Assistance.

23.005 Appalachian Housing Fund.

23.006 Appalachian Housing Technical Assistance.

*Multifamily (see also Community Development) (25 programs by two agencies)*

14.141 Non-Profit Housing Sponsor Loans—Planning Projects for Low and Moderate Income Families.

14.146 Public Housing—Acquisition, Construction, and Rehabilitation.

14.607 Public Housing—Modernization of Projects.

14.148—Public Housing—Leased.

14.149 Rent Supplements—Rental Housing for Low Income Families.

14.111 Mortgage Insurance—Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Homes for Resale to Low Income Families.

14.104 Interest Subsidy—Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Homes for Resale to Lower Income Families.

14.136 Mortgage Insurance—Rental Housing for Low and Moderate Income Families, Below Market Interest Rate.

14.137 Mortgage Insurance—Rental Housing for Low and Moderate Income Families, Market Interest Rate.

14.135 Mortgage Insurance—Rental Housing for Low and Moderate Income Families.

14.134 Mortgage Insurance—Rental Housing.

14.139 Mortgage Insurance—Rental Housing in Urban Renewal Areas.

14.151 Supplemental Loan Insurance—Multifamily Rental Housing.

14.103 Interest Reduction Payments—Rental and Cooperative Housing for Lower Income Families.

14.102 Housing Loans—Rental Housing for the Elderly and the Handicapped.

14.138 Mortgage Insurance—Rental Housing for the Elderly.

14.145 Property Improvement Loan Insurance—Existing Multifamily Dwellings.

14.133 Mortgage Insurance—Purchase of Units in Condominiums.

14.127 Mortgage Insurance—Mobile Home Courts.

14.609 Urban Renewal Projects.

14.600 Certified Area Grants.

14.603 Demolition Grants.

14.601 Code Enforcement Grants.

11.600 Building Code (Regulation) Assistance to States.

14.608 Relocation Assistance and Payments.

*Experimental and development projects (see also Community Development) (11 programs by two agencies)*

14.207 New Communities—Loan Guarantees.

14.208 New Communities—Supplemental Grants.

14.125 Mortgage Insurance—Land Development and New Communities.

14.501 Mortgage Insurance—Experimental Homes.

14.503 Mortgage Insurance—Experimental Rental Housing.

14.502 Mortgage Insurance—Experimental Projects Other Than Housing.

14.500 Low Income Housing Demonstration Grants.

14.504 Urban Planning Research and Demonstration.

14.505 Urban Renewal Demonstration Grants.

14.300 Model Cities Supplementary Grants.

11.600 Building Code (Regulations) Assistance to States.

*Indians (five programs by one agency)*

15.115 Indian Housing Development.

15.116 Indian Housing Improvement.

15.111 Indian—Forest Fire Suppression and Emergency Rehabilitation.

15.127 Indian—Transfer of Federally-Owned Buildings, Improvements, and/or Facilities.

15.109 Indian—Federal School Facilities—Dormitory Operations.

#### INFORMATION AND STATISTICS

(See also all other Categories having similarly titled subcategories.)

*Libraries, clearinghouses, archives (eight programs by five agencies)*

10.700 National Agricultural Library.

11.602 Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information.

14.205 HUD Clearinghouse Service.

39.004 National Archives Reference Services.

40.001 Depository Libraries for Government Publications.

29.001 Clearinghouse Services and Civil Rights Complaints.

39.005 National Audiovisual Center.

40.002 Government Publications—Sales and Distribution.

*Library of Congress and Smithsonian services (13 programs by two agencies)*

42.005 Library of Congress Publications.

42.003 Distribution of Library of Congress Catalog Cards.

42.006 Library of Congress Reference and Bibliographic Services.

42.004 Library of Congress Photoduplication Service.

42.002 Copyright Service.

42.007 Research and Referral Services in Science and Technology.

60.010 Smithsonian Associates.

60.012 Smithsonian Institution Libraries.

60.015 Smithsonian Publications.

60.008 Registrar Programs.

60.001 Smithsonian Institution Programs in Basic Research and Public Education.

60.017 Smithsonian Special Public Affairs.

60.013 Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service.

*Census data (five programs by one agency)*

11.001 Census and Statistical Reports.

11.005 Census Special Tabulations and Services.

11.003 Census Geography.

11.004 Census Intergovernmental Services.

11.002 Census Data Access and Use Laboratory.

*General (nine programs by seven agencies)*

21.003 Tax Information and Training.

11.404 Weather Forecasts and Warnings.

11.402 River and Flood Forecasts.

56.001 Youth Opportunity.

11.700 Measures and Analyses of the United States Economy.

17.003 Prices and Cost of Living Data.

22.001 Intergovernmental Relations Advisory Service.

51.001 Intergovernmental Relations and Liaison.

49.007 Federal Information Exchange System.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT

*Planning and operations (five programs by two agencies)*

16.500 Law Enforcement Assistance—Comprehensive Planning.

16.502 Law Enforcement Assistance—Improving and Strengthening Law Enforcement.

16.501 Law Enforcement Assistance—Discretionary Grants.

16.503 Law Enforcement Assistance—Technical Assistance.

15.131 Indians—Law and Order.

*Research, education, and training (14 programs by four agencies)*

16.507 Law Enforcement Research and Development—Project Grants.

16.506 Law Enforcement Research and Development—Pilot Grants.

16.505 Law Enforcement Research and Development—Graduate Research Fellowships.

16.508 Law Enforcement Research and Development—Visiting Fellowships.

16.504 Law Enforcement Education Program—Student Financial Aid.

16.005 Public Education on Drug Abuse—Technical Assistance.

16.003 Law Enforcement Assistance—Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Technical Laboratory Publications.

16.302 Law Enforcement Assistance—FBI Field Police Training.

16.300—Law Enforcement Assistance—FBI Advanced Police Training.

16.004 Law Enforcement Assistance—Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Training.

21.100 Secret Service—Training Activities.

21.002 Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms—Training Assistance.

15.602 Conservation Law Enforcement Training Assistance.

11.606 Weights and Measures Service.

*Narcotics and dangerous drugs (six programs by two agencies)*

16.004 Law Enforcement Assistance—Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Training.

16.001 Law Enforcement Assistance—Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Laboratory Analysis.

16.003 Law Enforcement Assistance—Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Technical Laboratory Publications.

16.002 Law Enforcement Assistance—Nar-

cotics and Dangerous Drugs—State Legislation.

16.005 Public Education on Drug Abuse—Technical Assistance.

13.239 Mental Health—Narcotic Addict Treatment.

*Crime analysis and data (six programs by two agencies)*

16.301 Law Enforcement Assistance—FBI Crime Laboratory Support.

16.001 Law Enforcement Assistance—Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Laboratory Analysis.

21.001 Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms—Laboratory Analysis.

16.303 Law Enforcement Assistance—FBI Fingerprint Identification.

16.304 Law Enforcement Assistance—National Crime Information Center.

16.305 Law Enforcement Assistance—Uniform Crime Reports.

#### LEGAL SERVICES

*General services (23 programs by 14 agencies)*

49.008 Legal Services.

36.001 Consumer and Business Protection.

29.001 Clearinghouse Services and Civil Rights Complaints.

16.200 Community Relations Service.

16.104 Protection of Voting Rights.

16.102 Equal Enjoyment of Public Accommodations.

16.100 Desegregation of Public Education.

13.602 Civil Rights Compliance Activities.

58.001 Investor Protection—Complaints and Inquiries.

11.006 Personal Census Search.

21.003 Tax Information and Training.

42.002 Copyright Service.

11.601 Calibration and Testing Services.

11.606 Weights and Measures Service.

11.600 Building Code (Regulations) Assistance to States.

61.002 Trade Adjustment Assistance—Firms.

61.001 Tariff Adjustment (Industry).

61.003 Trade Adjustment Assistance—Workers.

33.001 Shipping—Investigation of Complaints.

19.201 Protection of Ships From Foreign Seizure.

41.002 Interstate Commerce—Investigations of Complaints.

41.001 Interstate Commerce—Cooperative Enforcement Agreements with States.

32.001 Communications—Information, Regulation, and Investigation of Complaints.

*Employment rights (eight programs by three agencies)*

16.101 Equal Employment Opportunity.

17.301 Equal Employment Opportunity by Federal Contractors.

17.303 Minimum Wage and Hour Standards.

30.001 Job Discrimination—Investigation and Conciliation of Complaints.

30.003 Job Discrimination Technical Assistance to Employers, Unions, and Employment Agencies.

30.002 Job Discrimination—Special Project Grants.

17.102 Veterans Reemployment Rights.

17.300 Age Discrimination in Employment.

*Labor-management relations (five programs by three agencies)*

46.001 Labor-Management Relations.

34.001 Labor Mediation and Conciliation.

17.100 Labor-Management Relations Services.

17.304 Workers Safety and Labor Standards.

17.101 Labor Organization Reports.

*Housing rights (two programs by two agencies)*

14.400 Equal Opportunity in Housing.

16.103 Fair Housing.

*Claims against foreign governments (four programs by two agencies)*

19.200 Claims Against Foreign Governments.

37.001 Claims Against the Government of Bulgaria.

37.002 Claims Against the Government of Italy.

37.003 Claims Against the Government of Rumania.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES

*Mineral research (four programs by one agency)*

15.303 Minerals Research—Grants and Contracts.

15.802 Minerals Discovery Loan Programs.

15.800 Geologic and Mineral Resource Surveys and Mapping.

15.304 Mineral Resource Information.

*Water conservation and research (seven programs by three agencies)*

65.001 Water Resources Planning.

15.951 Water Resources Research—Assistance to States for Institutes.

15.952 Water Resources Research—Matching Grants to State Institutes.

15.950 Additional Water Resources Research.

15.500 Atmospheric Water Resources Research.

15.804 Water Resources Investigations.

62.003 Tennessee Valley Region—Water Resources Development.

*Wildlife research and preservation (seven programs by two agencies)*

15.610 Wildlife Research.

15.611 Wildlife Restoration.

15.609 Wildlife Enhancement.

15.900 Disposal of Surplus Wildlife.

15.604 Fish Research.

39.002 Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property.

15.606 Migratory Bird-Banding and Data Analysis.

*Land conservation (14 programs by five agencies)*

65.001 Water Resources Planning.

35.001 Water Resources Development.

15.907 Park Practice Program.

15.602 Conservation Law Enforcement Training Assistance.

15.002 Commercial Fisheries Disaster Assistance.

10.050 Agricultural Conservation.

10.901 Resource Conservation and Development.

10.414 Resource Conservation and Development Loans.

10.650 State and Private Forestry Cooperation.

10.904 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention.

10.902 Soil and Water Conservation.

23.007 Appalachian Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control.

23.010 Appalachian Mine Area Restoration.

15.126 Indian—Soil and Moisture Conservation.

#### RECREATION

*Planning and technical assistance (see also Community Development) (eight programs by two agencies)*

15.400 Outdoor Recreation Planning—Financial Assistance.

15.401 Outdoor Recreation—Financial Assistance.

15.402 Outdoor Recreation Technical Assistance.

15.906 Park and Recreation Technical Assistance.

15.907 Park Practice Program.

10.901 Resource Conservation and Development.

10.507 Extension Programs for Recreation, Wildlife, and Natural Beauty.

15.010 Jellyfish Control.

*Land and facility acquisition and maintenance (see also Community Development) (eight programs by six agencies)*

14.209 Open Space Land, Acquisition and Development Grants.

14.212 Urban Beautification and Improvement Grants.

15.202 Public Land for Recreation, Public Purposes and Historic Monuments.

39.002 Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property.

10.413 Recreation Facility Loans.

10.412 Recreation Association Loans.

12.101 Beach Erosion Control.

35.001 Water Resources Development.

*Fish and game management (seven programs by one agency)*

15.601 Animal Damage Control.

15.603 Farm Fish Pond Management.

15.604 Fish Research.

15.605 Fish Restoration.

15.608 Sport Fish Management.

15.001 Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation.

15.600 Anadromous Fish Conservation.

#### SCIENCE

*Research general (20 programs by four agencies)*

10.200 Contracts and Grants for Scientific Research.

47.016 National and Special Research Programs.

47.028 Scientific Conference Grants.

10.201 Research Facilities.

47.027 Science Planning and Policy Studies.

47.012 Institutional Grants for Science.

47.011 Graduate Science Facilities.

47.035 University Science Development.

47.004 Departmental Science Development.

60.001 Smithsonian Institution Programs in Basic Research and Public Education.

47.013 Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to Problems of Our Society.

47.006 Engineering Sciences Research Initiation Grants.

47.007 Engineering Sciences Research Project Support.

47.029 Social Sciences Research Project Support.

47.005 Doctoral Dissertation Research in the Social Sciences.

47.002 Biological Sciences Research Project Support.

47.016 Mathematical and Physical Sciences Research Project Support.

47.008 Environmental Sciences Research Project Support.

10.001 Agricultural Research—Basic and Applied Research.

19.007 Technology Applications for Less-Developed Countries.

*Specialized research (see also Nuclear Education subcategory of Education) (15 programs by five agencies)*

47.017 National and Special Research Programs.

47.031 Specialized Research Facilities and Equipment.

24.024 Nuclear Science and Technology—Research and Development.

24.030 Work Experience.

47.018 Oceanography—Basic Research Grants.

20.002 Coast Guard Cooperative Marine Sciences.

47.023 Sea Grant Project Support.

47.022 Sea Grant Institutional Support.

60.004 Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies.

60.019 Visiting Research Appointments in Astrophysics, Geodesy, Meteorites and Space Sciences.

60.011 Smithsonian Center for Short-lived Phenomena.

15.500 Atmospheric Water Resources Research.

47.001 Antarctic Research.

60.018 Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute.

60.016 Smithsonian Special Foreign Currency Grants for Museum Programs and Related Research.

*Information and technical services (see also Information and Statistics) (28 programs by six agencies)*

47.026 Science Information Services and Publications.

47.024 Science Information Activities—System Development and Improvement.

11.602 Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information.

11.603 National Standard Reference Data System.

11.604 Standard Reference Materials.

42.007 Research and Referral Services in Science and Technology.

60.015 Smithsonian Publications.

60.009 Science Information Exchange.

60.006 International Exchange of Scientific and Literary Publications and Governmental Documents.

60.013 Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service.

60.014 Smithsonian Oceanographic Sorting Centers.

47.014 International Cooperative Science Activities.

47.015 International Travel.

43.002 Technology Utilization.

24.023 Nuclear Science and Technology—Literature and Information Services.

24.025 Nuclear Science Lecture Demonstrations for Secondary Schools.

24.029 Uranium Industry Workshops.

24.002 Atomic Energy Motion Picture Film Libraries.

24.001 Access Permits.

43.001 Space Science Education Project.

11.403 Seismological Investigations.

11.601 Calibration and Testing Services.

47.003 Computers—Research and Educational Activities.

47.030 Special Computer Services for Research and Science Education.

11.201 Importation of Duty-Free Educational and Scientific Materials.

11.605 State Invention Program.

24.003 Granting of Patent Licenses.

11.900 Patent and Trademark Technical Information Dissemination.

#### TRANSPORTATION

*Urban mass transit (seven programs by one agency)*

20.500 Urban Mass Transportation Capital Improvement Grants.

20.501 Urban Mass Transportation Capital Improvement Loans.

20.503 Urban Mass Transportation—Managerial Training.

20.504 Urban Mass Transportation—Research, Development, and Demonstration.

20.502 Urban Mass Transportation Grants for University Research and Training.

20.505 Urban Mass Transportation Technical Studies Grants.

20.300 High Speed Ground Transportation Research and Development.

*Highways and roads (18 programs by five agencies)*

20.205 Highway Planning and Construction.

20.206 Highway Planning and Research Studies.

20.211 Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety.

20.210 State and Community Highway Safety.

20.207 Highway Safety Demonstration Projects.

20.208 Highway Safety Research Fellowships.

20.204 Highway Beautification—Landscaping and Scenic Enhancement.

20.203 Highway Beautification—Control of Outdoor Advertising.

20.202 Highway Beautification—Control of Junkyards.

20.200 Federal-Aid Highways—Emergency Relief.

12.105 Protection of Essential Highways, Highway Bridge Approaches, etc.

20.209 Public Lands Highways.

20.201 Forest Highways.

11.400 Geodesy.

23.003 Appalachian Development Highway System.

23.008 Appalachian Local Access Roads.

15.122 Indian—Reservation Roads and Bridges.

15.125 Indian—Roads Maintenance.

*Water Navigation (seven programs by four agencies)*

20.001 Boating Safety.

12.107 Small Navigation Projects.

12.100 Aquatic Plant Control.

12.108 Snagging and Clearing for Flood Control.

15.010 Jellyfish Control.

11.401 Nautical Charts and Related Data.

11.402 River and Flood Forecasts.

*Air (six programs by four agencies)*

20.101 Federal-Aid Airport Program.

39.002 Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property.

39.003 Donation of Federal Surplus Personal Property.

15.200 Land Lease for Airports.

26.001 Air Carrier Payments.

20.100 Aviation Education.

*General (three programs by two agencies)*

20.400 Transportation Planning Information—Environment and Urban Systems.

11.501 Development and Promotion of Parts and Intermodal Transport Systems.

11.404 Weather Forecasts and Warnings.

#### WELFARE AND SOCIAL SERVICES

*Research, demonstration, training (18 programs by two agencies)*

13.739 Social Welfare Cooperative Research and Demonstration Grants.

13.740 Social Work Manpower—Training Grant.

13.723 Public Assistance Demonstration Projects.

13.724 Public Assistance Staff Development—Formula Grants to States.

13.728 Rehabilitation Research and Demonstration Grants.

13.729 Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers.

13.731 Rehabilitation Services Expansion Grants.

13.732 Rehabilitation Services Innovation Grants.

13.733 Rehabilitation Training.

13.706 Child Welfare Research and Demonstration Grants.

13.708 Child Welfare Training.

13.711 Juvenile Delinquency Planning, Prevention and Rehabilitation.

13.712 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control—Model Programs and Technical Assistance.

