

years. The price increased in two instances, but in only one was the increase even near the general price rise. In the two other instances there was a sizable decline in price, thus going against the general upward trend.

In the case of petroleum, of which we hear and read constantly, the price increase remained far below the general level despite the import quota. On a base of 100 using 1957-59 as the starting point, the price of refined petroleum products had risen to only 104.2 in May, 1970, compared with a level of 116.8 for all commodities. Coal, a competing fuel on which there is no import quota, meantime rose to 146.9 in the same period.

As for cotton textiles about which much has also been heard recently, only a very modest advance in wholesale price has been registered. On the 1957-59 base as 100, the May, 1970 price was only 105.3, or again far below the general price advance to 116. Cotton textiles have been under an import limitation for about ten years. The price on woolen textiles, which are under no import limitation, rose to only 103.8 during the same period, thus leaving little to choose between their price level, and that on cotton textiles which were under limitation.

Dairy products (milk, butter, cheese) have

also been under an import quota for a number of years. By May, 1970 the price stood at 135.4, where 100 represents the 1957-59 period.

This increase was greater than in the wholesale price of "farm products, foods and feeds," as a whole, which, of course, includes wheat and cotton which pulled down hard on the average.

Nevertheless the wholesale price of dairy products did not keep pace with that of pork (hogs) which rose 62 per cent since 1964, compared with 35.4 per cent. Yet pork imports were not restricted. If unlimited imports operate to keep prices down, why the greater rise in pork and coal prices than in petroleum, dairy products, wheat, sugar, etc., which were under import control?

Footwear imports zoomed greatly in recent years as all our ladies know. Imports are now supplying nearly a third of our market. There is no import quota. Yet what happened to footwear prices? They went well above the level for all apparel and distinctly above the rise in dairy prices.

What happens then to the economic theory? The answer: "other things" did not remain the same. Nevertheless the theory thrives and proliferates in the fact of overwhelming contrary testimony.

DAHOMEY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Dahomey, I wish to extend the heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the members of the Presidential Commission and to the Government and people of Dahomey.

The United States takes pride in the friendly relations it has shared with Dahomey since 1960, and hopes this good feeling and mutual cooperation will continue throughout the coming decades as well.

This Independence Day celebration will be a very special one for Dahomeans. We hope it will be followed by much joy and fulfillment for Dahomey in the years ahead.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 22, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D. offered the following prayer:

True justice is the harvest reaped by peacemakers from seeds sown in a spirit of peace.—James 3:18 (new English Bible).

O Lord, our God, who hast made this earth a grand place in which man can live, reveal to us Thy will and renew Thy love in us that responding to Thee we may learn to live together on this planet in peace and with good will.

Help us to feel Thy presence within us this day seeking to guide us as we determine our decisions and striving to assist us in leading our people along the roads to righteousness, our Nation along the ways of justice, and our world along the paths of peace.

"Incline our hearts with Godly fear
To seek Thy face, Thy word revere;
Cause Thou all wrongs, all strife to cease
And lead us in the paths of peace."

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3279. An act to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S. 3889. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for two years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

CXVI—1597—Part 19

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3192. An act to designate the navigation lock on the Sacramento deepwater ship channel in the State of California as the William G. Stone navigation lock.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, July 21, 1970, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 3978. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1970, during the present session of Congress, I was, while in Phoenix, Ariz., served with a subpoena duces tecum to appear before the Superior Court of Arizona, the next day, on April 1, 1970, as a witness for the plaintiff in the case of *Yuma Greyhound Park Inc. v. Samuel Jenkins et al.* (case No. 28609) and to bring with me certain documents referred to therein. I appeared in that court on April 1, 1970, and advised that this was in violation of my privileges as a Member of this House, and in violation of the privileges of the House and its protection guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

On May 15, 1970, I was served by the Superior Court of Arizona in the same case with an order to appear and to show cause on May 26, 1970, why I should not answer questions as a witness pursuant to the earlier subpoena. Under the precedents of the House, I was unable to comply with the order to show cause without the permission of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I sent

to the desk the order to show cause for the consideration of this body on May 19, 1970.

On May 26, 1970, the court was advised of the privileges of the House and the protection guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States and the court ordered the motion to compel me to appear and answer questions be denied under the above-mentioned privileges and protections.

On June 15, 1970, the Supreme Court of Arizona was petitioned to overrule the lower court's order and on June 30, 1970, the Supreme Court of Arizona saw fit to rule that there was no privilege and issued an alternative writ of mandamus reversing the lower court and ordering it to require me to be deposed at a time and place mutually convenient to the parties.

On July 2, 1970, a judgment was also signed by the chief justice which provided that the deposition should be noticed for a time certain at a place designated by the petitioner.

On July 2, 1970, the Superior Court of Arizona issued an order that compels me to appear in Phoenix, Ariz., on August 3, 1970, in further disregard of the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, just as I could not obey the original subpoena without the permission of this House, or the order to show cause which flowed from it, I cannot obey this last order which is also the product of that subpoena.

I will say that this whole matter is intended to harass me since I have made it abundantly clear that after Congress adjourns there is no privilege from the service of a subpoena nor would I assert any privilege.

I will also say that on three separate, recent occasions when I have testified, under oath, concerning Emprise Corp., which has done and is doing business with organized crime, that I have been subjected to cross-examination for a total of over 7 hours by extremely com-

petent counsel including a member of the same law firm which seeks to depose me now.

I mention this because after such cross-examination it had to be apparent I knew nothing of the subject matter of the above captioned lawsuit.

If it is the will of the House that I respond to this last order to be deposed, I will, of course, comply.

I send to the desk the subpoena duces tecum, the order to show cause, the order of the superior court of May 26, the order of the Supreme Court of Arizona, the judgment of the supreme court and the order of the superior court directing me to appear on August 3, 1970, for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[In the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, No. 10082]

YUMA GREYHOUND PARK, INC., PLAINTIFF, v. HON. CHARLES L. HARDY, JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, SITTING IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA, RESPONDENT, AND SAM STEIGER, REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

JUDGMENT

In accordance with the opinion of this Court filed on July 2, 1970.

It is herewith ordered, adjudged and decreed that the respondent, the Honorable Charles L. Hardy, shall enter a Rule 37(a) order compelling the Honorable Sam Steiger to appear for a deposition and to answer questions. Such an order shall notice the deposition for a time thirty days removed from this judgment at a place to be designated by the petitioner; but shall provide that upon five days' notice within that time by the Honorable Sam Steiger, the time and place may be changed to any earlier time and any place in the United States convenient to Mr. Steiger.

Done in open court this 2nd day of July, 1970.

LORNA E. LOCKWOOD,
Chief Justice.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1155

Whereas Representative Sam Steiger of Arizona, a Member of this House, has been served by the Superior Court of Arizona, Yuma County, in the case of *Yuma Greyhound Park, Inc. v. Samuel Jenkins, et al.* (case No. 28609) with an order to answer oral interrogatories on Monday, August 3, 1970 at 9:00 a.m. in Phoenix, Arizona, or at such earlier time and at such place convenient to Representative Steiger upon five days notice to counsel for plaintiff; and

Whereas by the privileges of this House no Member is authorized to appear and testify in response to an order of a court but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative Sam Steiger of Arizona is authorized to appear in response to the order of the Superior Court of Arizona, Yuma County, in the case of *Yuma Greyhound Park, Inc. v. Samuel Jenkins, et al.* at any time when the House has adjourned to a day certain for a period in excess of three days; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the order of the court a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was on the floor when the distinguished minority leader, GERALD FORD, said, and I quote him:

The economy of the United States is healthy now.

I wonder about that, particularly when that remark was punctuated by the stock market's fall of 11 points yesterday. However, more important than that is the fact that there are too many blue-collar and white-collar workers still unemployed. There are stockholders who have suffered enormous losses in their investments. I get letters from these constituents and I speak with them and others every week. I am sure the distinguished minority leader also gets letters from and talks to his constituents. Mine are still distressed about the state of the economy and I would be surprised if his were not too.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION TO SENATOR HOLLAND

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Senator SPESARD L. HOLLAND's long, distinguished service to the Nation and especially to the people of Florida, he has been honored in a resolution unanimously passed by the board of directors of the Peace River Electric Cooperative, Inc. I certainly agree with the following resolution and am happy to join in this expression of appreciation to Senator HOLLAND for his devoted years of service to our country:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Board of Directors of the Peace River Electric Cooperative, Inc., has met on this day, and

Whereas, said Board of Directors wishes to recognize Senator Spessard Holland for the many years he has spent unflinchingly representing the people of Florida and the United States of America, and

Whereas, Senator Spessard Holland has been a true friend of the Rural Electrification Program and the Peace River Electric Cooperative, Inc.,

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Board of Directors of the Peace River Electric Cooperative, Inc. express their fullest appreciation to Senator Holland for his great service in the past, and for his continued personal friendship and good health in the future.

Signed this 14th day of July, 1970.

H. E. Durrance, President; J. Lynn Harrison, Vice President; Perry Bush, Secretary-Treasurer; W. V. Stephens, H. Grady Kickliter, Maurice Henderson, Matthew J. Tola, George Helms, Jr., Board Members.

SPENDERS AND NONSPENDERS

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minority leader took time out from his busy duties—including two picture-taking sessions at the White House for which the House adjourned early yesterday and for which it will adjourn early again today—to attack Democrats in Congress as spenders.

Mr. Speaker, my curiosity got the better of me. Guess what I discovered about "spender" ANDY JACOBS and "non-spender" GERRY FORD?

For fiscal 1970 "nonspender" GERALD FORD supported \$200 million more in appropriations than "spender" JACOBS.

For fiscal 1970: "Nonspender" GERALD FORD, \$121,365,560,057; "spender" JACOBS, \$121,081,036,000; "inflation fighting" administration—which has overspent its entertainment allowance by \$100,000—controllable budget request, \$135,190,041,000.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Of course, I would be very curious to get the figures and the detailed information that the gentleman uses to arrive at his comparison. I am sure that he will be very glad to cooperate and send them to me.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman from Michigan can be assured of that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But I suspect, without having any prior information on the figures, that the gentleman has used various attempts at reductions in the Defense Department authorization on appropriations. Is that the case?

Mr. JACOBS. It is not.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If that is the case—

Mr. JACOBS. It is not.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If that is not the case, then will the gentleman please let me have the benefit of the figures he uses to arrive at his conclusion.

Mr. JACOBS. Delighted to do so.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Indiana voted to increase spending on two or three crucial issues, one on the veto of the education bill wherein he wanted to spend \$1.2 billion more, and on the veto of the Hill-Burton legislation he also voted to spend additional money in the amount of approximately \$350 million plus mandatory spending.

I am just curious to see the figures of the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. I do not blame the gentleman for being curious, but let me point out that in determining who supports the most spending, one must examine the total amount supported by each Member, not just individual items, some of which the minority leader supported and I did not, some of which I supported and the minority leader did not. And naturally one hates to admit

he has been beaten. But when it comes to total appropriation spending for fiscal 1970, the minority leader beats me by voting to spend \$200 million more than I supported.

STATEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO CHANCES OF A RECESSION

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

Mr. BOGGS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in my good friend from Michigan who recently made the statement on the White House steps that the chances of a recession were nil.

It just so happens that I happen to be a member of the Joint Economic Committee and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The revenue estimates of the Treasury Department are off well over \$1 billion. Why? Because unemployment has increased.

One of the big increases in Government expenses this year is in unemployment compensation, because there are more people unemployed.

And, Mr. Speaker, when they are unemployed they do not pay any taxes. The Government supports them.

And how much in taxes do you think the Treasury Department collected from Wall Street today with a \$300 billion loss in security values since Nixon became President?

KNOCK, KNOCK, WHO'S THERE?

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, Shakespeare—William, not Frank—once wrote that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." The Attorney General, however, tells us that certain provisions of the District of Columbia crime bill by any other name would smell sweeter.

I agree with Mr. Mitchell on one point—the current smell is less than pleasant. However, changing "no knock" to "quick entry" as suggested hardly changes the basic fact that police are being authorized to enter private homes without announcing purpose or authority.

Perhaps we can expect the Attorney General's "name game" to be carried even further. The bill's provision reducing the minimum age for adult criminal prosecution to 16 may yet become the Justice Department's "provision to bridge the generation gap"—or "accelerated maturation." And given the President's demonstrated affinity for football, "preventive detention" is likely to be termed "defensive holding." But if the administration backs the wiretapping provision because it literally "brings us together," it will bug a lot of people.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 20, I was necessarily absent from the House while conducting hearings in Florida's 11th Congressional

District on H.R. 17763, a bill to provide nutrition programs for elderly citizens.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 221 on H.R. 18253, a bill to provide national service life insurance funds to guarantee home loans for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I would have also voted "yea" on rollcall No. 222 on H.R. 14114, a bill to redefine the area of administration of the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my position on these two rollcall votes this week be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JULY 24, TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 18546

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have permission to file a report on H.R. 18546 by midnight, July 24, 1970.

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

WE MUST INCREASE OUR EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF OUR AMERICAN POW'S AND MIA'S

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the announcement by the South Vietnamese that they will demolish the so-called tiger-cages on Conson Island was welcomed by everyone. I would hope that we would become as concerned and up in arms over the plight of American prisoners of war as we have been over conditions on Conson Island. It would appear to me that if the North Vietnamese were sincere in their criticism of Conson as expressed at the Paris peace talks recently, they would now show good faith and begin abiding by the Geneva Convention themselves. The first step for them to take would be to allow periodic inspections of their POW camps by the International Red Cross. We should also press them to release the names of U.S. servicemen they hold captive and allow the free flow of mail between the prisoners and their families in America.

Three members of the select committee on Southeast Asia met with an official of North Vietnam in Vientiane, Laos, relative to the POW situation. We made a strong plea for humane treatment of Americans they hold. Unfortunately, we were ignored and given no hope our requests would be met.

Mr. Speaker, we must never relent in our efforts on behalf of our American POW's and MIA's.

AMERICAN'S INHUMANITY TO FELLOW AMERICANS

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I join in the concern of the gentleman from Mississippi relative to the lack of response from the North Vietnamese concerning our men held as prisoners of war. On a related subject, it does occur to me that the display we have in the Capitol of North Vietnamese prisoner of war cages demonstrating the cruelties and tragedies that are involved in the holding and treatment of our men by the North Vietnamese might be duplicated by a similar display in the Capitol of American migrant workers' quarters so that visitors to Washington would have a visual example of the cruelties and tragedies involved in the way some Americans are treated by some Americans in this country.

It is my understanding that the replica of North Vietnamese prisoner of war cages was constructed in the Capitol to evoke, from Americans who visited Washington, rage at the cruelty and barbarism of the enemy. That might be a worthwhile objective. It clearly would be equally worthwhile to evoke in Americans an equal rage at the cruelty and barbarism involved in the treatment of American migratory workers by some American growers and corporate farmers.

AMENDMENT TO HEW APPROPRIATION TO INCREASE CHILD WELFARE FUNDS

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

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon if the opportunity presents itself, I intend to offer an amendment to the appropriation bill asking for an increase in appropriations under the child welfare provisions, increasing that amount from \$46 million to the authorized amount of \$110 million.

I realize there is a lot of talk around about excessive spending, but I wish to point out to the Members of the House that the administration is on record pledging to increase this amount.

The amount has been static for the last 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, this matter deals with the most underprivileged and most deprived children in America—the child welfare children. These are children who live in institutions and who are farmed out to homes in various houses for their upkeep and the Federal Government contributes 6 percent toward their upkeep while the AFDC—the Government contributes 75 to 83 percent.

There is no justification for this disparity in the contribution on the part of the Federal Government because the children we are talking about have no parents and no mother to take care of them and no relatives. They are wards of the State until they reach the age of maturity. They are just shuffled around and completely forgotten. They are youngsters without any political muscle. There is nothing exotic about helping them because nobody gets any publicity by helping these children. But

you and I have a moral obligation to take care of these children.

This Federal Government of ours has spent billions of dollars for lesser causes. Let those who want to oppose this amendment of mine today go home tonight and put their heads down on the pillows and sleep with a clear conscience. I do not see how they can do it. I do not see how the administration can do it. I do not see how anybody can do it.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that we adopt this amendment this afternoon.