13.713 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control—Training.

13.701 Aging—Research and Development Grants.

13.702 Aging—Training Grants.

49.010 Older Persons Opportunities and Services.

49.012 Volunteers in Service to America.

*Families and Child Welfare (see also Health) (25 programs by four agencies)*

13.703 Aid to Families With Dependent Children.

13.737 Social Services—Families with Dependent Children.

13.709 Emergency Welfare Assistance.

10.502 Extension Program for Improved Family Living.

49.006 Family Planning.

13.217 Family Planning Projects.

13.600 Child Development—Head Start.

13.601 Child Development—Technical Assistance.

49.002 Community Action Operations.

56.001 Youth Opportunity.

13.711 Juvenile Delinquency Planning, Prevention, and Rehabilitation.

13.712 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control—Model Programs and Technical Assistance.

13.713 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control—Training.

13.748 Work Incentive Program—Child Care.

13.710 Foster Grandparent Program.

13.707 Child Welfare Services.

13.708 Child Welfare Training.

13.706 Child Welfare Research and Demonstration Grants.

10.551 Food Stamps.

10.550 Commodity Distribution.

49.005 Emergency Food and Medical Services.

49.003 Comprehensive Health Services.

13.494 Vocational Education—Consumer and Homemaking.

13.727 Refugees in the United States—Welfare Assistance and Services.

13.726 Refugees in the United States—Resettlement.

*Disabled and Handicapped (see also Education) (25 programs by four agencies)*

13.736 Social Services—Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled.

13.705 Aid to the Permanent and Totally Disabled.

13.735 Social Services—Aid to the Blind.

13.704 Aid to the Blind.

42.001 Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

13.720 New Career Opportunities for the Handicapped.

53.001 Handicapped Employment Promotion.

13.802 Social Security—Disability Insurance.

13.806 Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners.

64.109 Veterans Compensation for Service-Connected Disability.

64.104 Pension for Non-service-Connected Disability for Veterans.

13.718 Mental Retardation Rehabilitation Service Projects.

13.728 Rehabilitation Research and Demonstration Grants.

13.729 Rehabilitation Research and Training Center.

13.730 Rehabilitation Service Expansion—Contracts with Industry.

13.731 Rehabilitation Services Expansion Grants.

13.732 Rehabilitation Services Innovation Grants.

13.733 Rehabilitation Training.

13.747 Vocational Rehabilitation Services for Social Security Beneficiaries.

13.746 Vocational Rehabilitation Services—Basic Support.

13.721 New Career Opportunities in Vocational Rehabilitation.

13.745 Vocational Rehabilitation Training Services Grants.

13.744 Vocational Rehabilitation—Technical Assistance.

13.742 Vocational Rehabilitation—Facility Improvement Grants.

13.743 Vocational Rehabilitation—Initial Staffing.

*Social security insurance (10 programs by four agencies)*

13.802 Social Security—Disability Insurance.

13.803 Social Security—Retirement Insurance.

13.805 Social Security—Survivors Insurance.

13.804 Social Security—Special Benefits for Persons Aged 72 and Over.

57.001 Social Insurance for Railroad Workers.

13.806 Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners.

17.302 Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation.

64.103 Life Insurance for Veterans.

13.800 Health Insurance for the Aged—Hospital Insurance.

13.801 Health Insurance for the Aged—Supplementary Medical Insurance.

*Old age assistance (12 programs by three agencies)*

49.010 Older persons Opportunities and Services.

13.710 Foster Grandparent Program.

13.738 Social Services—Old Age Assistance.

13.722 Old-Age Assistance.

13.714 Medical Assistance Program.

13.800 Health Insurance for the Aged—Hospital Insurance.

13.801 Health Insurance for the Aged—Supplementary Medical Insurance.

13.803 Social Security—Retirement Insurance.

13.804 Social Security—Special Benefits for Persons Aged 72 and Over.

57.001 Social Insurance for Railroad Workers.

13.700 Aging—Grants to States for Community Planning and Services.

13.701 Aging—Research and Development Grants.

*Indians (see also as subcategory of community development, employment, health and housing) (10 programs by three agencies)*

15.113 Indian—General Assistance.

15.104 Indian—Community Development.

15.102 Indian—Aid to Tribal Governments.

15.103 Indian—Child Welfare Assistance.

15.118 Indian—Investment of Indian Tribal Trust Funds and Individual Indian Monies.

15.129 Indian—Tribal Accounting Services.

49.005 Emergency Food and Medical Services.

13.228 Indian Health Services.

15.100 Indian—Adult Education.

15.114 Indian—Higher Education.

*Veterans (see also as subcategory of health) (36 programs by three agencies)*

64.115 Veterans Information and Assistance.

64.107 Veterans Assistance Centers.

27.002 Federal Employment Assistance for Veterans.

64.116 Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans.

64.111 Veterans Educational Assistance.

64.100 Automobile Grants for Disabled Veterans.

64.108 Veterans Business Loans—Guaranteed and Insured Loans.

64.106 Specially Adapted Housing for Disabled Veterans.

64.113 Veterans Housing—Direct Loans and Advances.

64.114 Veterans Housing—Guaranteed and Insured Loans.

64.112 Veterans Farm Loans.

64.007 Rehabilitation of Blind Veterans.

64.103 Life Insurance for Veterans.

64.109 Veterans Compensation for Service-Connected Disability.

64.104 Pension for Nonservice-Connected Disability for Veterans.

64.012 Veterans Prescription Service.

64.011 Veterans Outpatient Care.

64.013 Veterans Prosthetic Appliances.

64.006 Prosthetics Research.

64.001 Biomedical Research.

64.009 Veterans Hospitalization.

64.010 Veterans Nursing Home Care.

64.015 Veterans State Nursing Home Care.

64.002 Community Contract Nursing Home Care.

64.005 Grants to States for Construction of State Nursing Home Care Facilities.

64.014 Veterans State Home Program.

64.008 Veterans Domiciliary Care and Restoration.

12.500 U.S. Soldiers Home.

64.102 Compensation for Service-Connected Deaths for Veterans Dependents.

64.110 Veterans Dependency and Indemnity Compensation for Service-Connected Death.

64.105 Pension to Veterans' Widows and Children

64.117 War Orphans and Widows Educational Assistance.

64.101 Burial Allowance for Veterans.

12.201 National Cemeteries.

12.200 Memorial Plots in National Cemeteries.

12.202 Headstones and Markers.

*Other specialized services (15 programs by eight agencies)*

13.741 State and Local Administration of Public Assistance Programs.

11.006 Personal Census Search.

49.008 Legal Services.

13.734 Repatriated United States Nationals Assistance.

44.001 Federal Credit Union Charter Examination and Supervision.

17.103 Welfare and Pension Plan Reports.

49.004 Drug Rehabilitation.

49.001 Alcoholic Counseling and Recovery.

49.009 Migrant and Seasonal Farm workers Assistance.

13.727 Refugees in the United States—Welfare Assistance and Services.

13.725 Refugees in the United States—Health Services.

13.726 Refugees in the United States—Resettlement.

14.608 Relocation Assistance and Payments.

25.001 Spanish Surnamed Americans Assistance.

16.400 Citizenship Education and Training.

### THE PRESIDENT GAINS SUPPORT

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not easily fooled.

They have made this clear in the latest Gallup poll which shows that 59 percent of them approve of the way President Nixon is doing his job. This is more than twice as many as the 29 percent who disapprove and is an increase of 2 percent over last month.

The American people have for nearly a year and a half rallied around the President's leadership as he unflinchingly has made the tough decisions in South Vietnam, in the Mideast, and at home.

Americans have proved once again that they admire and respect and will follow the kind of leadership the President is giving.

They will follow it despite the bleatings and bleedings of those who seek to polarize our Nation in the name of surrender, those who seek to divide us on the issues of economy or justice or law and those who seek to make political gain at the expense of our Nation's security.

They know the talk about credibility gaps, about crises of leadership, about "isolation of the President" is purely a political propaganda gimmick. They are proving once again that you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

The poll referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 1970]

### THE GALLUP POLL: NIXON GAINS SUPPORT DESPITE CAMBODIA

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—President Nixon has registered steady gains in popularity over the last two months. In the latest survey, completed prior to his report to the nation last Wednesday on Cambodia, 59 per cent of adults expressed approval of his performance in office.

The previous survey, conducted soon after the President's announcement on April 30 of his decision to send troops into Cambodia, showed him with an approval rating of 57 per cent, up a point from his pre-Cambodia rating. The President's ratings have climbed steadily since late March when his popularity had hit its low point to date, 53 per cent approval.

One factor helping to explain the latest survey result is the overwhelming (5-to-1) opposition of the adult population to recent student strikes that focused on Mr. Nixon's Cambodian action.

Another factor that undoubtedly is helping sustain the President's approval rating is his policy of "Vietnamization"—the staged withdrawal of U.S. troops as South Vietnamese forces are trained to take over the fighting. This plan has been popular with the American people for more than four years, as reported in numerous Gallup Poll surveys.

President Nixon is accorded a higher popularity rating than his predecessor, former President Lyndon B. Johnson, at a comparable point in time.

A year and a half after President Johnson took office, in January, 1965, for his first full term, his approval rating stood at 47 per cent. Shortly after Mr. Johnson began his second term, the U.S. greatly stepped up its commitment in Vietnam.

A total of 1,509 adults were interviewed in person in the survey that covered more than 300 scientifically selected localities across the nation. Field work was undertaken May 22-25. Following is the question asked and the trend since January:

*Do you approve or disapprove the way Nixon is handling his job as President?*

[In percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
May 22-25.....	59	29	12
May 2-5.....	57	31	12
Apr. 17-19.....	56	31	13
Mar. 20-22.....	53	30	17
Feb. 28-Mar. 2.....	56	27	17
Jan. 30-Feb. 2.....	66	23	11
Jan. 16-19.....	63	23	14
Jan. 2-5.....	61	22	17

President Nixon's popularity is greatest among whites living in the South, where approval outweighs disapproval 3-to-1. The President is least popular with Negroes, with disapproval outweighing approval by a 2-to-1 ratio.

The larger the community or city, the more likely the resident is to disapprove. In cities of one million people or more, 50 percent express approval of the President's performance in office. In the smallest communities of the nation—those under 2,500—67 percent voice approval.

### WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to save and conserve our national environment.

Action on this legislation would not only help conserve our land and water, but would help revitalize rural and small-town America as well.

This bill would authorize inclusion of all relevant benefits to determine the cost feasibility of all water resource projects. If this legislation is enacted, the benefit-cost ratio would include such important secondary and intangible benefits as:

The economic impact of additional domestic, municipal, agricultural, and industrial water supply;

Outdoor recreation, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, preservation of unique areas of natural beauty;

Protection of unique archeological, historical, or scientific values, and

Area development and population dispersal.

If we are to continue our Nation's water resource development program, a more favorable investment picture resulting from the inclusion of these secondary benefits is essential. This legislation would provide new life for many projects ruled unfeasible by the current interest rate of 4 $\frac{1}{2}$  percent. The interest rate most likely will be increased again in July to 5 $\frac{1}{8}$  percent, causing additional delay and cancellation of vital water resource projects.

Recently the President's Task Force on Rural Development concluded water resources are vital to rural development. The task force report states:

Whatever is done to develop rural America—whether rural industry, recreation, housing, transportation, or open space—it will be built on land and depend on water.

President Nixon also emphasized the importance of rural development when he said:

The population of our country is likely to grow by 50 per cent in the next 30 years. Where these next hundred million persons locate is a tremendously important question for our society. After an era in which people have moved steadily from the countryside to large and crowded cities, we must now do what we can to encourage a more even distribution to our population.

Success of this program depends on accelerated water resource development.

In dealing with the pressing emergencies that compete for our immediate attention and limited resources today, we cannot neglect the conservation and wise use of our natural resources if we are to be blessed with a beneficial environment and a better quality of life in the future in both rural and urban America.

The future quality of the American environment in the cities, as well as the country is dependent on water resource and rural development. The proper development will set the tone of new living in the country, development that will ease the environmental pressures in our cities.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this legislation I am introducing today could certainly help attain these most needed goals.

#### VETERANS CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentle-

man from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely disturbed over recent allegations and distorted news reports that have cast a pall of gloom over the Veterans' Administration and seriously concern its Administrator, the Honorable Donald E. Johnson, who is a long-time devoted friend.

Don Johnson took command of the VA last June only after a close Presidential examination of his brilliant business ability and background in veterans affairs.

This 46-year-old veteran of World War II climbed the ladder of success from a highly unusual start. He joined his foster father in the conduct of a very successful farm supply business. Don Johnson interrupted his college education to serve his Nation with valor as an enlisted man. He returned from the battlefields of Europe as a buck sergeant wearing, among other decorations, the Bronze Star from the U.S. Government, and the Croix de Guerre awarded to him by a grateful Belgium Government.

He returned to Iowa State University after his war service.

This giant of a man was elected department commander of the American Legion in Iowa in 1952 and 12 years later, his devotion to the cause of veterans was recognized on a national level when he was named head of the national American Legion.

I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that during these years that he advanced with the American Legion, he still found time to direct the activities of six very successful Iowa business firms.

He also found time to rear his nine wonderful children in the truest traditions of America. He assisted not only his own children, but other children, too. He has been very active in church and social work, in the Boy Scout movement, and PTA activities.

His accomplishments were so great that the radio and television broadcasters in the State of Iowa voted Don Johnson as Iowan of the Year in 1965.

This man now administers the affairs of 27.5 million living veterans and the widowed and orphaned of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in service to their country.

Mr. Speaker, it is utterly foolish and outright stupid to believe that a man of his compassion, character, and stature would condone or tolerate neglect of, or lack of concern for our veterans.

He knows of the horrors of war—of the anxieties of parents and wives who have husbands or brothers in Vietnam. Don Johnson has personally visited in Vietnam. He has a son who just returned from combat in Vietnam.

In his brief time as Administrator, Don Johnson, because of his keen business ability, his understanding of veterans and their families, has made many improvements in the quality of medical care. He is cognizant of other improvements that must and will be made.

It must be realized, Mr. Speaker, that the Veterans' Administration is the largest independent Federal agency with an

annual budget of more than \$8.7 billion. It administers to more than 800,000 veterans a year in its network of 166 hospitals. It employs more than 5,100 physicians and 15,000 nurses.

It operates one of the largest life insurance programs in the world and education and training programs that will soon involve 1 million veterans and dependents in training at the same time.

I repeat when I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is utterly ridiculous to think for one minute that the Veterans' Administration is not headed by a capable, industrious, compassionate and understanding man with the highest moral character that we look for in public administrators.

I believe that Don Johnson is all of these and more. We are indeed very fortunate to have Don Johnson as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read some excerpts from a press statement issued by the Administrator on May 25, 1970, as the result of news attacks on the Veterans' Administration—attacks that have created a terrible blow to the morale of not only servicemen who expect to be transferred to VA hospitals and to veterans already confined to VA hospitals, but to many of the 134,000 people employed by VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Don Johnson declared to the news media, and I quote:

I have invited you here—not to criticize—but to ask your help in establishing a more balanced perspective in regard to the VA medical program. I ask this help for the sake of the thousands of veterans who will become our patients, for the morale of our hospital staffs, and in the interest of a better understanding by a concerned public.

I ask your help for these reasons only, and not because I am trying to duck criticism. I firmly believe that every agency of government, and every public official should not only expect—but should welcome—criticism. Sincere and constructive criticism helps all of us to do a better job.

In recent days, weeks and months, however, there has been some criticism in some media so exaggerated as to lead our veterans and the public to fear that VA is practicing grossly inferior medicine with hospital staffs that have little or no concern for their veteran-patients. . . .

This kind of criticism does a great deal of damage. It serves to tear down the very program these critics say they are trying to strengthen. It serves to needlessly alarm the thousands of patients VA is treating, and will be privileged to treat in the future.

There is increasing evidence that it is demoralizing the competent and hard-working staffs at VA's 166 hospitals. The competition for scarce-category medical personnel is always intense, and these stories make VA staff recruitment efforts even more difficult.

It is perhaps for all of these reasons that the Council of Deans of the American Association of Medical Colleges—at a regularly scheduled meeting held May 21, 1970, here in Washington unanimously went on record in two particulars.

The Council, composed of the Deans of the 101 medical schools in America that set the pace for the best there is in medicine, condemned—as completely unjustified—what that body referred to as intemperate and inaccurate attacks on the VA medical program that have recently appeared in some news media, and expressed the Council's confidence in the continuing ability of VA hospitals to render high quality medical care.



Certainly we are not perfect, nor will we ever be. I can promise, though, that we will keep trying to the very limit of our capabilities and endurance to constantly improve, and to give veterans the very best possible medical care.

The very finest care possible is what they deserve. VA's motivation will never wane, for our medical personnel feel just as do I that we are privileged to serve America's finest citizens—our veterans.

#### A PART OF THE SILENT MAJORITY NOW SPEAKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to convey to the Congress a communication from a self-proclaimed portion of what has become known as "the silent majority."

Albert Zerges, State secretary of the Ohio Junior Order of United American Mechanics, has sent me the following letter with which I am happy to comply:

JUNIOR ORDER,  
UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,  
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 28, 1970.

HON. CLARENCE BROWN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BROTHER BROWN: At the meeting of the State Board of Officers of the Junior Order, United American Mechanics, on May 23d, 1970 at the Sheraton-Gibson Hotel in Cincinnati, Ohio, the enclosed Statement of Support of our President was unanimously approved.

We have faith in our President and believe in him. We also have a lot of confidence in you as a real American, and are asking you to read this Statement of our Support of our President and have it recorded in the Congressional Record. We believe this will get others to sit up and take notice that there are many Americans who support those we put into office, with the confidence that they will handle things wisely.