APPEARANCE OF RENNIE DAVIS, ONE OF THE "CHICAGO 7," AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, an incredible event, a classic insult to patriotic Americans, is scheduled to take place at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare later this month. Rennie Davis, one of the infamous "Chicago 7," has been invited by Federal employees calling themselves "the Thursday Discussion Group" to expound his views on July 30 in room G-751 of the HEW north building.

The office of James Farmer, Assistant Secretary for Administration at HEW confirmed that they had made arrangements for the group to allow Davis to speak.

Davis, a convicted felon, was found guilty last February of crossing State lines to incite a riot by giving inflammatory speeches. In addition to receiving 5 years for this offense, the radical hatemonger was sentenced to 25 months and 14 days for 23 counts of contempt of court.

This repulsive revolutionist stated on the day he was sentenced:

We're going to turn the sons and daughters of the ruling classes in this country into Vietcong.

Why should the Federal Government set the stage and provide the audience for Davis' tirades? If an individual wishes to indulge his taste for this vicious venom, let him do so on his own time and not at taxpayer expense. While the first amendment guarantees the right of free speech, nowhere does the Constitution direct the Government to subsidize such drivel. This project should be canceled.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the

following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 227]

Ashley	Davis, Ga.	Teague, Calif.
Baring	Dawson	Lukens
Blanton	Dent	Meskill
Brock	Diggs	Monagan
Burke, Fla.	Dorn	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Edwards, La.	Ottinger
Caflery	Foley	Patman
Carey	Gallagher	Pollock
Celler	Gettys	Powell
Chamberlain	Gilbert	Rarick
Chisholm	Goldwater	Rhodes
Clark	Gray	Rivers
Clay	Hathaway	Rogers, Colo.
Colmer	Hébert	Roudebush
Cramer	Hunt	Ryan
Crane	Ichord	Skubitz
Cunningham	Kirwan	Symington
Daddario	Long, La.	Taft

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF TERMINATION DATE OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 TO AUGUST 31, 1970

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution to extend the termination date of the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 30 days to August 31, 1970. Although the Banking and Currency Committee has completed action on H.R. 17880 and will file a report on Monday, July 27, this extension is still needed. Without it the act will expire on July 30.

The other body has passed legislation—S. 3302—granting a 2-year extension, as our bill would also do, but there are two major points of difference in other provisions of the bill which will require a conference. Because these differences are likely to prove quite controversial, and because the other body has reported to us that it already has a heavy schedule for next week it seems highly unlikely that we can complete action on these bills before July 30, I, therefore, consider the prompt enactment of this resolution to be of the utmost importance.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17619, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 17619) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 21, 1970.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 17619, Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1971, provides total appropriations of \$2,028,524,700. This amount is \$311,968,400 over the 1970 appropriation and \$6,346,900 below the 1971 budget estimate. The conference total is \$227,298,000 over the amount approved by the House and \$127,200 over the amount approved by the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Do I understand that the appropriation for the arts and humanities ended up at more than \$31 million?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This is correct, \$31,310,000. The conferees reduced the sum in conference for the Endowment for the Humanities by \$2 million. This does not alter the Senate allowance for the Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. GROSS. That is an increase over the expenditure of last year of about \$13 million?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It is \$13,400,000?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the conference report as brought to the House is some \$311 million above the expenditures for the Department of the Interior appropriations of last year?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. I would like to explain that the major portion of the increase relates to four activities.

One is in the land and water conservation fund. The conference report provides full funding for this activity. This fund is to acquire recreation land over the United States, as the gentleman knows. The appropriation in 1970 was \$131,100,000, and the 1971 appropriation will be \$357,400,000. The accelerated funding will curb escalation of land prices, and it will, in the end, save the United States a great many tax dollars.

For the Indian health program, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, there is a material increase over 1970. But I do want to remind the gentleman that previous appropriations for these activities have been instrumental in eliminating deaths from tuberculosis in Alaska among the Indian population, and I think this is very remarkable.

There is a large increase in the mine

health safety field, which was brought about because of the necessity to provide funding for the observation and supervision of mining.

For Geological Survey, the increase is \$6,402,000. A large portion of this increase will be spent on inspectors and inspection procedures in connection with our offshore oil leases. It has seemed to me it is high time for our Government to have the same information that private industry has on those resources, to properly safeguard the leasing procedure.

Mr. GROSS. I might suggest to the gentlewoman there is also a sizeable increase in the amount of pay apparently.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The House has voted increases in pay. May I say that in this bill we do not provide for the last 6 percent increase. This will come later in a supplemental.

Mr. GROSS. That was the next question I would have asked the gentlewoman, whether the last pay increase is included in this bill.

It ought to be apparent to the Members of the House what is taking place as the appropriation bills come through with respect to pay increases and those projected in the future. We are now beginning to pay the bills for the action of the House last year and earlier this year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. One of the increases which I believe is deeply appreciated by Indian people all over the country is the increase provided to meet the desperate needs and shortages in the field of medicines and drugs and personnel in the Indian hospitals which are operated by the Public Health Service. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her part in securing those additional funds as a result of this conference.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would point out that an additional \$957,000 is included in the bill for drugs and supplies, which the gentleman discussed with the committee at some length earlier. There is also additional funding of \$1,269,000 for hospital personnel. The committee feels not at all apologetic in recommending that this money be expended on behalf of our Indian people.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentlewoman.

On page 8 of the report of the managers there is an item for appropriation under this bill of \$100,000 for research on the red tide in the New York Bight area. This has been a grave problem along the east coast for quite some time, and has been economically depressing to the entire resort area along the central New Jersey shore.

It has been estimated that for full research concerning this red tide menace approximately \$400,000 might be needed. It is proposed that funds be requested for research money under the Public Works

appropriation bill, under water pollution control.

Will there be enough flexibility with respect to this \$100,000 so that it may be used in connection with or in conjunction with any other funds granted by the Federal Government for such a survey?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would say yes. Customarily good research, particularly in the Department of the Interior, is carried on in an interbureau manner. Therefore a maximum amount of information may come from the minimum amount of money expended, yet using all the money available in the fields of water pollution and water quality research in this field.

No one knows the scope of that problem which is a most difficult research problem.

And I would be remiss if I did not take the opportunity at this time to acknowledge the diligent and helpful efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey in bringing this matter to the committee's attention and obtaining funds for research on the problem.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentlewoman for recognizing the problem and starting the momentum toward providing enough funds to research the problem.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I should like to compliment the conference committee on two items; amendment No. 25, on the Bureau of Mines, and amendment No. 26, on the Office of Coal Research.

There has been some comment in newspapers and magazine articles, and some statements generally, that the administration was intending to close down the Office of Coal Research or to reduce it drastically, and as well to reduce research into minerals exploration and use. I recommend strongly that that not be done.

I would ask if it is not the intent of this committee and of this House that we continue the research which has produced so much in the field of coal and minerals and support for such good institutions as the Coal Research Institute in the Department of the Interior.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Our committee hearings made it very plain that we expect the research to be continued.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So there is not in prospect at the present time any particular plan or program within the Congress or, so far as we know, within the administration to reduce the research on minerals, the Coal Institute, or the various research programs in the Department of the Interior?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would certainly hope that the administration does not not have such a reduction in mind, because I believe it would be disastrous to our energy potential. I know of no such plan by the Congress to reduce research.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We can say that specifically as to the legislative intent of the Congress?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I compliment her.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding.

I notice in connection with an amendment reported in technical disagreement, particularly amendment No. 42, that we plan to recede and concur in an amendment providing in one case for slippage for construction of one airport at Anchorage, Alaska, and in another case for apparently \$712,000 for total construction of an airport at Jackson Hole, Wyo.

I can certainly understand the importance in an appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies of many of these appropriations, but why are we in the airport construction business?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We are not in the airport construction business. The Jackson Hole airport and facilities for the Anchorage airport were deleted from the bill in conference.

Mr. HALL. In other words, the gentlewoman's motion to recede and concur with an amendment will take that out of the report?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield with pleasure to our very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my opinion the House of Representatives and the people of this country owe a big vote of thanks to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington; to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL) and to other members of the subcommittee for the grand job that has been done on this bill. I know that the gentlewoman from Washington has really afforded the leadership that has made it possible to get an excellent measure enacted into law. She has done a good job and those who have worked with her have done a good job. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to offer a special word of thanks and appreciation.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in

congratulating the subcommittee on the fine work it has done and particularly in congratulating the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee for the excellent manner in which she has handled and always handles these bills and for the effective results she accomplishes. The people of her district are justified in being very proud of the service that the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) renders. I am quite sure that at the proper time, when the people go to the polls to vote, they will manifest their complete confidence in and respect for the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) by reelecting her by a tremendous majority.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished Speaker for those kind words.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I echo what the distinguished Speaker has just said and add that the expeditious manner, and I might say the unanimous manner, in which the gentlewoman chaired and managed this bill through the House testifies to the confidence the entire House has in her leadership and the work of her committee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished Members of the House for their cooperation and their work and service in the preparation of this bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify a point with respect to amendment No. 5 in the conference report wherein it states:

The reduction below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$300,000 for the California Rural Indian Health Board and \$150,000 for the California Rural Indian Health Pilot Program.

Now, if I understand that correctly, the request for the \$300,000 by the California Rural Indian Health Board is, in fact, included and they can expect the funds to be included in the appropriation bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The \$300,000 and the \$150,000 are not included, but we have said in the conference report that proper guidelines should be established between the Indian Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the States. The problem of Indian health in urban as well as rural areas is tremendous, but at the present time there are not sufficient guidelines to provide Indians the same assistance that any other citizen receives within the States.

So, in the conference report we tell them to explore the problem and to develop some guidelines. I can assure the gentleman that the committee will not turn its back on the Indians' health needs.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman from Washington

will yield further, this does not represent a rejection of the need, but the gentlewoman simply wants to have better guidelines and then you will consider this matter later?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is not any question at all as to our awareness of the need, but where does the responsibility of the Federal Government in this field lie and where does the responsibility of the States lie?

Therefore, let us draw some guidelines which will give us an indication so to speak of what we should do. It is impossible to do the kind of job that needs to be done across the Nation without establishing these guidelines.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I want to join in what the distinguished Speaker and other Members have said with respect to the gentlewoman's chairing of this particular piece of legislation and to express my appreciation for the funds allocated for the Point Reyes National Park.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add my thanks for the very efficient and capable manner in which the distinguished gentlewoman has handled this measure. The gentlewoman deserves the thanks of this entire House for this excellent job.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. There are several appropriations in this bill totaling many millions of dollars for line item grants to colleges for study and research; is that not correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There are many types of grants made to colleges in the field of forestry, commercial and sport fish, water research, mining, et cetera, which various bureaus have established with colleges and universities. For example, the bill provides \$50,000 for a grant to Iowa State University for a coal research project.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentlewoman will yield further, is the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee aware of any grants to colleges from the Interior Department that are contained in the blanket appropriation for the office of the Secretary as categories which are not revealed by line item, such as water research and so on?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In the regular bill there are items carried for water research which are cooperative grants to State water agencies.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield for one further question, it is my understanding that the Department has for years had a standing, ongoing, repetitive grant program to colleges but which does not even show

up as a part of the Office of the Secretary's expenses.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In the training programs?

Mr. KYL. Yes.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am not aware of such a program and I trust that the Secretary will continue to be as forthright in the presentation of items of that nature as he has been.

Mr. KYL. Well, if the gentlewoman will yield for one final question, I think this matter might merit some investigation, because it is my understanding that it has been a regular practice year after year whereby the Department of the Interior has granted to a list of 40 colleges in the United States a certain grant each year without any justification whatsoever insofar as the Appropriations Committee is concerned.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The committee will be very glad to investigate this, but I can assure the gentleman that he will undoubtedly find that those grants are for some specific purpose.

Mr. KYL. I hope the distinguished gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. DEVINE. 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 387, nays 3, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—387

Abbutt	Boggs	Clancy
Abernethy	Boland	Clark
Adair	Bolling	Clausen,
Adams	Bow	Don H.
Addabbo	Brademas	Clawson, Del
Albert	Brasco	Clay
Alexander	Brinkley	Cleveland
Anderson,	Brooks	Cohelan
Calif.	Broomfield	Collier
Anderson, III.	Brotzman	Collins
Anderson,	Brown, Calif.	Colmer
Tenn.	Brown, Mich.	Conable
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Ohio	Conte
Andrews,	Broyhill, N.C.	Conyers
N. Dak.	Broyhill, Va.	Corbett
Annunzio	Buchanan	Corman
Arends	Burke, Mass.	Coughlin
Ashbrook	Burleson, Tex.	Cowger
Aspinall	Burlison, Mo.	Culver
Ayres	Burton, Calif.	Daddario
Baring	Bush	Daniel, Va.
Barrett	Button	Daniels, N.J.
Beall, Md.	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, Wis.
Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.	de la Garza
Bell, Calif.	Cabell	Delaney
Bennett	Camp	Dellenback
Berry	Carey	Denney
Betts	Carter	Dennis
Bevill	Casey	Dent
Biaggi	Cederberg	Derwinski
Blester	Celler	Devine
Bingham	Chamberlain	Dickinson
Blackburn	Chappell	Dingell
Blanton	Chisholm	Donohue

Dowdy	Kyl	Reuss
Downing	Kyros	Riegle
Dulski	Landgrebe	Roberts
Duncan	Landrum	Robison
Dwyer	Langen	Rodino
Edmondson	Latta	Roe
Edwards, Ala.	Leggett	Rogers, Fla.
Edwards, Calif.	Lennon	Rooney, N.Y.
Elberg	Lloyd	Rooney, Pa.
Erlenborn	Long, Md.	Rosenthal
Esch	Lowenstein	Rostenkowski
Eshleman	Lujan	Roth
Evans, Colo.	Lukens	Rousselot
Evins, Tenn.	McCarthy	Roybal
Fallon	McClory	Ruppe
Farbstein	McCloskey	Ruth
Fascell	McClure	St Germain
Feighan	McCulloch	Sandman
Findley	McDade	Satterfield
Fisher	McDonald,	Saylor
Flood	Mich.	Schadeberg
Flowers	McEwen	Scherle
Flynt	McFall	Scheuer
Foley	McKneally	Schneebell
Ford, Gerald R.	McMillan	Schwengel
Ford,	Macdonald,	Scott
William D.	Mass.	Sebellus
Foreman	MacGregor	Shipley
Fountain	Madden	Shriver
Fraser	Mahon	Sikes
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Sisk
Frey	Mann	Skubitz
Friedel	Marsh	Slack
Fulton, Pa.	Martin	Smith, Calif.
Fulton, Tenn.	Mathias	Smith, Iowa
Fuqua	Matsunaga	Smith, N.Y.
Galianakis	May	Snyder
Garmatz	Mayne	Springer
Gaydos	Meeds	Stafford
Gialmo	Melcher	Staggers
Gibbons	Michel	Stanton
Goldwater	Mikva	Steed
Gonzalez	Miller, Calif.	Steiger, Ariz.
Goodling	Miller, Ohio	Steiger, Wis.
Green, Oreg.	Mills	Stephens
Green, Pa.	Minish	Stokes
Griffin	Mink	Stratton
Griffiths	Minshall	Stubblefield
Grover	Mize	Stuckey
Gubser	Mizell	Sullivan
Gude	Mollohan	Symington
Hagan	Montgomery	Talcoff
Haley	Moorhead	Taylor
Halpern	Morgan	Teague, Calif.
Hamilton	Morse	Teague, Tex.
Hammer-	Morton	Thompson, Ga.
schmidt	Mosher	Thompson, N.J.
Hanley	Moss	Thomson, Wis.
Hanna	Murphy, Ill.	Tiernan
Hansen, Idaho	Myers	Tunney
Hansen, Wash.	Natcher	Udall
Harrington	Nedzi	Ullman
Harsha	Nelsen	Van Deerlin
Harvey	Nichols	Vander Jagt
Hastings	Nix	Vanik
Hawkins	Obey	Vigorito
Hays	O'Hara	Waggonner
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Konski	Waldie
Heckler, Mass.	Olsen	Wampler
Helstoski	O'Neal, Ga.	Watkins
Henderson	O'Neill, Mass.	Watson
Hicks	Passman	Watts
Hogan	Patman	Weicker
Holifield	Patten	Whalen
Horton	Pelly	Whalley
Hosmer	Pepper	White
Howard	Perkins	Whitehurst
Hull	Pettis	Whitten
Hungate	Pickle	Widnall
Hutchinson	Pike	Wiggins
Jacobs	Pirnie	Williams
Jarman	Poage	Wilson, Bob
Johnson, Calif.	Podell	Wilson,
Johnson, Pa.	Poff	Charles H.
Jonas	Preyer, N.C.	Winn
Jones, Ala.	Price, Ill.	Wold
Jones, N.C.	Price, Tex.	Wolf
Jones, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.	Wright
Karh	Pucinski	Wyatt
Kastenmeyer	Purcell	Wydler
Kazen	Qule	Wyllie
Kee	Quillen	Wyman
Keith	Railsback	Yates
King	Randall	Yatron
Kleppe	Rees	Young
Kluczynski	Reid, Ill.	Zablocki
Koch	Reid, N.Y.	Zion
Kuykendall	Reifel	Zwach