If it is possible to get a copy of the Congressional Record that this will be printed in, I would appreciate a copy.

Yours fraternally,

ALBERT ZERGES,  
State Secretary, Jr. O U. A. M.

The Junior Order has 60,000 members in the United States in about half the States and over a thousand local chapters. Originally founded to protect the interests of working craftsmen and laborers, it was a forerunner of the labor movement in America. But it has become a fraternal organization since the development of the more militant labor movements which evolved from the assembly line industrialization of this century. Now Junior Order members are dedicated to the preservation and independence of public education, American freedoms, thoughts of labor and advocates of teaching moral principles to our youth in the home. The organization maintains a national orphans' home, life insurance benefits and a national legislative committee and a publication called "Junior American."

The following is the statement of support for our President which the Ohio Junior Order unanimously adopted:

JUNIOR ORDER, UNITED  
AMERICAN MECHANICS,  
Cincinnati, Ohio.

#### A PART OF THE SILENT MAJORITY NOW SPEAKS

The President during his campaign for that High Office, told the American people that if elected he would bring an end to the Vietnam War and return the American Troops back home. Likewise, after his election, and as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, he had the responsibility of protecting lives of the Troops and to inaugurate a program which would in time bring this War to a close, and return the Armed Forces of America back to their homeland.

In the responsibility assumed by the President, he did inaugurate such a program, it being to train and equip the South Vietnamese fighting forces until they had reached that point of being able to defend themselves against an enemy. Likewise, he initiated a program for the people of South Vietnam in which they would understand what he was doing and the people of South Vietnam by their actions and conduct merely shows that they were in favor of same. There were less desertions, there was more dedication to country, and the fighting forces of South Vietnam are now more powerful as a fighting organization than they have ever been since the very beginning of the war, and they are carrying a great deal of the burden in protecting their land at this time with the help of the American Forces by air power and otherwise. This program has been more rapid in its development than any one could foresee when it was begun, and during the year of 1969 the casualties in this war so far as the Americans were concerned were lower than ever before in the history of the war, and President Nixon has returned one hundred thousand boys back home.

During the term of the President to this time the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have had sanctuaries in Cambodia against the will of the Cambodians, which gave to them a great advantage, being able to stockpile supplies, food, ammunition, technical equipment, drugs and hospitals, and the enemy saw where they could rush across the Cambodian line using the ammunition to kill American troops and then fall back across the line into Cambodia feeling that they were perfectly safe.

The President many times has advised the North Vietnamese that if they escalated the war he would respond quickly with appropriate action.

A few weeks ago the President took that quick and positive action and ordered American troops across the line into Cambodia, together with the South Vietnamese troops, not with the idea of invading or destroying Cambodia, but for the purpose of destroying the sanctuaries of the enemy which would reduce the casualties to the boys of the Armed Forces of the United States which as Commander in Chief the President must always protect.

Even during the first year of the President's Administration there were demonstrations upon the campuses of the colleges all over this United States, and they were demonstrating against the South Vietnamese War. During that time we witnessed the burning of buildings and the looting of property, the destruction of personal property, taking over universities, all in the guise of peaceable dissent, but at the same time throwing rocks, beer bottles, molotov cocktails, cutting fire hose. After crossing the lines into Cambodia by our troops these campus unrests took on the aspect of mob violence. They burned millions of dollars of buildings of the educational institutions, stoned firemen, cut their hose, used molotov cocktails to destroy personal property and demanded the closing of the universities. This all under the guise of peaceable protest. Such actions can amount to no more or no less than mob violence with but one purpose in mind—not to stop the Vietnam War, but to destroy the institutions of learning.

Unfortunately the college administrators and those who are hired for the purpose of educating the young folks within the colleges, give in to the small militant majority amounting to less than three percent, and close the colleges, depriving the other ninety-seven percent of pursuing an education to prepare them for taking their place in American society upon graduation. Certainly no American citizen or no group will find any fault with peaceable protest. The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, peaceable assembly and protest and freedom of religion; but a brick in one pocket and a molotov cocktail in the other by a screaming mob is not a peaceable protest and it is not guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

Such conduct shall not be tolerated.

It would seem that a good study should be made of the make-up of those who operate the colleges and the professors therein who teach the youth. If these militants are registered into a college and they participate in this mob violence, then they should be prosecuted immediately and removed from the campus of that institution.

The Junior Order of the United American Mechanics had its founding some one hundred and sixteen years ago by twelve young men, all under the age of twenty-one. They were God-fearing young men. They came from Christian homes. They loved their country for the freedom they then enjoyed, and they desired it to be protected and perpetuated so that their posterity likewise might enjoy its many blessings. They believed in protecting the jobs in America for the American people, wanted a home and organization that no one would be in who did not believe in a Supreme Being. If you did not believe in a Supreme Being you could not join that organization. It taught the beauty of a Christian home wherein people cry together, pray together, play together and stay together. They envisioned an America that would be one which would be envied by the world and where freedom and opportunity, pursuance of life and happiness would prevail, and live for future generations. This Organization loves the Flag of this Nation. They love its Institutions. They love its freedom. And they are willing to protect it and defend it by the use of all their property and their lives as well.

In every Council Hall in this great Organization is displayed upon the Altar the open Holy Bible and the Flag of the United States of America, and we are happy to salute that Flag and give our pledge of allegiance to it and to our Government, the institutions, constitution and laws. We do this weekly, and are glad to do so.

The Junior Order of United American Mechanics is a part of the silent majority, but the time has arrived, and because of the conditions we find ourselves in, we no longer desire to be silent. We want to speak out in defense of the land we love and the land that we are willing to die for. Thank God we have a praying President and we are certain that before any of these great decisions have been made by him up to this time or in the future he will talk and commune with his God more than anybody knows, before he makes these decisions.

The President has initiated several proposals for the help of the poor, he has instituted some proposals to make free and clean our air and the water of this Nation. He has made proposals to stop and curb inflation. Any thinking person knows that this cannot be accomplished over night, but he is trying.

Therefore, Mr. President, the State Board of Officers of the State Council of Ohio, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in meeting assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, May 23, 1970, desires to convey to you by this document the very fact that we are one hundred percent in accord with your domestic

policies that you have initiated, and likewise, we support your foreign policy as relates to the Vietnamese War. We believe you, Mr. President, we know you would not lie to us purposely, because you are too much of a God-fearing man to do that. Our prayer to our God at this time, Mr. President, is that your health will be protected and that you keep on praying, because the Bible says if God is on your side, who have you to fear. We are certain that you want peace more than anybody in the world and that you will accomplish it with honor, and that our boys will return. We thank you for your courage; we thank you for your sincerity; and may God bless you, Mr. President, is our prayer.

HAROLD J. BAYERSDORFER,  
State Councilor.  
EARL W. HOLLAND,  
Junior Past State Councilor.  
OTTO J. RADO,  
State Vice Councilor.

Attest:

ALBERT ZERGES,  
State Council Secretary.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my good friend and colleague, Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., in recognizing in the RECORD the statement adopted by the State Board of Officers of the Junior Order, United American Mechanics, on May 23, 1970, in Cincinnati.

The statement is in support of President Nixon's handling of the Vietnam war, and his efforts to bring about an early, responsible end to the involvement of American combat men in that conflict.

I salute the Junior Order, United American Mechanics, for their patriotism and understanding. I know that the President has been greatly heartened by their support and the support of millions of Americans across the country. It will help show that support, and thus help to expedite the responsible withdrawal and achievement of just peace that we seek.

#### HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House and interested parties, the full Committee on Banking and Currency schedule following conclusion of the hearings on the housing legislation—H.R. 16643, H.R. 17845, and H.R. 16647—is as follows:

On Friday, June 12, and Monday, June 15, the full Committee on Banking and Currency will meet to consider H.R. 17795, a bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. This legislation would authorize the appropriation of up to \$1 billion for the fiscal year commencing June 1, 1970, for grants for basic water and sewer facilities.

Beginning on Tuesday, June 16, the full committee will meet to hear testimony on H.R. 17880, a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENT ON THE ECONOMY BY ATTORNEY TOM BOGGS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our economy is in serious trouble because of poor economic policies. We are suffering from recession and inflation at the same time. Meanwhile, high interest rates are ruining the housing industry and starving our cities and towns of capital.

I was very pleased to receive recently a highly competent analysis of our economic problems and the requirements for correcting them. Tom Boggs, a local attorney and a former member of the Joint Economic Committee staff, has authorized this penetrating analysis of our present ills and has indicated with wisdom what we might do about them.

I call this fine analysis to the attention of my colleagues:

#### STATEMENT ON THE ECONOMY, JUNE 4, 1970

Our economy is in a troubled state. Unemployment is at the highest level in six years and is still rising. The rate of price increases worse than anytime since the Korean War.

We are facing the worst possible combination of economic ills: simultaneous inflation and recession. Millions of Americans have suffered reduced incomes not only because of lay-offs but also shorter work weeks, forced pay cuts, and lower commissions. Yet, these families are forced to pay even higher prices for necessities under our sky-rocketing inflation.

The consumer price index has risen by more than 8 percent since January, 1969 and more than 6 percent since January, 1970. In April alone it was at an annual rate of 7.2 percent. Meanwhile, GNP, in real terms, is just about where it was in the first quarter of 1969. There is practically no growth. There is, however, substantial growth in unemployment: from 3.3 percent in January, 1969, to over 5 percent at the present time.

Nor is the employment and income situation of consumers the only indication of economic illness. Interest rates are higher than anytime in our history. Mortgage money is so difficult to obtain and mortgage interest rates so prohibitively high that only the higher income groups are buying houses these days. The rest of us have to pay more and more rent.

Our housing starts dropped from over 1.8 million in January, 1969, to about 1.1 million at present. Interest rates have jumped from 6.5 percent in January, 1969, to 8.3 percent, and municipal bonds in that same period have risen from 4.9 percent to 6.7 percent. The stock market, as measured by the Dow Jones Industrial Average, declined from 968 in December, to 627 at the end of May—a decline of over one-third.

The stock market is an important indicator of the health of our economy—especially the mental health and confidence of our economy. Since the present Administration took office, the market has suffered a devastating decline and even recent improvement does not do much for the demoralized state of the market. We find many brokerage houses over extended and some close to bankruptcy. The prevailing atmosphere on Wall Street is one of gloom and depression. We haven't seen anything like this, I am told, since the 1929 crash.

All of these painful symptoms are not the result of some uncontrollable plague from outer space. They are the direct results of poor, ill-advised and distorted policy put

into effect by the Administration. As such, they can be corrected by wiser policies.

Perhaps the most shocking aspect of all of this is that it was the financial community that took the lead in backing Mr. Nixon. They thought that he was the type of conservative Republican whose prudent conservative policies would assure continued growth and prosperity. How angry and frustrated they are now to find that the very leader they chose became the Pied Piper to lead them to economic disaster and with it most of the rest of the country.

How did this come about?

Actually, the Administration's policies are open to severe criticism on two counts. First, their original plans were wrong, and second, even those erroneous original plans were based on false optimistic assumptions.

Let us look at the position the Administration outlined in January.

They predicted that we must suffer some recession in order to stabilize the economy. Now any responsible Government engaged in producing such a development should also propose, at the same time, contingency programs to be put into effect if the anti-inflationary policies get out of hand and cause serious unemployment or recession. But nowhere in the Administration does one see any indication of such programs. The subject was completely ignored in their economic policy statement, as submitted to the Congress at the beginning of this year.

This is all the more surprising because during 1969 unemployment had risen by over 870,000 and was clearly threatening to increase further in the months ahead directly as a result of Administration measures to repress the economy.

The prices had increased all year. Over the course of 1969 as a whole, prices had risen by 4.7 percent, as measured by the most comprehensive index. This is, as we know, much too fast for the well being of the economy. For the first quarter of this year, the price index rose at an annual rate of 6 percent, and the latest figures indicate that prices are rising at the same high rate.

The Joint Economic Committee estimated that these recessionary policies of the Administration would result in our falling short of our full growth potential by about \$30 billion in 1970. This means that they were willing to forgo this massive amount of production to slow down the price increases. If we take their own projections, this slowdown would last for four years and would result in a total shortfall of at least \$80 billion. This is a frightful loss from what we might otherwise achieve, particularly when there is so much need for this production in our economy. Everywhere we look there is need for wise application of added production to improve our cities, eliminate poverty, improve the standard of living for all Americans or permit us to help the underdeveloped regions of the world. The most tragic thing about this waste is that it is being undergone in order to slow down the price rise. But it is not succeeding in doing that, so as a result, this very costly and painful medicine is not curing the ills of inflation.

Meanwhile, a serious credit squeeze has practically wrecked the home building industry and stunted severely the construction of public facilities. These are the sections of the economy that bear the greatest brunt when money becomes tight. Our society is being starved of decent housing and of basic community facilities and there is no assurance in the Administration's program as announced at the beginning of the year that these starved sections of our economy would be getting any real help in 1970. In effect, the program guaranteed a frightening increase in deficiencies that we can ill afford. These deficiencies in basic facilities and homes will hurt our growth for many, many years to come.

The program as announced by the Administration was fundamentally unsound to begin with because it guaranteed higher unemployment, a stagnant economy, and an increasing shortage of homes and public facilities while, at the same time, it permitted inflation to continue without any serious effort to deal with it.

I am proud to say that the Democratic Party in many pronouncements, including the 1970 Report of the Joint Economic Committee, quickly pointed out this failure to the Administration. The Majority report of the Committee expressed deep concern at the absence of any policy to deal directly with excessive price and wage increases. They went on to say that such failure accentuates the dilemma of rising unemployment and simultaneously continuing price inflation.

Another great weakness in the Administration's program cited by the Committee was the fact that the President's program contained no provision for channelling credit to the deprived sectors of the economy. It was pointed out that in spite of the fact that the Congress passed selective credit control legislation giving the President power and the authorization to put into effect controls on credit in order to assure that priority needs were being met, no action was taken by the Administration despite repeated urgings from the Democratic Members of Congress. The President's failure to act to correct serious credit imbalances is destabilizing our economy and hurting our future growth, yet there is still no sign of concern at the top levels of the Administration.

Another serious criticism of the President's program was its failure to pay any attention to Congressional recommendations that the Administration focus attention on assessing our national requirements and objectives as well as on developing means of determining priorities for public expenditure. The plain fact is that we do not have enough revenue either now or in the foreseeable future to do all the things that should be done. Like any family or company, we, therefore, have to decide which programs are most important and cut back on the others. Nowhere is there any effort within the Administration to do this job on an adequate basis. Yet, it is a fundamental necessity that should be taken care of first.

Deficient as the "game plan" of the Administration was, its failure to make a realistic analysis of future prospects aggravated its deficiency. As one part of its programs, the Administration projected a small budget surplus both for fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971. In the circumstances, this was wise. Budget deficiencies are inflationary and moreover they make it necessary for the Federal Government to borrow in the credit markets and make credit all the scarcer.

But how realistic has the estimate of a budget surplus proven? From the start, it was obvious that it was based on a number of assumptions and contingencies that were not realistic.

Let me, by example, spell out the changing budgetary picture to show up the bankruptcy of the Republican economic policy makers.

In FY 1969, we had a budgetary surplus of \$3.2 billion on a unified basis. This was largely determined by a Democratic Congress and President.

The present Nixon Administration proposed last January Federal budgets (on a unified basis) of slightly more than a billion dollars for 1970 and 1971. It was well known and widely accepted at that time, the surpluses were phony, especially on grounds that it implied receipts from sale of assets which could not be achieved in the light of the Administration's own estimates of money market conditions.

Now the realities are surprising. On the basis of most recent careful analysis, and

accepting the assumption of Administration expenditure estimates (an assumption I regard as highly unlikely), we are faced with a budget deficit of \$2.4 billion for 1970 and \$9.2 billion for 1971. (Only in the unlikely event that Congress were to accept the Administration's controversial tax proposals, the 1971 deficit might be reduced to \$4.5 billion.)

Moreover, these budget deficits are kept low because they are measured on the so-called unified budget basis. If the traditional Administrative budget concept were used—which was the case until a few years ago—the budget deficit would be \$17.5 billion in 1971 (unless Congress acts to raise taxes) or \$13.6 billion (if Congress accepts the Nixon tax proposals).

There is a very important point which is concealed in these dry statistics. *Essentially what is proposed even in the lower deficit proposed by the Executive* is that we achieve these results by increasing basically regressive taxes—payroll taxes—rather than by some more progressive taxation to which we have been committed for generations.

It should be noted that the Republican fiscal policies fail to achieve responsible results because tax revenues are retarded by general economic policies which aim at reduced output and higher unemployment in the name of inflation control. Yet we do not have such control. If we had high employment, Federal revenues would be \$12 billion higher than we can now foresee!

Let me point out in as brief analysis as I can at this point, the tendency toward bankruptcy in the second and only other major policy instrument to which Nixon is committed. We have spent more than a decade learning that we cannot have responsible monetary policy which involves vast short-term changes in the expansion of money. Yet last year, in 1969, the authorities held money expansion to near zero, even though money demand was expanding rapidly. This year, the reverse process is under way; the monetary policy makers have been expanding at a higher than 10 percent rate—even though they still are aiming at inflation control. Where has rationality gone?

We must reverse the present drift of economic policy. First, there should be established immediately a reasonable incomes policy. By this I mean that the President must appoint a responsible council which could set forth standards to govern earnings increases as well as any price increases. This should be backed up by a competent fact finding staff which could obtain, effectively and promptly, all the relevant information on proposed wage and price action that would have a serious effect on the public interest.

It is my firm belief that with such a board, backed by the authority of the President, we could have an effective limitation on inflationary pressures. As proven in President Kennedy's Administration, the bright light of publicity backed by Presidential authority is a potent lever to keep excess out of our economy. Such a program would have the additional advantage of avoiding rigid controls which would necessitate a large bureaucracy and heavy administrative costs.