NAYS—3

Gross	Hall	Schmitz
Ashley	Bray	Burke, Fla.
Blatnik	Brock	Burton, Utah

NOT VOTING—41

Caffery	Gettys	Ottinger
Cramer	Gilbert	Philbin
Crane	Gray	Pollock
Cunningham	Hathaway	Powell
Davis, Ga.	Hébert	Rarick
Dawson	Hunt	Rhodes
Diggs	Ichord	Rivers
Dorn	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Eckhardt	Long, La.	Roudebush
Edwards, La.	Meskill	Ryan
Fish	Monagan	Taft
Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.	

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

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Crane.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Cunningham.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hunt.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Pollock.
 Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Rhodes.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Rarick.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Ichord.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Kirwan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Senate amendment No. 3: Page 5, line 18, strike out "\$218,645,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$218,678,500".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disengagement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$217,615,000".

The motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Senate amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 9, strike out "\$18,935,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,800,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$19,885,000".

The motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Senate amendment No. 6: Page 6, line 24, insert the following:

" : Provided further, That not to exceed \$150,000 shall be for assistance to the Wagner South Dakota, East Charles Mix Independent School District No. 102, for planning on addition to the district school facilities".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Senate amendment No. 7: Page 7, line 3, insert the following:

" : Provided further, That not to exceed \$365,000 may be used for enlargement, remodeling, and improving the Sioux Indian Museum and Crafts Center, Rapid City, South Dakota."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Senate amendment No. 14: On page 10, line 23, strike out "\$56,000,000" and insert "\$95,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$96,600,000".

The motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Senate amendment No. 25: On page 16, line 8, strike out "\$45,122,000" and insert "\$45,272,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$46,422,000".

The motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The

Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: On page 17, line 12, strike out "\$16,200,000" and insert "\$16,500,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$17,160,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Senate amendment No. 33: On page 21, line 19, strike out "\$56,356,000" and insert "\$56,705,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$56,840,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: On page 22, line 1, strike out "\$4,175,000" and insert "\$3,497,000".

MOTION BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$4,983,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: On page 24, line 7, strike out "\$57,670,000" and insert "\$58,035,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$57,990,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk

will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: On page 24, line 7, insert: "Provided, That \$54,000 of the funds herein provided shall be available only upon enactment into law of H.R. 12758, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: On page 24, line 10, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$100,000 shall be advanced to the Plymouth-Provincetown Celebration Commission upon enactment into law of S. 2916, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: On page 25, line 6, strike out "\$16,385,000" and insert "\$17,583,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$16,259,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53, Page 31, line 16, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection and utilization of national forest resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein necessary to these objectives, \$14,188,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,300,000 of this appropriation may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519)."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$15,467,700".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 37, line 9, strike out "\$1,070,000" and insert "\$941,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$891,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 37, line 9, insert:., and in addition \$229,000 of the balance of the appropriation granted under "Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system" are transferred to and shall be available for salaries and expenses:

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 40, line 7, strike out "\$35,737,000" and insert "\$35,066,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$34,702,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 42, line 20, insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

"For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356), including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$750,000, to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 43, line 11, insert:

**"AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION
"SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491), as amended, establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, \$373,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H.R. 16408 or S. 3630, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation."

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 and concur therein.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is it correct that there is still no authorization for this particular item?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is correct.

May I point out to the gentleman that time is of the essence in this connection.

The 200th anniversary date is very rapidly approaching and there must be a great deal of planning to be successful in bringing to the country the kind of birthday celebration that this Nation merits and wants.

We felt we should expedite this as much as possible.

I hope the gentleman will accept the committee's explanation and accept our recommendation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield further, I simply arose to make the record here today that this has not been authorized and that the House is pursuing, as was attempted in the original appropriation bill in the House, to take unusual action, in fact action that is in violation of the rules.

I simply rose to make the record for to further contest this item would serve no useful purpose. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. There are two points I wish to make. First, I join in the complimentary remarks that have been directed to my distinguished chairman by other Members of the House. I wish to say, on behalf of Mr. McDADE and Mr. WYATT, my two colleagues on the subcommittee, from this side of the aisle, that the record shows that she has always been completely impartial in considering the requests and the needs of the Members on this side of the aisle who have come before our committee.

I believe the record vote of 386 to 3 for adoption of the conference report eloquently speaks to the manner in which this bill has been handled by the distinguished chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington.

My second point involves the concern and interest, and rightly so, in the Indian Americans of this country. President Johnson, when he was in office, made an excellent statement to this body. An equally fine statement has been made by President Nixon concerning the con-

ditions of life of the Indian population and what is needed for them. The distinguished chairman of this committee has no peer in this or the other body with respect to her concern and effectiveness in appropriating necessary funds for Indian programs.

I hope the people in her district and her State, as well as all American Indians across the Nation are aware and deeply appreciative of her interest and concern for them.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. May I say it is with genuine regret that we see him leave the House of Representatives and leave our committee at the end of this session of Congress. It has been a joy and a pleasure to work with him for the people of this Nation, for he has represented the entire cross section of our Nation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I concur in the statements made by the gentleman from South Dakota in relation to the gentlewoman from Washington. She has certainly acted as fairly as she could in considering the many problems with which she has been confronted. They are varied. We have been trying, and I think we have made progress in this particular field of matters relating to Indians. I have repeatedly said that probably the darkest pages of the history of the United States contained the treatment of the American Indian. I am glad to see that the President of the United States has now come forth with a statement as to the policies of his administration insofar as Indians are concerned. I know that the gentlewoman is well aware of the fact, however, that these are merely the beginnings of programs that we should have had for a long time.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point pertinent tables relating to the funds provided in this conference report:

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971
(H.R. 17619)

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appro- priated, 1970 (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (3)	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House (4)	Senate (5)	Conference (6)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (7)	House allowance (8)	Senate allowance (9)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR								
Public Land Management								
Bureau of Land Management								
Management of lands and resources.....	\$81,111,000	\$58,940,000	\$58,940,000	\$58,605,000	\$58,605,000	-\$335,000	-\$335,000	
Construction and maintenance.....	2,899,000	3,215,000	3,215,000	3,310,000	3,310,000	+95,000	+95,000	
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)			
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	16,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000			
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	1,769,000	1,841,000	1,841,000	1,841,000	1,841,000			
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	101,779,000	81,996,000	81,996,000	81,756,000	81,756,000	-240,000	-240,000	

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971—Continued
 (H.R. 17619)—Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appro- priated, 1970 (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (3)	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House (4)	Senate (5)	Conference (6)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (7)	House allowance (8)	Senate allowance (9)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Con.								
Bureau of Indian Affairs								
Education and welfare services	\$191,445,000	\$216,995,000	\$217,145,000	\$217,178,500	\$216,115,000	-\$880,000	-\$1,030,000	-\$1,063,500
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(1,057,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)			
Resources management	60,320,000	66,217,000	65,690,000	64,122,000	64,622,000	-1,595,000	-1,068,000	-500,000
Construction	26,264,000	18,266,000	18,935,000	18,800,000	19,885,000	+1,619,000	+950,000	+1,085,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,200,000)	(20,200,000)	(+200,000)	(+200,000)	
General administrative expenses	5,513,000	5,626,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	-26,000		
Tribal funds (definite)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000			
Tribal funds (indefinite)	13,204,000	13,204,000	13,204,000	13,204,000	13,204,000			
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	299,746,000	323,308,000	323,574,000	321,904,500	322,426,000	-882,000	-1,148,000	+521,500
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation								
Salaries and expenses	3,950,000	* 3,975,000	3,825,000	3,995,000	3,895,000	-80,000	+70,000	-100,000
Land and water conservation								
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite)	115,572,000	* 327,400,000	138,500,000	327,400,000	327,400,000		+188,900,000	
(Appropriation out of the fund to liquidate contract authority)	(15,528,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	119,522,000	331,375,000	142,325,000	331,395,000	331,295,000	-80,000	+188,970,000	-100,000
Office of Territories								
Administration of territories	15,196,400	17,409,600	17,350,000	17,380,000	17,350,000	-59,600		-30,000
Permanent appropriations (special fund)	(239,400)	(118,000)	(118,000)	(118,000)	(118,000)			
Transferred from other accounts (special fund)	(292,700)	† (367,000)	(330,000)	(367,000)	(367,000)		(+37,000)	
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	48,112,000	60,000,000	50,000,000	49,750,000	49,750,000	-10,250,000	-250,000	
Total, Office of Territories	63,308,400	77,409,600	67,350,000	67,130,000	67,100,000	-10,309,600	-250,000	-30,000
Total, Public Land Management	584,355,400	814,088,600	615,245,000	862,185,500	802,577,000	-11,511,600	+187,332,000	+391,500
Mineral Resources								
Geological Survey								
Surveys, investigations, and research	99,990,000	* 106,957,000	108,057,000	106,392,000	106,392,000	-565,000	-1,665,000	
Bureau of Mines								
Conservation and development of mineral resources	42,495,000	44,972,000	45,122,000	45,272,000	46,422,000	+1,450,000	+1,300,000	+1,150,000
Health and safety	27,452,000	54,395,000	54,395,000	54,395,000	54,395,000			
General administrative expenses	1,799,000	1,799,000	1,799,000	1,799,000	1,799,000			
Helium fund (authorization to spend from public debt receipts)	24,000,000							
Total, Bureau of Mines	95,746,000	101,166,000	101,316,000	101,466,000	102,616,000	+1,450,000	+1,300,000	+1,150,000
Office of Coal Research								
Salaries and expenses	15,300,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,500,000	17,160,000	+960,000	+960,000	+660,000
Office of Oil and Gas								
Salaries and expenses	1,085,000	1,195,000	1,181,000	1,181,000	1,181,000	-14,000		
Total, Mineral Resources	212,121,000	225,518,000	226,754,000	225,539,000	227,349,000	+1,831,000	+595,000	+1,810,000
Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources								
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries								
Management and investigations of resources	27,536,000	27,156,000	28,168,000	27,893,000	27,893,000	+737,000	-275,000	
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000			
Construction	2,325,000							
Construction of fishing vessels	3,000,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000			
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development	4,603,000	4,040,000	4,040,000	4,040,000	4,040,000			
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation	2,318,000	2,168,000	2,168,000	2,168,000	2,168,000			
Administration of Pribilof Islands	2,774,000	2,774,000	2,774,000	2,774,000	2,774,000			
Fishermen's protective fund	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000			
General administrative expenses	896,000	896,000	896,000	896,000	896,000			
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund	(385,000)	(385,000)	(385,000)	(385,000)	(385,000)			
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	43,527,000	37,309,000	38,321,000	38,046,000	38,046,000	+737,000	-275,000	
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife								
Management and investigations of resources	52,523,000	56,226,000	56,356,000	56,705,000	56,840,000	+614,000	+484,000	+135,000
Construction	4,259,000	2,619,000	4,175,000	3,497,000	4,983,000	+2,364,000	+808,000	+1,486,000
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance)	5,800,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000			
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation	2,311,000	2,311,000	2,311,000	2,311,000	2,311,000			
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)		100,000				-100,000		
General administrative expenses	1,875,000	1,875,000	1,875,000	1,875,000	1,875,000			
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	66,768,000	70,631,000	72,217,000	71,888,000	73,509,000	+2,878,000	+1,292,000	+1,621,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appro- priated, 1970 (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (3)	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (7)	House allowance (8)	Senate allowance (9)
			(4)	(5)	(6)			
National Park Service								
Management and protection.....	\$53,606,000	\$58,021,000	\$57,670,000	\$58,035,000	\$57,990,000	-\$31,000	+\$320,000	-\$45,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	41,396,000	48,763,000	48,500,000	48,543,000	48,543,000	-220,000	+43,000	-----
Construction.....	7,700,000	16,885,000	16,385,000	17,583,000	16,259,000	-626,000	-126,000	-1,324,000
Parkway and road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(21,500,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(17,660,000)	(17,650,000)	(+1,650,000)	(+1,650,000)	(-10,000)
Preservation of historic properties.....	1,640,000	6,950,000	6,801,000	6,672,000	6,801,000	-149,000	-----	+129,000
General administrative expenses.....	3,580,000	3,605,000	3,580,000	3,580,000	3,580,000	-25,000	-----	-----
Total, National Park Service.....	107,922,000	134,224,000	132,936,000	134,413,000	133,173,000	-1,051,000	+237,000	-1,240,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources								
	218,217,000	242,164,000	243,474,000	244,347,000	244,728,000	+2,564,000	+1,254,000	+381,000
Office of Saline Water								
Saline water conversion.....	25,000,000	29,373,000	28,573,000	28,573,000	28,573,000	-800,000	-----	-----
Office of Water Resources Research								
Salaries and expenses.....	11,281,000	13,312,000	13,181,000	13,181,000	13,181,000	-131,000	-----	-----
Office of the Solicitor								
Salaries and expenses.....	5,904,000	7,344,000	6,924,000	7,229,000	7,074,000	-270,000	+150,000	-155,000
Office of the Secretary								
Salaries and expenses.....	10,614,700	11,954,000	11,353,000	11,771,000	11,563,000	-391,000	+210,000	-208,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Depart- ment of Interior.....	1,067,493,100	1,343,753,600	1,145,504,000	1,332,825,500	1,335,045,000	-8,708,600	+189,541,000	+2,219,500
Consisting of—								
Appropriations.....	1,043,493,100	1,343,753,600	1,145,504,000	1,332,825,500	1,335,045,000	-8,708,600	+189,541,000	+2,219,500
Definite appropriations.....	(896,948,100)	(983,308,600)	(973,959,000)	(972,380,500)	(974,600,000)	(-8,708,600)	(+641,000)	(+2,219,500)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(146,545,000)	(360,445,000)	(171,545,000)	(360,445,000)	(360,445,000)	-----	(+188,900,000)	-----
Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	24,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Memoranda—								
Appropriations to liquidate contract author- ity.....	(61,585,000)	(71,000,000)	(71,000,000)	(72,860,000)	(72,850,000)	(+1,850,000)	(+1,850,000)	(-10,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(1,129,078,100)	(1,414,753,600)	(1,216,504,000)	(1,405,685,500)	(1,407,895,000)	(-6,858,600)	(+191,391,000)	(+2,209,500)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES								
Department of Agriculture								
Forest Service								
Forest protection and utilization:								
Forest land management.....	222,253,000	*199,567,000	199,567,000	199,617,000	199,617,000	+50,000	+50,000	-----
Forest research.....	43,922,000	45,066,000	45,391,000	45,294,000	45,591,000	+525,000	+200,000	+297,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	22,939,000	21,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	+2,000,000	-----	-----
Total, forest protection and utilization.....	289,114,000	266,572,000	268,897,000	268,850,000	269,147,000	+2,575,000	+250,000	+297,000
Construction.....	(7)	12,008,000	15,125,700	14,188,000	15,467,700	+3,459,700	+342,000	+1,279,700
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(100,570,000)	(115,000,000)	(115,000,000)	(115,000,000)	(115,000,000)	-----	-----	-----
Acquisition of lands for national forests:								
Special acts (special fund, indefinite).....	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	-----	-----	-----
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite).....	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	-----	-----	-----
Assistance to States for tree planting.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Forest Service.....	290,894,000	280,360,000	285,802,700	284,818,000	286,394,700	+6,034,700	+592,000	+1,576,700
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review								
Salaries and expenses.....	148,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Commission of Fine Arts								
Salaries and expenses.....	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	-----	-----	-----
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare								
Health Services and Mental Health Administration								
Indian health services.....	105,993,000	113,217,000	114,692,000	118,436,000	117,986,000	+4,769,000	+3,294,000	-450,000
Indian health facilities.....	20,952,000	17,950,000	17,950,000	19,510,000	18,715,000	+765,000	+765,000	-795,000
Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	126,945,000	131,167,000	132,642,000	137,946,000	136,701,000	+5,534,000	+4,059,000	-1,245,000
Indian Claims Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	850,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----	-----	-----
National Capital Planning Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	*247,700	1,390,000	1,070,000	941,000	*891,000	-499,000	-179,000	-50,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities								
Salaries and expenses.....	1,610,000	2,700,000	-----	2,660,000	2,660,000	-40,000	+2,650,000	-----
Endowment for the arts.....	8,250,000	16,090,000	-----	15,090,000	15,090,000	-1,000,000	+15,090,000	-----
Endowment for the humanities.....	8,050,000	16,210,000	-----	15,560,000	13,560,000	-2,650,000	+13,560,000	-2,000,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	17,910,000	35,000,000	-----	33,310,000	31,310,000	-3,690,000	+31,310,000	-2,000,000