At the same time, there should be greater efforts to train additional workers, particularly the unemployed. We face a shortage of skilled employees while, at the same time, we have a surplus of unskilled. The obvious answer is to turn the unskilled into skilled workers. The Administration is not doing this to sufficient extent.

A third important aspect of an incomes policy involves the removal of blockages to efficient operation. Monopolies, rigid labor practices, market rigging, and similar activities work against the public interest in slowing up the economy. We must assure more efficiency and more productivity in our econ-

omy since, after all, productivity is the best answer to inflation. The more supply we have the less upward pressure will there be on prices and then workers will not feel compelled to ask for higher and higher wages to compensate for the rising costs of necessities.

In respect to finance, there are a number of ways to mitigate the bad effects of present no-action policy of the Administration. In the first place, I believe that the Federal Reserve should maintain a policy of easier money while, at the same time, avoiding any excessive increases in the money supply. Secondly, I believe that the Federal Reserve should open its discount window to the Federally supported housing agencies, just as it has now opened it for commercial purposes.

Furthermore, we need to develop new financial arrangements to assure an adequate flow of capital funds into states and municipalities. I believe that the problem can best be met by setting up a public institution to provide credit for needed public facilities. This proposal has been made by Chairman Patman of the House Banking Committee and has already been approved in one form or another by many Members of Congress. I think there should be no delay in obtaining its passage.

In summary, I believe that our economy ought to be permitted to grow at the highest reasonable rate and that public policy should do its best to assure that this growth takes place in the healthiest way, that is, that we maintain a balanced growth with adequate public facilities, adequate housing, adequate industrial improvement, each supporting the other without the great imbalance we are suffering from at the present time.

#### INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION TESTIMONY FOR BANK HOLDING COMPANY LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Bankers Association of America, an organization representing more than 6,500 banking institutions in the United States, testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on May 28, 1970, on H.R. 6778, a bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. The association's president, Mr. Rod L. Parsch, and Mr. Kenneth J. Benda, president of the Hartwick State Bank, Hartwick, Iowa, gave what I regard as two of the strongest pieces of testimony presented before the Banking Committees of either House of Congress in support of immediate, strong bank holding company legislation during this Congress.

The Independent Bankers Association, which represents almost half of the banking institutions in the United States, clearly perceives the threat to independent small banks in this country of the dramatic growth of unregulated bank holding companies. Because it will be some time before the hearing record on the bank holding company issue the Senate Banking and Currency Committee becomes available, I include in the RECORD the complete statements of Mr. Parsch and Mr. Benda on behalf of the Independent Bankers Association of America.

## REGULATION OF ONE-BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

(Statement by Rod L. Parsch, president Independent Banks Association of America)

My name is Rod L. Parsch, of Lapeer, Michigan, where I am President of the Lapeer County Bank and Trust Company. I have been active in banking for more than 32 years.

I appear here as President of the Independent Bankers Association of America, an organization of more than 6,500 banks. Our Association was formed in 1930 to provide a voice for independent banks.

With me at the table is Kenneth J. Benda, Vice Chairman of the Federal Legislative Committee of our Association. He is President of the Hartwick State Bank of Hartwick, Iowa, served as a State Senator in the Iowa Legislature for seven years, and presently is a commerce commissioner in his state. Also here is Horace R. Hansen of St. Paul, Minnesota, our attorney.

We appreciate the opportunity to state to this Committee the views of our organization on H.R. 6778 and other pending bills to amend the Bank Holding Company Act.

The basis for our testimony here today is a convention resolution adopted in March. A copy of the resolution is attached to this statement as an exhibit and I would appreciate your receiving it.

## INTEREST OF THE IBAA

Our Association stands for the preservation of competition in the banking industry and the prevention of concentration of money and credit. We believe that the vitality of our free enterprise system can be maintained best by following the American tradition of dispersing both economic and political power. In banking, this means preserving independent, locally-owned banks as the best means of providing banking needs of people in their service areas. The banks we represent have a direct stake in the success of the people they serve and are thus responsive to their needs.

Preserving competition also means preserving alternate sources of credit and banking services at fair costs which only competition can provide.

Concentrated control of banking in giant holding company and branching systems is a constant threat to these objectives. Therefore, our Association consistently favors any legislation designed to regulate and control bank holding companies and bank mergers. Our Association for 14 years urged Congress to adopt a strong bank holding company act before its passage in 1956.

## THE BROAD ISSUES PRESENTED

It must be kept in mind that there are two distinct aspects in the bills before you, because they are aimed at amending the present multibank Holding Company Act while at the same time including one-bank companies. The focus is on one-bank conglomerates, but we must not lose sight of the fact that the amendments also directly affect multibank companies. Let me comment briefly on both aspects.

First, as to one-bank conglomerates. Our Association has carefully researched this problem in the past two years in many staff studies, meetings, committee hearings and at two national conventions.

We support the objectives of the Nixon Administration that these conglomerates must be curbed without delay. On March 24, 1969, President Nixon Stated:

"Left unchecked, the trend toward the combining of banking and business could lead to the formation of a relatively small number of power centers dominating the American economy. This must not be permitted to happen; it would be bad for banking, bad for business, and bad for borrowers and consumers.

"The strength of our economic system is

rooted in diversity and free competition; the strength of our banking system depends largely on its independence. Banking must not dominate commerce or be dominated by it."

On April 17, 1969, in the House hearings, Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy stated:

"This trend, just now developing, threatens to change the nature of the American private enterprise. Our economy could shift from one where commercial and financial power is now separated and dispersed into a structure dominated by huge centers of economic and financial power. Each would consist of a corporate conglomerate controlling a large bank, or a multibillion dollar bank controlling a large nonfinancial conglomerate."

We would add to these warnings that conglomerates dominated by huge banks would radically change the face of banking itself. They would present an overpowering competitive advantage over medium and small size banks.

While we agree with the objectives of the Nixon Administration for control of one-bank holding companies, we have our own ideas on specific provisions in the legislation. For example, we urge that regulations be left with the Federal Reserve Board, which has administered the Act for the past 14 years; and we urge your Committee consider that a distinction exists between large one-bank conglomerates, which admittedly present a danger to the economy, and the small companies which serve useful purposes, as we will explain.

Second, we turn to the effect of the bills as to multibank holding companies. While all of the bills would include one-bank companies, they propose other changes which effect equally the multibank companies. The 1966 amendment weakened control over multibank companies, and any legislation adopted by the Congress which expands the privileges of multibank holding companies would be contrary to the public interest. The record demonstrates, we believe, that Congress has not given the agency administering the Act an effective tool to accomplish the purpose for which the law was intended.

## EXPERIENCE UNDER THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT

When the present Act was adopted in 1956, Congress viewed with alarm the growth of bank holding companies and firmly expressed the purpose of drastically restraining them from expanding. Let me quote some excerpts from Senate Report No. 1095 of this Committee at that time:

"In the opinion of your committee, public welfare requires the enactment of legislation providing federal regulation of the growth of bank holding companies and the type of assets it is appropriate for such companies to control.

"The dangers accompanying monopoly in this field are particularly undesirable in view of the significant part played by banking in our present national economy.

"The factors . . . under this Bill also require contemplation of the prevention of undue concentration of control in the banking field to the detriment of public interest and the encouragement of competition in banking." In the same vein, House Report No. 609 in 1955, stated: "The holding company device lends itself readily to the amassing of vast resources obtained largely from the public, which can be controlled by the relatively few who comprise the management of the holding company, giving them a decided advantage in acquiring additional properties and in carrying out a program of expansion. Such power can be used to acquire independent banks by measures which leave local management and minori-

ty stockholders little with which to defend themselves except their own protests. . . ."

What has happened to these objectives? Let's look at the record in the past 14 years.

1. Almost four out of every five applications to form new multibank holding companies, and applications for acquisitions of more banks, have been approved. As a consequence, deposits controlled by multibank companies have increased since 1956 from about \$15 billion to \$66 billion.

2. In 1966, the giant banks of this country, with aggressive lobbying, tried to exempt banking from the federal antitrust laws. The assault was first made on the Bank Merger Act in 1966, then a few months later on the Bank Holding Company Act. The results are that the standards in both the Merger and Bank Holding Company Acts have been weakened. Mr. Benda will present our proposal to strengthen the standards in the Holding Company Act.

## THE PRESENT BANKING SCENE

In the last few months there has been a crescendo of statements, in and out of government, to the effect that changes are needed in the structure of banking so that it can better serve a growing economy.

We have even seen the spectacle in the last month of the Justice Department proposing liberalized branching laws so that large banks can grow larger. With your permission, we will enter into the record our April 22, 1970 letter to Attorney General Mitchell on this subject.

There is being formed a Presidential Commission to study the banking structure in this country. While we would hope that its report would point up the need for reversing the trend we have mentioned, the stage may be set to accelerate it.

When we analyze these statements for changes in the banking structure, we find they originate from large banks and banking groups consisting of branching and holding company systems. They have the taste of power and they want more.

The present outcries for big bank systems do not come from the people or even from large commercial borrowers who are knowledgeable about financial resources. They know that creating huge systems does not create any more loanable funds or commercial credit, but merely shifts control of financial resources to fewer hands. This process does not add one dollar to the gross national product, but merely helps the big get bigger.

For example, in Canada and England, three huge banks with thousands of branches control 75 per cent of deposits available for commercial credit. In Europe the growth of these huge systems went hand-in-hand with the development of large cartels and monopolies in industry. In the process, small business disappeared, and smaller banks serving them also disappeared.

## CONCLUSION

We do not want the European experience to happen in America. This is the last country in the world to have a large middle class, consisting of smaller businesses supported by independent banks. The small business segment act as a stabilizing balance wheel in our economy.

We can preserve the American system only if we preserve competition as the great regulator, in commerce as well as in banking. Dispersion of economic power among many economic units has proved to be the conservative and safe course, because decisions are made by many, not a few. This principle, in the economy as well as in government, has served America well.

We must not allow a few powerful voices, in and out of government, to change our system on the basis of vague clichés about the need to modernize our banking structure which, translated, merely means more concentration and less competition.

Let me conclude by saying that whatever useful purpose is claimed for large multi-bank holding companies is heavily outweighed by adverse effects upon the economy and the public interest. Therefore, in your thoughtful consideration of the legislation before you, we urge that your Committee not only eliminate large one-bank conglomerates, but also strengthen controls in the Act as to multibank companies.

Thank you for your attention. Now, with some of the specifics we wish to recommend to you, here's Kenneth J. Benda, Vice Chairman of our Federal Legislative Committee.

#### REGULATION OF ONE-BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

(Statement by Kenneth J. Benda, Independent Bankers Association of America)

My name is Kenneth J. Benda of Hartwick, Iowa, where I am President of the Hartwick State Bank. I appear here on behalf of the Federal Legislative Committee of the Independent Bankers Association of America. It will be my purpose to explain our proposals as to the bills pending before you.

In the interest of focusing on the principles involved and saving the time of this Committee, I will comment only on those we believe are of major importance. Mr. Hansen and I will respond to your questions for more detail than I will give in my statement, if you so desire. Later, if requested, we will furnish the Committee with suggested language for the amendments we propose.

First, I will comment on small one-bank holding companies and their importance in preserving independent banking.

#### HOW PROCEDURE WORKS

When a smaller bank is transferred from one independent owner to another, a loan secured by the capital stock of the bank usually is involved. These sales often occur when a retiring banker sells to a younger banker or to his employees. The seller usually desires to perpetuate local ownership.

Under the income tax laws, the younger banker would find it difficult, if not impossible, to repay the bank stock loan with his available after-tax dollars. Consequently, a one-bank holding company is formed to service the loan because more after-tax dollars become available to repay it. With the permission of the Committee we offer Exhibits 1 and 2 as illustrations.

In a typical arrangement, an insurance agency is used as the holding company; the bank stock is placed in this company; the loan to provide the means of purchase is made by the company, and the company repays the loan from earnings of the insurance agency, plus the bank dividends.

This plan provides active income other than bank dividends to the holding company, thus avoiding the personal holding company penalty.

Of course, the active business income to the holding company could be derived from activities other than an insurance agency, if related to the business of banking. Also, a bank-related business provides additional income which assists many small banks to remain in business.

Thus, small one-bank companies often provide the means of survival for small independent banks. The alternatives, all too often, are for the retiring banker to sell out to a multibank holding company, or merge with a larger bank and become its branch. Either of these alternatives results in more concentration of banking control and fewer alternate sources of credit.

For these reasons, we urge this Committee to recognize the special problems of small one-bank companies.

#### IBAA PROPOSALS

I will present our proposals:

1. We suggest that the definitions in Section 2 of the Act be broadened to include a

one-bank company, to include partnerships, and to reach beyond the false front of legal entities to include "controlling persons," along the line used in Securities and Exchange Laws and Regulations, in order to prevent evasions of the Act.

2. We suggest that the problem of exemption for small companies can be handled in one of two ways. If the language of Section 4 dealing with exemptions remains as presently worded in the Act, or substantially so, there would be no problem. Clause (8) in the present list of exemptions now permits bank-related activities which would satisfy the special problem I mentioned, and, in that case, no size exemption would be needed.

On the other hand, if this Committee or the Conference Committee decides to amend Clause (8) to contain a list of prohibitive activities, as in H.R. 6778, then a size distinction is needed, and in that case, we urge a specific exemption limited to small one-bank companies. This should be in the form of a proviso to Clause (8) which would exempt these companies if their total assets in the listed activities do not exceed one-third of the total assets of the bank, and in no case more than \$10 million in such nonbank assets.

#### EXPLANATION

Let me explain these suggestions.

If Clause (8) remains substantially unchanged and contains no such list, we will continue to have the general guidelines for permitted activities, coupled with the safeguard procedure for Board approval in each case. We prefer this approach to a laundry list of prohibited activities. Clause (8) as interpreted by the Board has proved generally satisfactory since the Act was adopted in 1966.

*It is significant that in 14 years this interpretation of the present language has not been criticized by any of the trade associations which sought and obtained the "laundry list" contained in H.R. 6778 as adopted by the House.* It is also significant that H.R. 6778, as originally introduced by Chairman Patman, made no changes in this Section 4, except to remove the exemption for "labor, agricultural or horticultural" organizations, with which we agree.

Clause (8) in the present Act exempts non-banking activities that are of a "financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature . . . so closely related to the business of banking . . . as to be a proper incident thereto and to make it unnecessary for the prohibitions of this section to apply in order to carry out the purpose of this Act." Under this language, small one-bank companies could survive, while the large conglomerates would be forced to divest clearly nonbank-related enterprises.

As interpreted by the Board, Clause (8) permits holding companies (which would include one-bank companies) to engage in the business of lending funds on their own account, investing in equities, meeting needs for financing that cannot be adequately met through debt instruments, acting as insurance agent or broker or as insurer in connection with extensions of credit by other subsidiaries of the holding company, providing accounting for data processing service, acting as fiduciary, and acting as travel agent. (See testimony of Chairman Martin in the House hearings, Pages 199-201.)

We would like to mention here, in passing, that many one-bank holding companies operate an insurance agency as the only bank-related activity. This is a common practice in smaller banks throughout the country. An insurance agency is specifically permitted to be operated by national banks in towns under 5,000 population, and some states permit their state banks to operate agencies. If a bank can have an agency, or if an individual owner of a bank can operate an agency as a sole proprietor, then there is good rea-

son for permitting it to a one-bank holding company.

The concept in Clause (8) of the present Act, without a "laundry list," would satisfy the objectives of the legislation. It also would protect the small holding companies and cause no complications for multibank companies.

#### EXEMPTION NEEDED FOR SMALL OBHC'S

However, if the "laundry list" approach is used, then a specific exemption for small one-bank companies is needed. As mentioned, we suggest the asset formula—that the assets in nonbank activities shall not exceed one-third of the bank's assets, and in no case more than \$10 million.

In applying the formula, the total bank and nonbank assets would be counted, even though the one-bank company owns less than 100% of either type of assets, so long as the company has effective control as described in the definitions section.

In connection with this exemption, we suggest retaining the same safeguard procedure as contained in Clause (8) of the present Act, namely, that each nonbank activity must be approved by the Board after notice, hearing and order of determination made on a written record. In addition, we suggest a further guideline for the Board to follow in considering an application for exemption—that the nonbank activities shall not result in an unreasonable concentration of control of such activities within the bank service area.

#### NEED TO RESTRAIN MULTIBANK COMPANIES

Our president, Mr. Parsch, has stated our deep concern with rapid growth of the power of multibank holding companies, despite the intent of Congress to restrain their expansion. He mentioned that Congress has not provided the Board with strong enough tools in the law itself. Let me list the most obvious deficiencies, based on 14 years of experience.

1. The standards whereby the Board considers approval of the formation of a new holding company or acquisition of a bank by an existing company have been vague from the beginning and were further weakened by the 1966 amendments.

We suggest amending Section 3(c) of the Act by striking the words in Section 3(c) (2) following "restraint of trade," and substituting a new clause (3) to read in effect as follows:

"(3) Any proposed acquisition or merger or consolidation under this Section unless it is affirmatively proved that such acquisition or merger or consolidation is required to meet the convenience and needs of the area to be served, or to prevent the imminent failure of a bank."

And further that the last sentence of Section 3(c) be amended to read as follows:

"In every case, the Board shall take into consideration the financial resources, the character of the management and the future prospects of the company or companies and the banks concerned."

The present standards in the Act are wholly inadequate. Section 3(c) clause (1) deals with a monopoly situation which would rarely, if ever, occur. Clause (2) deals with an acquisition which would substantially lessen competition, tend to create a monopoly, or would be in restraint of trade. Literally, these words can be taken to mean that if a bank holding company proposes to acquire another bank sufficiently distant from any other subsidiary bank so that there is no overlap of deposits or loans between the two banks, then the application must be approved.