Footnotes at end of tables.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971—Continued
(H.R. 17619)—Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appro- priated, 1970 (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (3)	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House (4)	Senate (5)	Conference (6)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1971 (7)	House allowance (8)	Senate allowance (9)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued								
Public Land Law Review Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$922,000	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$171,000			
Smithsonian Institution								
Salaries and expenses.....	29,365,000	36,367,000	34,987,000	35,066,000	34,702,000	-\$1,665,000	-\$285,000	-\$364,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program).....	2,316,000	4,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-2,000,000		
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	600,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000			
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	525,000	1,130,000	1,080,000	950,000	950,000	-180,000	-130,000	
Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	200,000							
The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	(3,300,000)	(8,897,000)	(5,200,000)	(5,200,000)	(5,200,000)	(-3,697,000)		
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	7,500,000							
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	3,581,000	3,716,000	3,716,000	3,716,000	3,716,000			
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	100,000		750,000	750,000	750,000	+750,000		
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	44,187,000	45,913,000	43,233,000	43,182,000	42,818,000	-3,095,000	-415,000	-364,000
Executive Office of the President								
Salaries and expenses, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.....	700,000							
Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska								
Salaries and expenses.....	213,500	263,000	214,000	214,000	214,000	-49,000		
Historical and Memorial Commissions								
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	5,000							
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	185,000	375,000		373,000	373,000	-2,000	+373,000	
National Council on Indian Opportunity								
Salaries and expenses.....	286,000	300,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	-25,000		
Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review								
Salaries and expenses.....		167,000		167,000	167,000		+167,000	
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Related Agencies.....	483,608,200	496,221,000	464,522,700	502,512,000	500,429,700	+4,208,700	+35,907,000	-2,082,300
Consisting of—								
Appropriations.....	483,608,200	496,221,000	464,522,700	502,512,000	500,429,700	+4,208,700	+35,907,000	-2,082,300
Definite appropriations.....	(482,828,200)	(495,441,000)	(463,742,700)	(501,732,000)	(499,649,700)	(+4,208,700)	(+35,907,000)	(-2,082,300)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)			
Memoranda—								
Appropriation to liquidate contract authority.....	(103,870,000)	(123,897,000)	(120,200,000)	(120,200,000)	(120,200,000)	(-3,697,000)		
Total, new budget (obligational) au- thority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(587,478,200)	(620,118,000)	(584,722,700)	(622,712,000)	(620,629,700)	(+511,700)	(+35,907,000)	(-2,082,300)
RECAPITULATION								
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	1,551,101,300	1,839,974,600	1,610,026,700	1,835,337,500	1,835,474,700	-4,499,900	+225,448,000	+137,200
Consisting of—								
1. Appropriations.....	1,527,101,300	1,839,974,600	1,610,026,700	1,835,337,500	1,835,474,700	-4,499,900	+225,448,000	+137,200
Definite appropriations.....	(1,379,776,300)	(1,478,749,600)	(1,437,701,700)	(1,474,112,500)	(1,474,249,700)	(-4,499,900)	(+36,548,000)	(+137,200)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(147,325,000)	(361,225,000)	(172,325,000)	(361,225,000)	(361,225,000)		(+188,900,000)	
2. Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	24,000,000							
Memoranda—								
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(165,455,000)	(194,897,000)	(191,200,000)	(193,060,000)	(193,050,000)	(-1,847,000)	(+1,850,000)	(-10,000)
Grand total, new budget (obligational) au- thority and appropriations to liquidate con- tract authority.....	(1,716,556,300)	(2,034,871,600)	(1,801,226,700)	(2,028,397,500)	(2,028,524,700)	(-6,346,900)	(+227,298,000)	(+127,200)

1 Includes \$4,000,000, S. Doc. 91-81, May 13, 1970.
2 Reflects reduction of \$50,000, S. Doc. 91-87, June 2, 1970.
3 Includes \$188,900,000, S. Doc. 91-81, May 13, 1970.
4 Includes \$37,000, S. Doc. 91-81, May 13, 1970.
5 Includes \$1,200,000, S. Doc. 91-81, May 13, 1970.
6 Includes \$14,000, H. Doc. 91-305, Apr. 13, 1970.

7 Included in Forest Land Management and Forest Research.
8 In addition, \$770,000 transferred from "Land Acquisition, National Capital Park, Parkway, and Playground System."
9 In addition, \$229,000, transferred from "Land Acquisition, National Capital Park, Parkway, and Playground System."
10 S. Doc. 91-68, May 11, 1970.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wash- ington.

The motion was agreed to. A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the various motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 18515) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 18515, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 7 on page 2 of the bill. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN AND TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For payments to unemployed Federal employees and ex-servicemen, as authorized by title 5, chapter 85 of the United States Code, and for necessary expenses to carry out the responsibilities of the Secretary of Labor in connection with trade adjustment assistance activities, as provided by law, including benefit payments to eligible workers, \$200,100,000 together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of benefits for any period subsequent to March 31 of the current year.

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

Mr. Chairman, on the 14th day of April 1970, the House adopted the provisions which I had offered, and which had been accepted in committee, to the bill making appropriations for the Department of Education, after refusing to strike them out by instructing the conferees by a vote of 191 to 157. These amendments are as follows:

Sec. 209. No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to force on account of race, creed or color the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force the transfer or assignment of any student attending any elementary or secondary school so desegregated to or from a particular school over the protest of his or her parents or parent.

Sec. 210. No part of the funds contained in

this Act shall be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to require the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force on account of race, creed or color the transfer of students to or from a particular school so desegregated as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal funds otherwise available to any State, school district or school.

Subsequent to this vote, in conference with the Senate these provisions were retained and when the matter came back to the House, the conference report, containing the language, was approved by a vote of 357 to 30.

Mr. Chairman, this makes quite clear the feeling of the Congress with regard to the use of force in the areas which these amendments cover, as well as the use of the power of the purse to withhold funds truly needed for education, which the Congress has provided, in order to force schools to voluntarily do that which is not required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a right not even claimed to be provided by the administration or the courts.

After consultation with members of the Committee on Appropriations, these amendments are not offered here because they are quite clear and for the Secretary of HEW or other officials to use funds in this bill, appropriated for other purposes, to attempt to evade the intent of the Congress as expressed in these provisions of the bill making appropriations for the Department of Education would be to break faith with the Congress and would certainly not be in line with the reputation for integrity which the Secretary enjoys.

After discussing this matter with members of the committee, it has been decided that, whatever we have provided or should provide, we have to rely on the good faith of the executive department and the courts to carry them out; for, if they cannot be relied on, it is to be doubted if any language could be written which could force them to leave the schools alone or parents and students alone where schools are completely desegregated, as that term is defined in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, because, after all, it is to the executive department that we must look for the carrying out, and the Federal courts to support, these provisions which are set out above and which appear in the conference report of the bill making education appropriations.