This means that a multibank holding company could make acquisitions all over a state so long as in each case it could be demonstrated that there was no existing significant competition between a subsidiary bank of the holding company and the bank to be acquired by the holding com-

pany. As a consequence, a multibank holding company could acquire a network of banks; then, by massive advertising could dominate the banking market of the state. The proviso in Clause (2) is to the effect that even though there are anticompetitive effects, the Board can find that they are outweighed in the public interest by meeting convenience and needs of the community to be served. This proviso should be eliminated. We cannot conceive of such overriding public interest, except in a failing bank situation.

Since these factors, in actual practice, are meaningless unless there is substantial competition between the bank to be acquired and another bank in the same holding company, there is an obvious need to strengthen the factors by adding a third clause, to the effect that the applicant holding company must bear the burden of proving that a proposed acquisition is required to meet the convenience and needs of the area to be served or to prevent imminent failure of a bank. Language of this nature would provide the kind of control and restraint upon holding company expansion that is badly needed and which would help greatly to carry out the purposes of the Act as shown by Mr. Parsch. Today, after 14 years of experience, there is more need than ever for additional restraint upon holding company expansion.

2. We urge that Section 3(a)(4) be amended by striking the words, "other than a bank," in order to stop interstate expansion of existing holding companies. These words unfortunately permit the subsidiary of a holding company in another state to acquire by merger an independent bank and put it out of business or convert it into a branch, all without approval of the Federal Reserve Board. (See the Court decision in *State of South Dakota v. National Bank of South Dakota*, 335 F. 2d 444; review denied, 379 U.S. 970.)

The legislative history shows that the words, "other than a bank" were inserted to prevent conflict between the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency, in cases where the latter can approve a merger into a national bank under the Bank Merger Act. We have seen that this phrase has breached the prohibition in the Act against interstate expansion of holding companies, a result never intended by the Congress. It is confusing to divide responsibility for controlling holding companies between two agencies and we urge that all control reside in the Federal Reserve Board. To achieve that objective it is necessary to strike the words "other than a bank" from the Act.

3. In addition to the above amendments, we propose important procedural amendments, dictated from experience, and on the principle that rights and prohibitions are no stronger than the remedies to give them effect. These important amendments are as follows:

(a) Amend Section 3(b) to require hearings on any bank acquisition where any other bank in the area contends it would be adversely affected and makes formal objection to the application. The present hearing requirements are completely inadequate, and often an acquisition occurs before adversely affected banks are fully aware of the situation.

Requiring a hearing on a contested application would protect the banks which might be adversely affected and would protect the public interest. It also would make it clear that the opposing parties have legal status as a "party" under Section 9 of the Act, regarding judicial review, and under the Administrative Procedures Act.

(b) Amend Section 8 dealing with the sole remedy of criminal prosecution, which has

proved ineffective, by adding two other procedures for enforcement, in order to prevent evasions and violations: (1) administrative orders along the line of cease and desist orders in the FDIC Act; and (2) civil actions for injunction by adversely affected banks or by the federal or state supervisory authority, as the case may be.

The suggested administrative orders along the line of those provided in the FDIC Act could be made upon a finding by a Board examination in the field, or an examination by the appropriate supervisory agency, federal or state, and reported to the Board, in order to prevent violations and evasions, and thus give prompt and adequate remedy, without the necessity for a criminal prosecution. A court appeal would be available, as in the FDIC Act.

An obvious additional remedy is to make available to aggrieved parties a civil action for injunction, which the courts do not now allow because Congress has specified criminal prosecution as the sole remedy. (See *South Dakota case*, cited above.)

#### CONCLUSION

In summary, we feel that Congress should not delay in taking action to eliminate large one-bank conglomerates, but that great care should be taken to preserve the use of one-bank companies for small banks, with the restrictions on nonbank activities as we have indicated.

While amending the Act, we strongly urge that this Committee take a hard look at the effect of the amendments on large multibank holding companies which have been expanding rapidly and need to be brought under tighter control.

Thank you for your kind attention.

#### ADVISORY POSITION OF INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION

The Independent Bankers Association of America hereby adopts the following advisory position regarding federal regulation of one-bank holding companies.

1. The objective of outlawing large-scale conglomerate activities by large banks through the device of one-bank holding companies is firmly supported by the Nixon Administration. We favor the same objective.

2. Adoption of H.R. 6778 by an overwhelming vote of 351 to 24 on November 5, 1969, demonstrated the deep and widely-held concern that the combination of banking and commerce on a large scale endangers America's economy.

3. H.R. 6778, as adopted by the House, adversely affects the smaller locally-owned banks. Therefore, in order to protect independent banking, modification by the Senate is necessary.

a. A distinction must be made between large conglomerates and small one-bank holding companies which present no danger to the national economy.

b. This distinction should be in the form of an exemption in the law, limited to these small one-bank holding companies. The exemption should carry suitable restrictions as to the extent, nature or size of their non-bank activities.

c. The definition of a one-bank holding company should be clarified so that an individual is not deemed to be a company.

4. The bill should further be amended to: (a) plug the loophole which now permits interstate expansion by existing multibank holding companies;

(b) broaden the means of preventing evasions and violations of the law;

(c) permit independent banks adversely affected by multibank holding company acquisitions to object and have the opportunity for hearings on these acquisitions.

Adopted March 18, 1970 at the 40th anniversary convention of the Independent

Bankers Association of America at the Hilton Hawaiian Village Hotel in Honolulu, Hawaii.

#### INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,

Washington, D.C., April 22, 1970.

HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This letter is to express the deep astonishment and concern of the Independent Bankers Association of America at the position in favor of liberalized branch banking taken by the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, as reported in the *American Banker*, the banking daily, on April 9, 1970. This is an invasion of States Rights.

Since this publication many of our more than 6700 member banks throughout the country are already protesting that this proposal is an unwarranted and unprecedented intrusion of the Federal government into the affairs of the States. Publication of these proposals with documentation of the proposed entry by the Federal government into the field reserved for States Rights, already is having an ill effect in the various State legislatures which will be considering banking legislation in the next few months.

For several days we have attempted to obtain from Justice a copy of the text of the proposal to permit detailed study, and have been unable to obtain one. Today, a delegation of our general officers discussed this matter with officials of your Department designated by Assistant Attorney General McLaren to meet with them. Again, we asked for a copy of the text and were told it was privileged.

We expressed to these officials our shock and dismay to proposals by the Department that would result in a liberalization of state laws on branch banking, in contradiction to the traditional role of the Department in support of preserving banking competition, and preventing concentration.

Furthermore, this proposal reveals a marked departure from repeated statements by President Nixon that have emphasized the new Federalism, which proposes to reduce centralized dominance and increase the role of the States in government. We view this proposal as heavy handed Federalism.

We are likewise astonished that this startling invasion of the traditional rights of the States has been sought obliquely, through the Council on State Governments, when such proposals should be addressed to Congress. We are presently supporting various Administration proposals, made legislatively in the normal way to the Congress.

We pointed out to your officials that since neither the Federal government nor the States have the right to pre-empt the field of banking, it must be shared, and that Congress, for more than a century, has followed the policy that national banks must adhere to state banking standards in the basic areas of banking, on the basis that each state is best able to decide what is best suited to its economy. What may good for New York state is not necessarily good for Nebraska.

The most sensitive of these basic principles, designated to achieve complete equality between the two systems, is the matter of branch banking. The Congress, throughout this century, has passed legislation affecting holding companies and mergers, but has deferred entirely to the States on branching matters.

We also stressed to your staff that from 1946 to 1969 branches increased from 22% to 60% of all banking offices; that two-thirds of bank deposits are already in branch banks; and that concentration of control of deposits is the highest in states permitting statewide branching.

In Canada, three banks control more than

75% of all bank deposits in the country, with hundreds of branches. Similar concentration can be found in England and other countries where liberal branching is permitted. In short, branching is the fastest vehicle to concentration, far outstripping mergers and holding companies.

Our surveys show that the chief proponents of liberalized branching in State Legislatures are the large banks seeking to become larger. Never have we found any demand for branching coming from people seeking more banking service.

Your proposal thus would place the Administration squarely on the side of these larger banks.

Independent unit banks, together with correspondent banking, afford the people alternate sources of credit and services at fair

costs which only competition can provide. We believe it is the role of your office to foster and preserve banking competition, not to suppress it by fostering widespread branching systems which can only lead to concentration and the disappearance of independent banks.

Having observed the rapid and dangerous trend to concentration in this country due to branching, and what has happened in other countries, we are determined to use all means available to us to oppose your endeavors to influence state legislatures to accelerate this trend. We hope that you will carefully review your proposal, and strongly urge that you withdraw it.

Sincerely,

ROD L. PARSCH,  
President.

TOTAL 15-YEAR DEBT SERVICE PERIOD

	Banker alone	Banker uses a holding company			Banker alone	Banker uses a holding company		
		Banker	Corporation	Total		Banker	Corporation	Total
<b>Taxable income:</b>								
Salary	\$300,000	\$300,000		\$300,000				
Insurance agency, net	315,000		315,000	315,000				
Dividends from bank	390,000							
Interest expense	(234,000)		(234,000)	(234,000)				
<b>Total</b>	<b>771,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>81,000</b>	<b>381,000</b>				
<b>Cash flow:</b>								
Taxable income	771,000	300,000	81,000	381,000				
Dividend deduction (a noncash charge to income)			390,000	390,000				
Retirement of debt	(450,000)		(450,000)	(450,000)				
<b>Federal income taxes:</b>								
Paid to IRS					(\$269,000)	(\$56,000)	(23,000)	(\$89,000)
Benefits received from bank for use of losses							5,000	5,000
<b>Total</b>					<b>52,000</b>	<b>234,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>237,000</b>
<b>Cash balance summary:</b>								
Banker and corporation								237,000
Banker alone								52,000
<b>Difference</b>								<b>185,000</b>

USE OF HOLDING COMPANY FOR FINANCED BANK ACQUISITION COMPARATIVE REVIEW—AFTER TAX RESULTS ACQUISITION DEBT INCURRED OF \$900,000

Assumptions:  
Banker with salary of \$30,000 purchases bank with borrowed funds of \$900,000 at 6½

percent, level principal payments plus interest over 15 years.

Dividend paid by bank of \$52,000 per year. Insurance agency purchased with bank earns commission income of \$50,000. Expenses of \$8,000 are paid to the bank for use of

employee time and bank space utilized for the agency operations producing net income of \$42,000.

Federal income taxes computed on basis of rates in effect for 1969 without consideration of temporary surcharge.

TOTAL 15-YEAR DEBT SERVICE PERIOD

	Banker alone	Banker uses a holding company			Banker alone	Banker uses a holding company		
		Banker	Corporation	Total		Banker	Corporation	Total
<b>Taxable income:</b>								
Salary	\$450,000	\$450,000		\$450,000				
Insurance agency, net	630,000		630,000	630,000				
Dividends from bank	780,000							
Interest expense	(468,000)		(468,000)	(468,000)				
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,392,000</b>	<b>450,000</b>	<b>162,000</b>	<b>612,000</b>				
<b>Cash flow:</b>								
Taxable income	1,392,000	450,000	162,000	612,000				
Dividend deduction (a noncash charge to income)			780,000	780,000				
Retirement of debt	(900,000)		(900,000)	(900,000)				
<b>Federal income taxes:</b>								
Paid to IRS					(\$167,000)	(\$118,000)	(45,000)	(\$163,000)
Benefits received from bank for use of losses							10,000	10,000
<b>Total</b>					<b>(125,000)</b>	<b>332,000</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>339,000</b>
<b>Cash balance summary:</b>								
Banker and corporation								339,000
Banker alone								(125,000)
<b>Difference</b>								<b>464,000</b>

ADMINISTRATION POLICIES CRUSH SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the administration officials talk about minor adjustments in the economy, thousands of small businessmen are being hard-pressed just to keep their doors open.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that the administration officials would realize that what they describe as "minor adjustments" in Washington can have a catastrophic effect on small businesses throughout the Nation. Small businessmen simply cannot continue to pay 10, 12, 15, 20 percent and higher interest rates. A continuation of such high interest rates will simply mean bankruptcies for small businesses in all parts of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a small businessman in Los Angeles, Calif., detailing the difficulties that he and his wife are having in their small business because of the economic policies pursued by the Nixon administration. I hope that Members of the House will read this letter and realize that we cannot allow high interest rates to wipe out this important segment of our economy. I place a copy of the letter in the RECORD:

MAY 30, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: "The overall economy was down a very minor amount as a result of controlled effort to slow down the economy".

This is a quote from Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans in the Los Angeles Times this week.

We, the public, who have been trying to keep body and soul together for the last six months (the duration of the recession so far) are now being told that the economy will normalize itself by the end of this year.

Congressman, that will be twelve months of joblessness; operating in the red for small business that doesn't have the millions behind it to weather this economic assault.

My wife and I went into business twelve months ago putting practically all we have saved through the years into it. President Nixon did not inform the American public in his campaign speeches that he was going to manipulate the economy. Had we known this we would have remained on the jobs we held for so many years and not invested our money in this enterprise.

As of now, my wife has gone back to work (she was fortunate enough to get her old position back) and I'm sitting in the Dept of Employment every morning looking for part time work in order to keep from losing everything. I hope to be able to put in an 18 hour day which would allow me the luxury of sleeping six hours every day. So far the situation has been too few jobs and too many job hunters. In two weeks the high schools and colleges will be dumping their students on the labor market. This should produce

the largest mass unemployment since the depression of 1932.

Frankly, I've lost confidence in this form of government that allows one man (be he Democrat or Republican) so much economic power that stock markets rise and fall on his every pronouncement. This matter should be regulated by Congress to insure a broader, more equitable application of financial policy.

I hope that in your position in congress you will be able to emphasize the urgent fact that we can not hibernate like bears until this economic storm is over. There is the food bill, rent, utilities, taxes, and insurances that still have to be paid and those waiting to be paid won't wait until the end of the year.

Sincerely,

WM. JACKSON,  
Los Angeles, Calif.

### FANNING THE FLAMES OF REBELLION

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the tight money-high interest policies of the administration are adding new fuel to the fire of rebellion against our Government by a large segment of our youth. Moreover, tight money-high interest rate conditions are eroding the faith of those very people who might otherwise be the staunchest defenders of our Government—the very people who have worked their way through college or through training programs to equip themselves for careers in the American free enterprise system.

Having worked hard for years, having spent large sums of money for education, they now find themselves robbed of the opportunity for homeownership—the cornerstone of our society and of our democratic concept of Government.

#### EROSION OF FAITH

Mr. Speaker, an example of the erosion of faith in our system that is now taking place among the young adults who will shoulder the responsibility of Government—Federal, State, and local—in a few short years is given in a letter to me by a Maryland resident which follows:

GAMBRILLS, Md.,  
May 19, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman, House Banking Committee, U.S.  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Recently I read an article in the Baltimore Sun which mentioned the fact that you are concerned about high interest rates. I am one of the young American taxpayers who is also concerned about high interest rates.

Last fall after spending nearly seven years at college "preparing for my future" I completed my studies with the MS degree. Presently I am employed by the State of Maryland as a professional. Even with all my years of training, an excellent record, and a very challenging, comparatively well paying position I find that I cannot even think of buying a home because of the high interest rates. In just the past two years interest rates have reached a ridiculous level. As a young member of American society—age 25 by the way—I feel almost compelled to revolt against the Federal Government. There is a hopelessness about the money situation that has many of

us younger people greatly disturbed. There are many of us who are respectable people, who do not riot, but yet who are wondering just exactly what we have to do to stop the skyrocketing cost of living. The fact that college trained people are no longer being paid adequate incremental wages to keep up with inflation is also disturbing.

Why has the Federal Government shirked its responsibility to the youth of America by allowing rampant inflation to continue? It is we, the younger people just starting out, who find it most difficult to get ahead. Is it no wonder then that college-age people everywhere are most sympathetic to dissent?

This letter is not meant to be a tirade against the Federal Government or even against certain individuals. Rather, it is written to express the opinion that a dangerous feeling of hopelessness is rapidly developing among the younger members of American society, and that something must be done to stop inflation and bring interest rates down.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. MATIS.

#### DO NOTHING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, the President has it within his authority to halt the march of interest rates. Last year this Congress approved legislation authorizing the President to exercise credit controls over any and all areas of the economy when such action is necessary in his judgment. At the time President Nixon signed the act, he said he was doing so reluctantly, and never intended to implement it.

Since then, as conditions worsened, there have been repeated calls for congressional, Government, and business leaders to use the authority and prestige of his office to stop the upward spiral of prices and wages. The President has refused to do anything except invite business leaders to a White House banquet where they were assured there was no need to worry about the future of the economy.

#### A CHANCE TO REVERSE THE TREND

Legislation is now under consideration to create a Federal bank to provide mortgage funds at reasonable rates for those low, moderate, and middle income families who are the victims of the Nation's crushing housing crisis. Legislation is also under consideration authorizing the President to freeze prices and wages for 6 months while a long-range solution to our economy problems is sought. The administration is in opposition to both measures. If these efforts to alleviate economic problems continue to meet with the same attitude the President expressed toward the credit control bill, then Mr. Matis and millions like him will have additional crushing examples deepening the despair he expressed in his letter to me.

Mr. Speaker, the implications of such attitudes fostered by genuine hopelessness are alarming to say the least.

### MAIL INDICATES GROWING CONCERN OVER HIGH INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, every week I receive hundreds of letters from

citizens all over the Nation urging that something be done to lower interest rates and to revitalize the U.S. economy. These letters come from all walks of life—small businessmen, farmers, homebuilders, and many consumers. Today, the theme is very similar regardless of where these letters originate. The people want action by the Congress and the administration on high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I know that other Members of Congress likewise are receiving much mail on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the widespread nature of this concern, I place in the RECORD three letters—one from Indiana, one from Texas, and a third from Wisconsin:

BEST WELDER, DIVISION OF AIR HYDRAULICS OF INDIANA, INC.,  
Indianapolis, Ind., May 19, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: The attached article appeared today in the Indianapolis Star.

I applaud your position in this matter and I urge you to continue to press the matter.

It appears to me that the present administration is too obstinate to do what is necessary to get the economy rolling.

We are a small business firm. We cannot continue to survive unless the situation is changed in the very near future.

Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND C. CHASE,  
President.

#### NIXON CHALLENGED ON MONEY COSTS

WASHINGTON.—The House Banking Committee chairman challenged President Nixon yesterday to use existing powers against high money costs, saying if he does not "we will bring down interest rates by statute."

Representative Wright Patman (D-Tex.) said Congress should stay in session "night and day and on weekends if necessary . . . until we have a specific program to bring about lower interest rates and to revitalize our entire economy."

Patman gave his views in a speech prepared for House delivery today and released for publication last night.

Patman said Congress enacted five months ago legislation providing "the broadest possible set of tools to control credit and interest rates."

"The President has not acted to use this law," he said. "He has left it sitting idle while prices continued to climb and while interest rates remain at record levels. He left the law untouched while housing starts continued to decline."

The law, Patman said, permits the President to direct credit into needed areas, impose limits on interest rates and, through the Federal Reserve, control all elements of credit transactions.

In addition, he said, "I urge that the President and his Cabinet officials, such as the secretary of the Treasury speak directly to the banking community and demand that rates be lowered."

SCHNEIDER, BERNET & HICKMAN, INC.,  
May 23, 1970.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: As a member of the financial community I heartily endorse your efforts to control the critical abuses in the banking industry which are inflicting serious problems on our economic welfare both as individuals and as a nation.

Unless something is done to curb the astronomical interest rates and the huge benefits



being reaped by the largest banking interests the repercussions will be disastrous.

At the very time that business profits are plunging and country is being led toward depression by an adamant and short sighted administration the banking interests are profiting as never before at the expense of the general welfare of the nation as a whole.

The vast majority of the people, whether Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, would like to preserve our American way of life. But if the biggest money and banking interest are allowed to go unchecked and squeeze until the middle class is eliminated there would arise as a means of last resort a protest that would make the recent peace demonstrations look like a picnic. The result could well be socialism or just plain communism.

I am proud of you as a fellow Texan and distinguished American. Please keep up the good work you are doing.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD C. BYRD.

ALLIED REALTY SALES,  
May 22, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We want you to know that we appreciate very much what you and our good Senator William Proxmire are trying to do to bring the interest rates down to a reasonable level.

Our business has suffered greatly due to the high interest rates. Frankly we don't know if we can stay in business much longer under present conditions. Many builders and real estate brokers have been forced out of business.

More than 30% of the construction workers in the Milwaukee area are unemployed, and, this being the peak building season.

Please continue exerting pressure on the Nixon Administration to revitalize our economy. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

RUDOLPH MORVAK,  
Broker.

#### NEW HOUSING UNITS DECLINE 32 PERCENT HERE

New housing units authorized by building permits in the Milwaukee area declined from 786 during April of 1969 to 486 last month, the Metropolitan Builders Association of Greater Milwaukee said Wednesday.

The decline was 32.3%.

It was the 21st decline in the last 23 months, comparing each month with the same month the year before, and the lowest April on record. The builders' association has been monitoring building permits since late 1957 in Milwaukee, Waukesha, Ozaukee and Washington Counties.

The lowest previous April was in 1961 when permits were issued for only 665 dwelling units.

Single family homes fell to 281 last month from 427 in April last year. Duplex units dropped from 78 to 22 and apartments from 213 to 183.

Three of the four counties shared in the April losses. Milwaukee County took the brunt of the decline, dropping from 1,643 during that month last year to 529 this year. Washington County showed an increase from 67 to 87 units.

Building officials took solace in the comparison of the April decline with the whopping 64% decline in March, compared to March of last year.

"Sure it's bad," said Avrum M. Chudnow, the builder association president, of the April decline, "but the rate of decline is lower. Before, the drop was more precipitous."

Chudnow said he was encouraged by various government programs to stimulate housing and by the decision of First Wisconsin and Marine National Banks here to provide a

total of \$25 million for conventional mortgages.

"With the freeing of funds at realistic rates, I think you'll find the moderate and high income families buying homes again," he said. "Unlike the stock market, the bottom has been reached in the housing market."

#### HOUSE PANEL DEMANDS CUT IN INTEREST

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The House Banking Committee chairman challenged President Nixon Sunday to use existing powers against high money costs, saying if he does not "we will bring down interest rates by statute."

Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.) said Congress should stay in session "night and day and on weekends if necessary . . . until we have a specific program to bring about lower interest rates and to revitalize our entire economy."

Patman gave his views in a speech prepared for House delivery Monday and released for publication Sunday night.

#### AMERICANS SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious that despite the opposition of a strident and vociferous minority, most Americans approve of the way that President Nixon is conducting his job both abroad and at home.

That approval was made clear yesterday in the most recent Gallup poll which showed that 59 percent of the Nation support the President and only 29 percent oppose him.

This is the third consecutive monthly gain in the President's popularity and it comes in the wake of cries of isolation, lack of leadership, credibility gap, and all those other red herrings the radicals, the militants, and the Nixon haters seek to confuse the issues with.

It comes despite the tough, necessary steps the President has taken to deal with the problems of Vietnam and inflation.

It comes despite the demonstrations, the violence, the riots, and the personal invective. It comes despite all the efforts of the peaceniks and the anarchists and the revolutionaries to destroy the President's credibility and polarize this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a vote of appreciation by those of us in public office for making it clear that they cannot and will not be stamped by the rabid and divisive propaganda of the professional agitators and the political opportunists.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2

(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, during the debate on Reorganization Plan No. 2 the point was frequently made by its opponents that Congress was abdicating more of its authority to the Executive and was surrendering power which really should have been retained in the legislative branch.

An eloquent letter in the New York

Times of May 24, 1970, written by Erwin L. Levine, professor of government at Skidmore College, expresses this point of view most graphically. In particular, Professor Levine points out the ironical fact that it is the conservatives in this instance who have continued the process of increasing the power of the Executive after years of criticizing the liberals for similar actions. I am happy to append Professor Levine's letter to these remarks and I hope that it will be carefully read by Members of the House and that these words will be kept in mind as we watch in the future the operations of the new Office of Management and Budget and the Domestic Council.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N.Y., May 19, 1970.

#### NEGLECT BY CONGRESS

TO THE EDITOR: For years, conservatives of both the Republican and Democratic parties have been charging the liberals (and rightly so) with further enlarging the powers of the Presidents by legislative action, constitutional interpretation, and political cooperation. Now, lo and behold, the conservatives themselves have joined that foolish parade toward enhancement of Presidential power.

This past week, the Congress failed to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2 submitted by President Nixon on March 12, 1970. This plan took effect on Saturday, May 16, 1970 because neither the House nor the Senate disapproved it (each of the legislative Houses has the right to disapprove, within sixty days, any such executive reorganization). Indeed, by virtue of the vote of the House on May 14 (193 to 164 against such disapproval) and the Senate's failure even to have considered the plan on the Senate floor, the Congress has once again abdicated its constitutional authority to check the power of the President.

By not disapproving this plan, the Congress has permitted the President of the United States to develop even further excessive Presidential control over the power of the purse. One of the last vestiges of Congressional prerogatives has been its constitutional authority to authorize and then appropriate funds for expenditure by the executive branch.

The way the new Domestic Council and the Office of Management and Budget is now structured under this Reorganization Plan No. 2, a much greater barrier of insulation has been placed between the executive and legislative branches on domestic legislation, so closely tied to the appropriations process. More and more the Congress is losing, and indeed giving up, its constitutional right to check the President.

This is not because Presidents have been usurping power. Rather it is because the Congress continues to neglect its own responsibilities and duties. Now that the conservatives in the Congress seem to have captured control of the national legislative process, it is all more the pity that they have fallen into the same trap that the liberals fell into long ago. They have handed to the President (regardless of who he is) unheard of power. The democracy is much the worse for it.

ERWIN L. LEVINE,  
Professor of Government,  
Skidmore College.

#### PRESERVING THE VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON—WHEN?

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I know I

begin to sound like a broken record on the subject of the "view from Mount Vernon" but the commercial development which threatens the beauty of the national—nay, international—monument we have made of the first President's home needs dramatization. In an earlier plea to save the view, back in 1967, I asked:

If we cannot as a people, through our duly constituted institutions, save Mount Vernon—pray tell, what can we save?

I have recently considered kidnapping Secretary Hickel and Parks Director Hartzog and holding them until such time as they promised to give Mount Vernon the priority status it deserves—meaning, simply, that they would come to the Congress and actively seek the funds to protect the view. I have been dissuaded from this course of action—reluctantly.

The chorus of concern about the view from Mount Vernon has been taken up recently by the New York Times based on the centennial theme. Frankly, I do not care how or who makes the point for preservation so long as we achieve the goal of protecting one of our greatest historical treasures for future generations of American and world citizens.

Such preservation cannot be achieved if those in charge of the Mount Vernon area do not care. My goal is to make them care.

Some assistance in this quest is shown in the New York Times editorial of June 3 which follows:

#### VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON

As the United States prepares to observe the two hundredth anniversary of its founding, there is cause for alarm over the present status and future prospect of some of the great homes and sites of the Revolutionary era.

The greatest one of all is George Washington's home overlooking the Potomac and the low Maryland shore. "No estate in United America," Washington wrote, "is more pleasantly situated than this." Every year a million and a quarter people from all over the world visit the beautiful mansion and its grounds and discover that Washington's words are almost as true today as they were then, thanks to the care given this estate by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, which has owned it for more than a century.

But even Mount Vernon is vulnerable. The Department of the Interior controls the view upriver on both sides of the Potomac, and, directly across the river, has gained scenic easements generously donated by—or purchased from—private landowners.

However, substantial parts of the Maryland shore opposite and downstream from Mount Vernon are in imminent danger of development. About one hundred acres along the water and some 1,200 acres on the slopes behind are not under scenic control. Nearby a twenty-acre amusement park might grow to a frightening one hundred commercial acres under rezoning by Charles County in Maryland.

The Federal Government has a mandate from Congress to protect and expand the Mount Vernon overview. The original authorization to buy up the lands has been renewed regularly by Congress—but the Administration has failed to ask for funds for land acquisition and Congress has failed to correct this omission. Unless the unprotected acreage is acquired immediately by the National Park Service, the historic landscape can be ruined.

Looking ahead toward the centennial of

the American Revolution, the founder of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association wrote in 1874 that when thousands come "from the ends of the earth, to whom the home of Washington will be the place of places in our country, let them see that, though we slay our forests, remove our dead, pull down our churches, remove from home to home, till the hearthstone seems to have no resting place in America, let them see that we know how to care for the home of our hero." A century has gone by; now the bicentennial nears; and these words serve once again to remind Americans that we must not lose our heritage.

#### FEEDING THE ELDERLY IN SCHOOL

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, meeting the nutritional and social needs of the millions of elderly persons in this country is a task far from completed. A society can consider itself among the strongest when it assumes responsibility to do away with the loneliness and despair which so often marks the retirement years of persons who have led active and productive lives.

Our distinguished colleague, CLAUDE PEPPER, who has devotedly served his country in both bodies of Congress, has recently introduced a bill which would have considerable impact on improving the lives of Americans 65 or more years old.

His bill—H.R. 17763—provides Federal grants to States for the establishment and operation of low-cost meal programs and opportunity for increased social contact for the elderly. This would be achieved through a more effective utilization of existing facilities at public institutions such as schools and community centers.

In this regard, I found most interesting an article in School Management magazine entitled "Feeding the Elderly in School." The author, Marion Cronan, is a well-known authority on school lunch planning, and is director of food service and homemaking for the Brookline, Mass., public schools. In her article, Miss Cronan discusses pilot programs in Brookline and Pittsfield, Mass., which supply low-cost lunches at local schools and after-lunch activities for the elderly. As Miss Cronan writes:

Extension of school cafeteria services in this direction seems a logical use of school—and taxpayer—facilities."

The article follows:

#### FEEDING THE ELDERLY IN SCHOOL

Food service directors, already struggling with higher food costs, labor shortages and inadequate financing, can't be expected to jump for joy when asked to stretch their lunch periods to serve needy senior citizens. But it's happening. School breakfasts for children are no longer an oddity, and an increasing number of public officials are searching for ways to feed their senior citizens also. Since school feeding facilities represent a sizable community investment, they are a natural selection to accommodate such a program.

In late 1967, schools in Massachusetts were authorized to use their lunchroom facilities to serve lunches to poor elderly persons, and Brookline and Pittsfield were designated to conduct pre-pilot programs. When approached

with the idea, I immediately had visions of the difficulties involved: Would employees be willing to work longer hours? How much more record keeping would the program involve? How would the elderly fit into a lunch program that was designed primarily for young people?

As it turned out, my fears were groundless. The program has been exceptionally successful and the appreciation of participants is gratifying.

The 1967 law specified these conditions:

The charge for each lunch cannot exceed 50 cents.

Lunches must meet the nutritional standards set by the state department of education.

The procedure established by each school board for conducting the program must be approved by the Commission on Aging and the Office of School Lunch Programs in the department of education.

The Commission on Aging will determine eligibility for participation in the program.

One of the most important stipulations is that the program cannot involve the expenditure of local funds. Anything the school spends that isn't covered by the 50-cent charge for the meal is paid by federal and state grants from the Council on the Aging through the Office of School Lunch Programs. For example, the costs of additional labor, custodial services, clerical help and food are reported monthly to the state for total reimbursement.

For the most part, the "A" type lunch served to students constitutes the meal for the elderly. We know relatively little about geriatric feeding. However, we do know that the aged need basically the same nutrients as young people, but perhaps in different amounts. We have added coffee and tea to the menu, and usually serve three ounces of a protein-rich substance instead of two.

The added volume of business is small, so our per capita costs are higher for feeding the elderly than for feeding youngsters. Our costs are higher also because the custodian schedule was interrupted when the program was initiated, resulting in daily overtime pay. Extending our serving period for a half hour after the pupils are served adds two to three hours to total employee time.

Before starting the program, we feared that elderly persons would be particularly fussy about their food, but we've found the opposite to be true. They are our most appreciative and enthusiastic customers, and they are interested in the kinds of foods they should eat. By explaining to them the purpose of the lunch program and the content of the "A" meal, I have been able to point out the modifications that older people should make in choosing their food. It's doubtful, for instance, that they need all the bread and butter that the youngsters eat. But we serve the same amount because participants in the program tend to take home the food they don't eat, for consumption later or for giving to others.

When the program began, attendance varied from day to day, depending on the weather, transportation and, of course, the health of the participants. At first, tickets for meals were sold at the town's multiservice center, but this procedure didn't work out very well. It was aggravating for the aged to make a special trip to obtain a ticket for the next day's meal, then not be able to make it to the lunch for some reason. I decided that it would be best for them to pay each day in the same manner as our pupils. After awhile, the staff can predict accurately the number to expect at each day's program.

Participation in the program varies with the menu, the weather and planned after-lunch activities, which are sponsored by volunteers from the community. We have a social worker available for consultation, a psychiatrist who conducts group therapy meetings and an artist who gives lessons one

day a week. Several persons from the town's mental health center volunteer time at after-lunch sessions while they are in training.

When we brought a second school into the program, we found that after-lunch activities can play a big part in attracting participation. Although the second school was within walking distance for many eligible persons, some of them still elected to go to the other school if it offered a better after-lunch program.

As interest in reduced-price lunches for the elderly grows, the churches and community service organizations that now sponsor most such programs are going to need help. Extension of school cafeteria services in this direction seems a logical use of school—and taxpayer—facilities.

#### CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING—SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR REFORM

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

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Wyoming is necessarily absent today but he requested before his departure that I insert in the RECORD on his behalf a report released today by the 20th century fund. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that Mr. WOLD's comments and the report, be printed in the body of the RECORD:

#### CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING—SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR REFORM

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, today the Trustees of the Twentieth Century Fund released a detailed report on the problems of Congressional Campaign Financing. A year in preparation by a fund task force headed by former Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, the report contains many proposals for reform.

Regardless of whether one agrees with all points of the report, the recommendations it contains are—to quote the foreword by fund director M. J. Rossant, who merits much credit for the document—"not watered down compromises."

"In every case," writes Mr. Rossant, "they involve very real reforms of our electoral processes."

Mr. Speaker, I include the report of the task force of the Twentieth Century Fund in the body of the RECORD.

#### REPORT OF THE 20TH CENTURY FUND FOREWORD

It is clear that there is something wrong with the nation's electoral system. There are many manifestations of popular disaffection. For example, there is the concern—expressed by politician and voter alike—with rising costs of campaigning, which suggests to some people that politics is an exclusive preserve of the rich and to others that it is a cynical and dirty business. The large number of votes recorded by a third party in the 1968 election is another sign of uneasiness. So, too, is the fact that many potential voters are staying away from the polls.

Both the Congress and the two major parties have been attempting to become more responsive to these and other signs of national concern. Congress is currently moving to eliminate or at least revise the Electoral College; at the same time, it is considering legislation to provide political candidates with greater access to television at less cost. Meanwhile, the major parties are seeking to carry out reforms that will enable them to attract people with ability and to open up their ranks to those—including many blacks, many poor, and many of the young—who now feel that the political system has nothing to offer them.

The Trustees of the Twentieth Century Fund, most of whom have been activist politically, have been no less concerned about the problems plaguing the political process in the United States. In 1967, the Fund sponsored the independent bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era<sup>1</sup> to suggest reforms for campaigning on the presidential level. Its report, entitled *Voters' Time*, has served to stimulate debate and, hopefully, action, that will lead to better and cheaper exposure of presidential candidates on television as well as greater participation by the electorate in political campaigns.

The following report is an outgrowth of the deliberations of the Fund's Commission on Campaign Costs. For in reporting to the Fund, the Commission noted that the problems facing congressional candidates "may well be greater than those facing the national tickets." As one who was privileged to sit in on some of the meetings of the Commission, I can attest to its own concern about the difficulties of entry into politics for people who are not rich or well-connected and its feeling that new ways must be found to broaden and expand public participation in the political system.

As a result, the Trustees last year approved the setting up of a Fund Task Force to specifically consider the problems of congressional campaign financing. We were fortunate in assembling a distinguished and ecumenical group who, collectively, possessed an extraordinary amount of experience and information about political campaigns at the congressional level. Moreover, it was a deeply committed Task Force, one that was not only aware of the multiple problems involved in congressional campaigning but determined to do something constructive about them.

Like most other Fund Task Forces, the report of the Task Force is accompanied by a background paper that provides details and outlines the dimensions of the problems under discussion. It was prepared by David Rosenbloom, of the Political Science Department of M.I.T., who also served as the Task Force's rapporteur.

The Task Force demonstrated its commitment in its willingness to devote time and energy to the assignment. It held spirited debates on many issues but, partly because of the display of cooperative zeal on the part of Thomas B. Curtis, the Task Force chairman and a former Republican Congressman, and Neil Staebler, its vice chairman and a former Democratic Congressman, and partly because the group as a whole believed that the problems required consensus solutions, there were very few instances where the Task Force could not come to unanimous agreement on the proposals for reform. Yet their all but unanimous recommendations are not watered down compromises. In almost every case, they involve very real reforms of our electoral processes.

The Fund, its Trustees, and its staff appreciate the efforts made by the Task Force to produce a provocative, timely and useful report. In this congressional campaign year, the nation's political system will undergo new pressures and strains. It is our belief that the Task Force report offers positive remedies for many of the ills of the system.

#### REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE

The hoped-for objective of this report is simple: a fair, competitive election for every seat in the United States Congress. This objective requires that a candidate have access to adequate resources to wage a competitive campaign. We believe also that campaigns should be financed in a way that will build support for our political institutions and respect for the political process.

<sup>1</sup>Newton N. Minow, Chairman; Dean Burch; Thomas G. Corcoran; Alexander Heard; Robert Price.

There will always be some imbalance between candidates in an election. One candidate will have advantages—well-known image, issues, or events—over another. These advantages obviously cannot be eliminated. However, the imbalance of money and other campaign resources which now prevents many elections from being competitive can be reduced.

At present, about 25 per cent of the elections to Congress represent serious competition, that is, instances where the decision rests on less than a 60–40 per cent split of vote. An overwhelming proportion of elections are won by incumbents. Since 1954 incumbents have been involved in 3,220 House and 224 Senate primary or general elections. They have won 92 per cent and 85 per cent of them, respectively.

The growing success of these incumbents at the polls is closely related to current patterns of congressional campaign finance. Incumbents start a campaign well ahead of the challengers and usually stay ahead. Incumbency in Congress gives a person access to campaign resources that make his re-election highly probable. The incumbent has the natural advantages of experience, previous public exposure, and a public record. Additionally he has the prerequisites of office—especially his staff, his offices, his almost unlimited free postage—to help his re-election campaign.

The incumbent also has easy access to large special interest contributors<sup>2</sup> and to the national party campaign committees. Many incumbents begin their re-election campaigns with major portions of their funds already collected or pledged from Washington-based special interest groups. Some incumbents, especially those holding important committee assignments, can mobilize allies in the federal bureaucracy to help their re-election. Federal departments and agencies can grant or withhold federal contracts, appointments, or other redeemable political favors.

Many incumbents benefit in still another way. In setting House district boundaries, state legislatures often try to protect the incumbents in order to increase the seniority of their state's congressional delegation.

It is no accident that incumbents win so often. Many congressional elections are over before they begin because the challengers simply cannot raise the resources they need to overcome the advantages of the incumbents.

The cost of an effective campaign for Congress is rising rapidly. Today a competitive campaign for a House seat can cost each side more than \$100,000, while a Senate contest can cost each campaigner a minimum of \$250,000 even in a relatively small state.

With the exception of incumbents in "safe" districts, successful candidates for Congress must either be wealthy or have access to large sums of money. Challengers without such resources do run for Congress. Most lose.

The rapid rise in cost can be traced largely to changing communication patterns in the country. Most Senate campaigns and many House campaigns make heavy investments in television and radio time. In 1966 expenditures for all electoral advertising time on television and radio were \$32 million, about 1½ times what was spent in 1962. A substantial portion of this total was spent on congressional campaigns. If the laws are not changed, more than \$50 million will be spent in 1970.

Direct mail has long been used by congressional candidates to communicate with the voters. In recent years, however, it has become much more expensive. The cost of first-class postage has doubled since 1958

<sup>2</sup>We define a special interest contributor as any individual or association that has limited objectives in politics and makes contributions to promote them.

and will increase in 1970. In addition, the advent of computerized mailing techniques has made the use of direct mail both more effective and more costly.

The easy availability of air transportation is enabling more candidates to travel more. Despite the growth of mass media communication, candidates for Congress are making more personal appearances at greater cost to their campaigns than was true in the past. Some of this travel, in fact, is designed to create events for free publicity on news and interview shows.

To make full use of modern communication techniques candidates for Congress are turning increasingly to professional pollsters, managers, public relations firms, and advertising companies. These professionals often help candidates, but they also add to the cost of a campaign.

Despite the new ways of reaching the electorate, too many elections remain uncompetitive because a significant number of Americans do not vote. In 1970 less than half of the eligible population will vote in the congressional elections.<sup>3</sup> While the total number of people participating in congressional elections has grown in the last twenty years there has been no substantial change in the proportion of the eligible population that actually participates in congressional elections.

Many Americans are still prevented from voting. Economic and social repression has left many black, poor, and uneducated citizens afraid or unable to vote. Candidates who try to make their campaigns competitive by registering and involving groups that have been denied the ballot have found the process expensive and frustrating.

Lengthy residence requirements are still commonly used by some political organizations to keep voter turnout low and relatively controlled. Many Americans whose occupations force them to move frequently are in fact disenfranchised. Others who are away from their homes on election day are disenfranchised because absentee ballot provisions in many states are complicated and make voting difficult. Others do not vote because of indifference to the particular candidates or to the political system itself.

Voter frauds in some areas keep campaigns uncompetitive. Votes cast go unaccounted, votes may be bought, and fictitious votes may be recorded. Overcoming or eliminating these frauds is also expensive and frustrating.

Large amounts of money and other resources are now raised and spent, but not nearly as much as would need to be spent if all congressional elections were competitive. We must invest more money more wisely, to balance the advantages of incumbents, to finance adequate access to contemporary communications, to bring many excluded citizens into the electoral process, and to bring back those alienated from it.

To achieve the objective of fair competitive congressional elections changes must be made in the public policies which regulate the conduct and distribution of resources to congressional campaigns.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

##### I. Publicizing campaign finance

###### 1. Full Disclosure

We believe that full public disclosure and publication of all campaign distributions and expenditures are the best disciplines available to make campaigns honest and fair. We also believe full public reporting will tell the public where political contributions are

<sup>3</sup> We define eligible population as all those citizens who have reached voting age. We use this base because we believe that everyone who has reached voting age should be registered to vote. Voting participation figures would be even lower if the two million Americans outside the country were included.

going, where they are needed, and thus encourage more people to make contributions to political campaigns.

More than half the money spent in congressional elections today is not reported to the public. The federal Corrupt Practices Act requires candidates and committees to file reports on contributions and expenditures, but the law is riddled with loopholes and, as a result, few campaigns are fully reported. In 1968, 182 candidates for Congress filed reports stating that they had personally spent nothing and knew of no committee expenditures that needed to be reported at the federal level.

Some of those who reported nothing at the federal level filed more complete campaign income and spending reports with state or county agencies. However, thirty-one states either have no reporting laws or require reports of varying degrees of completeness only after an election. Almost no state has adequate auditing or enforcement procedures to deter or uncover illegal activities. As a result of the weaknesses of federal and state laws, some candidates spend more than \$1 million in their campaigns without reporting any of it to the public.

Total spending on the 1968 congressional campaigns reported under the federal statutes totaled \$8,482,857. Actual spending was probably more than \$50 million. We believe the public has the right to know who is paying how much for congressional campaigns. So long as the public is denied this information, beliefs about political finance that undermine for our political institutions will persist. The routine failure of candidates for high public office to disclose how much they spent in their campaigns and where they got the money contributes to this growing cynicism. If respect for our political institutions is to be restored, finance regulations must be changed. The public cannot be expected to respect the law when those who would be its lawmakers avoid or break the law to get elected.

Information about campaign finance should be available to the public in easily comprehended form during the campaign. Both the public and the candidates should be confident that attempts to conceal campaign contributions or expenditures will be investigated, exposed, and penalized.

At present, the federal statute specifically excludes primary elections from reporting requirements. In many areas primaries are more important than general elections. We believe that money contributed and spent to influence the selection of the party nominees in a federal election should be as fully reported to the public as the contributions and expenditures of the election itself.

We recommend that every political organization and committee that spends money or other resources to influence a primary or general election for federal office be required to register with a federal elections commission and to keep orderly and open records of its activities.

Any such organization or committee that raises or spends \$1,000 or more in any year should be required to file a report with a federal elections commission quarterly and fifteen and five days prior to a primary or general election.

Reports should be clear, simple, and easy for the public to understand. They should provide complete information about the source of all contributions, pledges, and new or outstanding loans; and about the recipient and purpose of all expenditures.

We recommend that firm and realistic penalties be established and enforced to deter late, inaccurate reports. Candidates and their authorized agents should be held responsible for the accuracy and completeness of reports filed by their campaign committees.

###### 2. Federal Elections Commission

No agency is now responsible for supervising compliance with federal campaign fi-

nance regulations. The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House are the statutory repositories for campaign spending reports but they do not have the authority, the staff, or the motivation to do anything but accept the reports that are filed. Further, there is no office that keeps records and provides information about political contributions and expenditures of committees seeking to influence federal elections.

There is no federal agency that regularly investigates serious charges of illegal conduct during a campaign. Nor is there any agency competent to give legal advice about campaign activities. We believe this administrative void must be filled if campaign finance regulations are to be effective.

We recommend the establishment of a bipartisan federal elections commission to administer regulations affecting federal campaigns. The commission should audit and publicize all campaign finance reports and report possible violations, including late filing, to the appropriate enforcement agencies for action. The commission should have the staff, resources, and independence to do the jobs assigned to it. It should have the power to investigate charges of illegal activity in federal campaigns, to subpoena evidence, and to establish uniform accounting and reporting procedures for political committees.

###### 3. Spending Limits

The traditional intent of campaign finance regulation in the United States has been to limit the size of campaign contributions and expenditures and to prohibit contributions from certain sources. The Corrupt Practices Act limits the amounts candidates and political committees may spend in any one year and limits the contributions an individual may make to a political committee in any year. Contributions from corporations, unions, and government contractors are prohibited entirely.

We do not believe this policy of ceilings has served the public well because expenditures have been neither limited nor disclosed. The limits now in the law—\$5,000 for a House candidate, \$25,000 for a Senate candidate, and \$3 million a year for a political committee—are unrealistically low. They do not significantly affect the amount of campaign spending. They are unenforceable and while some members of the Task Force would prefer legal limits we believe that no workable set of limits can be devised.

Many people are concerned that candidates spend too much in their campaigns. At least one candidate for the House in 1968 spent \$2 million in the general election alone. In some Senate campaigns, in the primary and general elections, as much as \$5 or \$6 million have been spent. Current laws have been ineffective in preventing or disclosing these expenditures.

If there were full public disclosure and publication of all campaign contributions and expenditures during a campaign, the voters themselves could better judge whether a candidate has spent too much. The policy would do more to protect the political system from unbridled spending than legal limits on the size of contributions and expenditures.

Some candidates probably spend too much, but that is not the point; the larger problem is that many candidates, especially challengers, do not have enough money for their election campaigns.

We recommend that all spending limits for congressional campaigns be eliminated.

###### 4. Limits on Individual Contributions

This Task Force was concerned that removing all limits on individual contributions to political committees might open the prospect of rich individuals buying federal elections. We would like to protect our political system from that threat. The Task Force agreed that neither rich candidates spend-

ing their own money, nor rich contributors supporting a candidate should be allowed to have undue influence on elections. Full disclosure will warn the voters when such an attempt is being made.

The Corrupt Practices Act prohibits individuals from giving more than \$5,000 to a political committee in any year. This law has not deterred people who wanted to make large contributions to candidates. They simply give their contributions to several committees supporting the same candidate.

Gifts, including political contributions, of more than \$3,000 to any single recipient in any year are subject to the gift tax provisions of the internal revenue code. This may be a more effective restraint on individual contributions than the limit in the Corrupt Practices Act.

Several members of the Task Force favor a limit on the amount an individual, including the candidate himself, may contribute to a campaign. Mrs. Mary Zon and Thomas B. Curtis believe that such a limit should be enacted and can be enforced. However, we were unable to prescribe an effective device for enforcing such a recommendation.

We considered recommending a \$5,000 limit on individual contributions even though it might not be fully enforceable. But since we believe one of the principal challenges of our electoral system is to restore its credibility with large numbers of the American people, we were reluctant to recommend anything that we did not think could be enforced. Moreover, we feel that unreported large contributions are much more of a danger than large contributions that are publicly reported.

The principal burden for reporting campaign contributions and expenditures ought to be borne by campaign organizations. However, reports from individuals who contribute substantial amounts of money to politics will serve as a valuable addition and cross-check to these reports.

We recommend that limits on the size of individual contributions to political committees be eliminated.

We recommend that individuals who contribute more than \$5,000 in a year to federal candidates and political committees be required to file a report with a federal elections commission listing the date, recipient, and amount of all contributions (including purchases of tickets to fund-raising events), pledges and loans of \$100 or more, and the aggregate total of all contributions of less than \$100. Such donors should be required to certify that they have contributed their own money and that they will not be reimbursed in any way.

#### 5. Ban on Contributions from Corporations, Unions, Trade Associations, and Government Contractors

Corporations, unions, and government contractors are now prohibited from making contributions to federal campaigns. Several ways have been developed to evade this prohibition. In the past, however, there have been only sporadic efforts to enforce this ban.

But we believe that corporations, unions, trade associations, and government contractors are unacceptable as sources of money and resources for federal campaigns. Contributions from these sources create too many potential, ethical problems for both the contributors and the recipients. We believe candidates should guard against such contributions. When illegal contributions are discovered and prosecuted, the names of the candidates who received them should be released to the public. This has not happened in the recent prosecutions.

Mrs. Zon objects to the equation of unions and corporations because of their whole purpose, constituencies, and methods of administering and administering policies.

We recommend corporate and union non-partisan efforts to encourage employees and members to contribute personal money and time to political campaigns and parties. We encourage corporations and unions to expand these activities. They should be allowed to continue financing them with regular operating funds.

We recommend that current prohibitions against corporate, union, and government contractor contributions to federal campaigns be continued and vigorously enforced. When a corporation, union, association, or contractor is prosecuted for making illegal contributions to federal campaigns the names of candidates who received such contributions should be released to the public.

We recommend that nonpartisan political solicitation programs financed by corporate and union operating funds be encouraged.

#### 6. A Single Responsible Campaign Committee

A common way for candidates and their managers to avoid the current limitations on spending and reporting is to establish many committees to finance and organize a single campaign. This procedure usually obscures information about the amount and sources of money spent in their campaigns. We believe that the elimination of contributing and spending limits removes any possible justification for the establishment of multiple financial structures for any congressional election campaign. To simplify disclosure of the sources of funds and use of money being spent in any campaign, only one official campaign committee should be established.

We know that many candidates and managers believe it is useful to organize their campaigns around many specialized committees. We have no intention of interfering with the proliferation of political committees unless this practice is carried out to evade the law and obscure financial data. This recommendation would not stop truly independent committees supporting a candidate from being set up.

The majority of the task force members believe that if this recommendation is to be effective, individual contributors should make all of their contributions to one committee. Neil Staebler and Charles Barr are concerned that limiting individuals in this manner is impractical and many, in fact, have an adverse effect on broadening the base of campaign givers.

We recommend that all candidates for federal office be required to designate one official campaign committee. All subsidiary and specialized committees should be responsible to the official campaign committee which shall file all required income and spending reports for the entire campaign. Individuals should be prohibited from making contributions to more than one committee organized specifically to support the same candidate.

### II. Increasing participation

#### 7. Tax Credit for Individual Contributions

We believe the best political finance system would be one based on relatively small contributions from large numbers of citizens. The number of small givers (under \$100), especially to the Republican party, has been growing substantially. We think this desirable trend should be encouraged.

A modest tax credit for small political contributors probably will increase their number for two reasons. For one thing, the availability of the credit itself will enable many more people to afford a small contribution. For another, a government tax credit will make political contributions more respectable. Many people are still reluctant to contribute to politics because they think there is something "wrong" with political finance.

Only about 8 per cent of Americans said they had made political contributions in

1968. Polls indicate, however, that many more would have given if they had been asked. We believe that a tax credit will create an opportunity for candidates and parties to raise more money in small amounts, provided they do a better job of solicitation. We urge the parties to cooperate with other institutions in the society to train more competent party officials and workers.

We have recommended a tax credit rather than a deduction because deductions favor higher bracket taxpayers. Our approach builds in the element of personal involvement, by allowing a credit for only part of the contributions.

We recommend a tax credit of up to \$25 (\$50 on a joint return) for 50 per cent of contributions made during a year to political committees.

#### 8. Full Voter Registration

While some improvement has been made in removing impediments to voting, we believe the nation must take a much more positive approach to insure that every citizen who reaches voting age is registered to vote. We believe national voter registration financed by the federal government would strengthen our democratic system and remove this financial burden from individual candidates, parties, and other private organizations.

We recommend that the Congress establish a simple and universal pattern for complete voter registration, including citizens who are abroad. This should be carried out through a new unit in one of the federal agencies or through subsidies to states that adopt model uniform legislation for this purpose.

#### 9. Voters' Information

We believe voter participation and electoral competition would be increased if all voters were given full information about the electoral process, such as the hours and places of voting and use of the absentee ballot.

We believe this should be provided at public expense. Some states already mail such information to their voters about the election procedures and the candidates and issues on the ballot. This practice should be expanded so that each voter receives official information about the election and his voting rights. We feel the states are best able to gather and distribute this information to the voters. This activity should be supported by postal subsidies.

We recommend that the federal government provide postage for voters' information material prepared by each state. To be eligible for free postage such material should include facts about voters' rights and the federal elections on the ballot.

#### 10. Postal Privileges for National Party Committees

We believe a slight change in federal policy would encourage our political parties to communicate with their members more frequently. With regular communication they could recruit new people as volunteers and donors. Regular political communication from the parties might ease the financial and physical burdens congressional candidates now face every two years in searching out and activating their party's members. Further, reduced postage would encourage parties to expand direct mail solicitation of small gifts.

We recommend that national committees of political parties (defined as having had congressional candidates in one-half of the states in the most recent or current congressional election) be allowed to use the lowest postal rate available to charitable organizations.

### III. Increasing competition

#### 11. Use of Congressional Facilities

A better balance of resources between incumbents and challengers would produce genuinely competitive contests for the Con-

gress. One means which we considered for correcting this imbalance is full cash subsidies for political campaigns.

We decided not to recommend this approach because we think it could lead to less political participation. Broad-based fund raising by political parties and candidates is a more effective way to achieve greater participation. Furthermore, if candidates got money directly from the government the parties might be even weaker than they are now, and their ability to organize government might erode even more. On the other hand, if parties alone got the government subsidies, their power would increase inordinately and the balance between a candidate's independence and his party loyalty would be threatened.

Our objective of more competitive elections can be accomplished through new federal policies that would prevent incumbents from using their public office for campaign purposes and which would ease the financial burden on all candidates for Congress. Many members now use their congressional offices to plan and conduct their re-election campaigns. Congressional staff members often spend significant amounts of time working on their next election. Hometown offices of members of Congress sometimes serve as campaign headquarters.

Members of Congress often use the extensive radio and television recording facilities in the Capitol to tape politically oriented messages for broadcast in their campaigns. The postal franking privilege has at times been abused for political mailings.

Members of Congress are entitled to ask staff people to work on campaigns. But we believe these people should leave the federal payroll during the campaign and be paid by the campaign organization. This would put the incumbent on an equal footing with the challenger who must pay his staff from campaign funds. Similarly, incumbents should not be allowed to use government facilities and equipment to plan and organize their campaigns. They should maintain separate campaign facilities paid for by their campaign organization.

We recommend that a federal elections commission enforce rules that will prevent members of Congress from using their staff, office, and communications facilities to plan and run their re-election campaigns.

#### 12. Postal Allowance for Candidates

It would be relatively cheap for the federal government to give each candidate for Congress the opportunity to put a piece of his own literature into the hands of each voter. While we are dealing here only with the general election we realize that in some areas the primary is still the most important arena in an electoral competition. If our recommendation proves to be as useful as we think it will, it could easily be extended to candidates in primary elections.

We recommend that every legally qualified candidate for Congress in the general election be entitled to one free mail delivery to each voter in his constituency.

#### 13. Access to Television and Radio

The Federal Communications Act of 1934 authorizes licenses to use but not to own the airwaves. We believe the airwaves belong to the people. We believe it to be proper public policy to assure candidates for federal office the right to use television and radio to communicate with their constituents during an election.

To implement this policy, legally qualified candidates must be granted reasonable requests to buy television and radio time. Some broadcasters refuse all political candidates the right to buy time. David Jones recommends that broadcasters be prohibited from denying a legally qualified candidate any reasonable request for time he may wish to purchase in general or primary elections. He opposes mandating that broadcasters sell

time at discounted prices. The other Task Force members believe that broadcasters should be required to sell time at reduced prices to provide access to television and radio to candidates of modest means.

In metropolitan areas television and radio stations encompass several House districts. In these areas television and radio are not effective campaign tools, at any price, and we do not encourage candidates to use them. We are therefore against mandating free time for all congressional candidates. We have limited ourselves to the problem of assuring candidates access to television advertising and political programming at reasonable prices. We believe more intensive study of the political uses of television is needed to insure that this important public resource is used to increase the quality of public knowledge and debate on important issues. For example, we think there should be much more comparative examination of the uses, impact, and effects of various formats as political communication tools.

The study of presidential television campaigning conducted by the Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era (*Voters' Time*) was useful. We urge that new studies of the impact and effects of television at all levels of the political system be conducted.

We recommend that commercial broadcasters be required to sell reasonable amounts of prime and other time to legally qualified candidates for Congress.

We recommend that commercial broadcasters be required to charge all legally qualified candidates for Congress for such political time as they buy in general and primary elections at no more than 50 per cent of the lowest charge made to any commercial advertiser for such time, provided that broadcasters may then, for federal income tax purposes, deduct amounts equal to the dollar value of such discounts to candidates from their total taxable income.

#### 14. Potential of Cable Television

Multichannel cable television is coming into wide use throughout the country. Because cable television is highly flexible and can deliver programs to limited geographic areas such as congressional districts, ground rules for the design and use of cable television systems ought to provide for effective use of this medium for political communication.

We recommend that in formulating regulations for the use of multichannel cable television, the F.C.C. take due regard of the tremendous political value cable television will provide in campaigns within limited geographical constituencies. Regulations governing the use of cable television should allow for maximum use of these facilities for political communication.

#### IV. Organizing reform

##### 15. A Select Committee of Congress

Under current congressional procedures recommendations for improving the system of congressional campaign finance fall under the jurisdiction of several different committees. We believe prospects for comprehensive examination and reform of our campaign finance procedures will be improved if one committee of the Congress has the authority to examine all of the important regulatory, financial, and communications aspects of federal election campaigns.

We recommend that a select committee of the Congress be appointed to study and recommend legislation that will improve congressional campaign finance practices.

##### 16. An Investigating Committee for the 1970 Congressional Elections

If past reporting practice is any indication of what will happen in 1970, the public will not be provided with adequate information about the financing of congressional campaigns. If changes in reporting are not

made between now and the elections, more than half the money spent will go unreported. Even if a thorough study is made afterward, much information about campaign practices will remain unknown because campaign organizations and records often disperse quickly after the election.

We recommend that a special investigating subcommittee be in operation throughout the 1970 congressional election campaigns to gather information about the financing of campaigns while they are taking place. The subcommittee should make information about the sources and uses of campaign funds available to the public.

#### A BILL TO PRESCRIBE THE MEASUREMENT OF FULL-TIME TRAINING FOR APPRENTICESHIP OR OTHER ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters from veterans participating in apprenticeship or on-the-job training programs under the GI bill and from labor leaders as well, calling my attention to an apparent inequity in the law with respect to these types of training.

Existing law provides that full-time training for apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs will consist of the number of hours which constitute the standard workweek of the training establishment but not less than 35 hours, unless a lesser number is established through bona fide collective bargaining. The law further requires that payments can be made only after receipt of a certification showing that the veteran was pursuing his program throughout the period being certified and payment may not be authorized for any day of absence in excess of 30 days in a 12-month period. It is a well-known fact, Mr. Speaker, that training on the job is subject to the peculiarities of the individual establishment, as well as the vagaries of the weather. There may be periods during a month when full utilization of the work force is not being had, and other months when the normal work hours are exceeded.

One of the many communications I have received best outlines the difficulties experienced under the existing law. This letter is from Mr. Doyle W. Durbin, Sr., an official of Local 2 of Indiana of the Bricklayers, Masons, & Plasterers International Union of America. Mr. Doyle is secretary of the Fort Wayne Joint Apprenticeship Committee, and writes in part as follows:

Under the present setup if an apprentice should miss more than the allotted hours or days work even through no fault of his own then his monthly benefit check is reduced in amount. Being a bricklayer apprentice means that these young people work outdoors approximately ninety percent of the time. During early spring rains or a real severe winter such as the one we just experienced, it would be possible that these people could miss days, and even weeks of work because of the weather and through no fault of their own. It is my contention that during these periods of reduced income is the time when these people need assistance most and not a reduction in their monthly benefit check. These apprentices are required to attend a

related training program which is an integral part of the whole apprenticeship program. Accurate attendance records are kept for this school and it is my contention that these records, along with a monthly report of progress and performance on the job should be used to determine eligibility. It is clearly understood by this office that there must be rules and regulations to help administer any law, and that any undue absenteeism should be dealt with and penalized accordingly. In my opinion to penalize these people for a condition that they cannot control is unjust.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied this matter at some length and am today introducing a bill that will alleviate the problems presented by Mr. Durbin and others. This bill provides that the number of hours recognized as constituting full-time training for apprenticeship or on-the-job training shall be the standard workweek of the training establishment, but not less than 30 hours, unless a lesser number is established through bona fide collective bargaining. However, 120 hours per month that are creditable toward the requirements of the trainee's occupational objective shall be considered full-time training for payment purposes. Certifications of attendance shall be based on the trainee's presence rather than his absence and would include a certification by the establishment that the trainee has not interrupted his training and is considered to be in full-time apprenticeship training. Fewer than 120 hours per month of training will proportionately reduce the monthly benefit.

Under my bill, Mr. Speaker, the trainee's normal progression would not be adversely affected by these reduced attendance requirements and his training would not be affected so long as he is engaged in training for a minimal number of hours each month. The reduction of the standard measurement of full-time apprenticeship training would make allowances for absences because of illness, weather, job conditions and other types of reduced operations in a realistic approach to reporting for benefit payment purposes.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 17960

A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe the measurement of full-time training for apprenticeship or other on-job training; and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 1681 (b) (2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "degree" the following: "(excluding programs of apprenticeship and programs of other on-job training authorized by section 1683 of this title)".

Sec. 2. Section 1683(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

(a) striking out "(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(b) (1)"; and

(b) adding a new clause (2) to read as follows:

"(2) In any month in which an eligible veteran pursuing a program of apprenticeship or a program of other on-job training fails to complete 120 hours of training in such month, the monthly training assistance allowance set forth in subsection (b) (1) of this section shall be reduced proportionately in the proportion that the number of hours worked bears to 120 hours rounded off to the nearest 8 hours."

Sec. 3. Section 1684(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

(a) striking out "and" after the semicolon in clause (3);

(b) striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof"; and"; and

(c) adding at the end thereof a new clause (5) to read as follows:

"(5) a program of apprenticeship or a program of other on-job training shall be considered a full-time program when the eligible veteran is required to work the number of hours constituting the standard workweek of the training establishment, but a workweek of less than thirty hours shall not be considered to constitute full-time training unless a lesser number of hours has been established as the standard workweek for the particular establishment through bona fide collective bargaining."

#### CRITICAL NEED FOR SUMMER JOBS FOR YOUTH

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the Nixon administration urged passage of an additional \$50 million in Federal funds for the Neighborhood Youth Corps' summer jobs program.

It gave even greater recognition to the critical need for jobs for youths in our cities.

I would urge that the Congress take immediate action on a larger amount of \$100 million, even if this means deferring other programs, and I have today introduced a bill to that effect.

There is a critical need for summer jobs for 14- to 21-year-olds. It takes \$445 per trainee for the Youth Corps' 10-week summer program. And unless we come up with the needed dollars, thousands of students across the country, especially in disadvantaged areas, will be out of work, roaming the streets, with little or nothing to do.

In Ohio, for example, an additional 6,000 jobs are needed in Cleveland, Columbus, and Cincinnati alone.

The summer jobs program has been one of the Neighborhood Youth Corps' most successful projects. A major purpose of the summer program has been to aid disadvantaged youths with on-the-job training, encouraging many to remain in high school.

While the Nation's overall unemployment rate has reached approximately 5 percent, teenage jobless figures reached 15.7 percent in April. Even more critical, the jobless rate for black teenagers was 32.7 percent in the first quarter of this year.

This is totally unacceptable.

Within the last few days, I have personally contacted high ranking Labor Department officials, to urge that additional funds be appropriated for summer jobs in Cleveland, Columbus, and Cincinnati. Hopefully, passage of the administration's \$50 million request would enable such supplemental appropriations to be made.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. The United States is the world's largest producer of cereal flour. In 1966 the United States produced 1,474,000 metric tons of cereal flour compared to 437,000 metric tons produced by West Germany, the second-ranked nation.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PELLY, for the week of June 15 to June 19, on account of hearings of Coast Guard Subcommittee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and other business in congressional district.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GAYDOS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. HOWARD), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. SCHWENGL, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 15 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BLATNIK and to include certain letters during his remarks in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 15712 with reference to his amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Texas to extend his remarks following those of Mr. HOSMER on the resolution.

Mr. RANDALL to revise and extend his remarks made today during colloquy with Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. RANDALL to revise and extend his remarks prior to adoption of House Resolution 976 today.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.  
Mr. BURTON of Utah in five instances.  
Mr. ROBISON.  
Mr. GUBSER.  
Mr. PETTIS.  
Mr. WYATT.

Mr. GUDE.  
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.  
Mr. CONTE in three instances.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in four instances.  
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. SCOTT.  
Mr. DENNEY.  
Mr. BERRY in two instances.  
Mr. SCHERLE.  
Mr. SCHWENGL in three instances.  
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.  
Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.  
Mr. BELCHER.  
Mr. ASHBROOK.  
Mr. QUIE.  
Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER in two instances.  
Mr. DENT in four instances.  
Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.  
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
Mr. NICHOLS in six instances.  
Mr. WALDIE in three instances.  
Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.  
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.  
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.  
Mr. WRIGHT in 14 instances.  
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.  
Mr. CASEY in two instances.  
Mr. WOLFF in two instances.  
Mr. HANNA in two instances.  
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.  
Mr. RIVERS.  
Mr. PATTEN in three instances.  
Mr. RODINO.  
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.  
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.  
Mr. BINGHAM.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3592. An act to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, to clarify the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, 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. 10184. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; and

H.R. 15166. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 5, 1970, present

to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12619. To amend section 11 of an act approved August 4, 1950 entitled "An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress."

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 9, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2115. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a copy of a Presidential determination authorizing military grant assistance to a country in Asia, pursuant to the provisions of section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2116. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Minot extension, Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, N.D., pursuant to the provisions of section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (H. Doc. No. 91-347); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2117. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting a copy of the proceedings of the meeting of the Judicial Conference held March 16-17, 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91-346); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2118. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1969 through March 1970, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2119. A letter from the chairman, Executive Committee, Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, transmitting the seventh annual report of the foundation, for 1969, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81-11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Investigation of "preselected winners" sweepstakes promotions (Rept. No. 91-1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIKES: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 17970. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1163). 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. BEALL of Maryland:  
H.R. 17950. A bill to establish and develop

the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:  
H.R. 17951. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE:  
H.R. 17952. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:  
H.R. 17953. A bill making an additional appropriation to carry out summer employment programs for youths under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:  
H.R. 17954. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:  
H.R. 17955. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide a penalty for persons who interfere with the conduct of judicial proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:  
H.R. 17956. A bill to define the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ROE, and Mr. MCCLURE):

H.R. 17957. A bill to establish procedures for benefit evaluation of proposed Federal and federally assisted water and related land resources developments; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. AYRES, Mr. BARING, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DORN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 17958. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, to liberalize certain criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for benefits under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDADE:  
H.R. 17959. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish an equitable survivors' annuity plan for the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADAIR:  
H.R. 17960. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe the measurement of full-time training for apprenticeship or other on-job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:  
H.R. 17961. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. JACOBS (for himself and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 17962. A bill relating to the appointment of the Capitol Architect; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 17963. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the computation of certain veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 17964. A bill to appropriate an additional amount to carry out section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 17965. A bill to provide for an Environment Corps to help Federal agencies and local units of government in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H.R. 17966. A bill to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 17970. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 1250. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning September 20, 1970, and ending September 26, 1970, as "National Machine Tool Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLORY:

H.J. Res. 1251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning August 2, 1970, and ending August 8, 1970, as "Professional Photography Week in America"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H. Con. Res. 657. Concurrent resolution the Congress reaffirms its constitutional responsibility of consultation with the President on matters affecting grave national issues of war and peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 1065. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ESCH:

H. Res. 1066. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. Res. 1067. Resolution on Earth Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

T. Fitzwater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 17968. A bill to provide compensation to certain silver-dealer claimants by authorizing the sale of silver bullion; to the Commission on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 17969. A bill for the relief of Victoria E. Doles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

398. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to oil drilling sanctuaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

399. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the settlement of Alaska Native land claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

400. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the completion of Interstate 95 in Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XX,

504. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to racism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 17967. A bill for the relief of John

## SENATE—Monday, June 8, 1970

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, at the beginning of a new week grant to us here a taste for that which is spiritual and sacred so that all we do which is temporal and secular may be in accord with Thy will. Grant that whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report, if there be anything which is unselfish and generous, if there be anything which Thou wilt accept and reward, may we think on these things.

Guide our Nation, O Lord, through these perilous days and vexing problems to an era of lasting peace and world brotherhood.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a

Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform my duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

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

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 5, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the call of the calendar for unobjected-to bills under rule VIII.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young) is recognized for a period of not to exceed 20 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for some insertions?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes, indeed.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR FANNIN TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the Journal tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) be recognized for not to exceed 45 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

#### LEASE AND TRANSFER OF TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 914.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.