Any reading of these provisions would clearly show that they are completely sound and I feel will be followed by this administration not only because of commitments but because the system of education is essential to any organized society; and, unless we return again to putting education first, as these amendments would do, soon we will go down the drain as have other societies in years past.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it well to call these facts to the attention of the Members of the House at this time.

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

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health and, except as otherwise provided, the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681, et seq.), and the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-793), \$368,516,000, of which \$15,900,000, shall remain available until June 30, 1972, for grants pursuant to parts A, C, and D of the Community Mental Health Centers Act: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation for "Mental Retardation" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustments made by the Secretary pursuant to section 132(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the text of the paragraph which begins on line 12 of page 11; and I hereby give notice that if such amendment is adopted I will at the proper time move to strike out the paragraph beginning on line 4 of page 13, the paragraph beginning on line 15 of page 14, the paragraph beginning on line 17 of page 16, the paragraph beginning on line 22 of page 18, the paragraph beginning on line 26 of page 18, the paragraph beginning on line 22 of page 19, and the paragraph beginning on line 6 of page 20.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 11, strike out line 12 and all that follows down through line 2 on page 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
"MENTAL HEALTH

"For carrying out the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health and, except as otherwise provided, the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681, et seq.), and the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-793), \$388,516,000, of which \$15,900,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1972, for grants pursuant to parts A, C, and D of the Community Mental Health Centers Act: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation for "Mental Retardation" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustments made by the Secretary pursuant to section 132(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act.

"MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

"For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, section 301 of the Public Health Service Act and title V of the Social Security Act, \$261,159,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 503(2) or 504(2) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of section 506 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State: *Provided further*, That \$4,750,000 of the amount available under section 503(2) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for mentally retarded children, and \$5,000,000 of the amount available under section 504(2) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for services for crippled children who are mentally retarded: *Provided further*, That \$5,820,000 of the amount available under section 502(1) (B) of such Act shall be used pursuant to section 510 of such Act for special projects for dental health of children.

"MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION"

"To carry out title VI of the Public Health Service Act, and, except as otherwise provided, for administrative and technical services under parts B and C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act (42 U.S.C. 2661-2677), the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), and the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681-2687), \$261,521,000, of which \$252,200,000 shall be available until June 30, 1973, for grants pursuant to section 601 of the Public Health Service Act for the construction or modernization of medical facilities, and \$5,000,000, to be deposited in the fund established under section 626, shall be available without fiscal year limitation for the purposes of that section of the Act.

"NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE"

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out title IV, part B, of the Public Health Service Act, \$193,479,000.

"HEALTH MANPOWER"

"To carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, sections 301, 306, 309, 311, title VII, and title VIII of the Public Health Service Act, \$399,888,000.

"Loans, grants, and payments for the next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after March 31 of the current fiscal year, loans, grants, and payments under section 306, parts C, F, and G of title VII, and parts B and D of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, and obligations incurred and expenditures made hereunder shall be charged to the appropriation for that purpose for such fiscal year: *Provided*, That such payments pursuant to this paragraph may not exceed 50 per centum of the amounts authorized in section 306, parts C and G of title VII, and part B of title VIII for these purposes for the next succeeding fiscal year.

"CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH, EDUCATIONAL, RESEARCH, AND LIBRARY FACILITIES"

"To carryout part B of title VII, and part A of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act with respect to grants for construction of facilities, \$226,100,000; including, for dental facilities as authorized by subsections (2) and (3) of section 720 of the Act, an amount equal to 20 per centum of the appropriation for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel; to remain available until expended.

"NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE"

"To carryout, to the extent not otherwise provided for, section 301 with respect to health information communications and parts I and J of title III of the Public Health Service Act, \$20,269,000 of which \$1,842,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1972."

Mr. YATES. 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. 229]

Alexander	Corbett	Gilbert
Anderson,	Cramer	Gray
Tenn.	Crane	Hansen, Wash.
Ashley	Culver	Hathaway
Barrett	Cunningham	Hébert
Brock	Daddario	Horton
Brooks	Davis, Ga.	Hunt
Burke, Fla.	Dawson	Ichord
Burton, Utah	Diggs	Kirwan
Caffery	Dorn	Long, La.
Camp	Edwards, La.	Lujan
Carey	Ellberg	Meskill
Clark	Gallagher	Monagan

Murphy, N.Y.	Rarick	Sikes
Nelsen	Reid, N.Y.	Steed
Ottinger	Rhodes	Taft
Patman	Rivers	Teague, Calif.
Pollock	Rogers, Colo.	Widnall
Powell	Roudebush	
Price, Tex.	Ryan	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 18515, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 374 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say that this amendment is a package amendment. It is not the intention of myself or others who will be speaking to specific amendments in the package—to offer any backup amendments—if this package amendment fails. I am sure that will be good news to a great many members of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the package emergency health amendment that I have offered increases the amount recommended by the HEW subcommittee in nine areas. The total amount of the increase is \$360,454,000. The programs for which this increase provides are detailed on page H7006 of yesterday's RECORD. Other members of the committee will speak to specific amendments.

Let me dwell on the amendment that goes to the medical manpower institutional support and student loans. This is broken down into three categories.

First. Institutional support of health schools.

Second. Loans for health professions students.

Third. Traineeships for health professions students.

Under the program for institutional support of health schools, formula grants and special project grants are awarded to schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, nursing, public health and the allied health professions.

The purpose of these grants is to increase the output of health professionals, rescue schools in financial difficulties and improve the quality of instruction.

It has been repeatedly stated, and acknowledged, that of all the problems, that combine to constitute, what the President, and many others, have referred to as the "crisis in health," the shortage of trained manpower is generally acknowledged to be the most acute.

The Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs, Dr. Robert O. Egeberg, has repeatedly emphasized that—

We—

And he is talking of this administration—

we place the highest priority on the need to overcome the grave manpower shortages that are literally crippling the American health care system.

The amendment I have offered seeks to establish that priority.

The institutional and special project grant programs provide the only direct Federal support to offset the increasing operating costs of medical schools—thus enabling them to expand their enrollments and to improve their educational programs.

Testimony before Mr. Flood's subcommittee indicates that the institutional and special project grants are the very lifeline for the advancement of medical education.

This program assists schools in serious financial straits. Sixty-one medical schools, more than one-half of the total in the Nation, have been awarded special project grants on the basis of some condition of financial distress.

Dr. John A. Cooper, the president of the Association of American Medical Colleges testified to the HEW subcommittee that—

The perilous financial structure of our medical schools has now reached such a degree of instability that the whole structure is gravely threatened, particularly the private schools which make up about half of all the medical schools in the country.

Many medical schools have been forced to go into debt. Most medical schools applied to HEW for emergency assistance grants to avoid financial disaster. Several have announced they will be forced to close their doors, if increased aid is not forthcoming.

The amendment I have offered gives them this assistance.

The legislative authority for these programs authorizes a total of \$255,500,000 for fiscal year 1971. The administration requested only \$147,966,000 and the committee increased this request by just \$2,700,000.

The amendment now pending would fund these programs of institutional support to the full amounts authorized, resulting in an increase of \$104,834,000.

LOANS FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENTS

The program of direct loans to students of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and the allied professions provide students with much needed funds for their professional education.

Fifty-six million dollars is authorized for these loans in fiscal year 1971. The administration requested only \$21,610,000—a sharp reduction from the previous year. The committee increased the request by \$16 million—still far short of the amount needed and authorized.

The health emergency amendment would fully fund these loan programs by increasing the appropriation by \$18 million.

TRAINEESHIPS FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENTS

Traineeships are provided to selected students of public health, nursing, and the allied professions.

Thirty-eight million dollars is authorized for these traineeships in fiscal year 1971. The administration requested \$22,-

270,000, and the committee made no change in this request.

The health emergency amendment would increase this appropriation by \$15,730,000.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation is now facing the stark reality of severe shortages of trained health professionals.

According to information supplied to the committee by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we need now: 50,000 more doctors, 17,800 more dentists, 150,000 more nurses, 266,000 more allied health personnel, 45,000 of them in environmental work.

The crisis is severe and is worsening every day.

If we continue as we are going, the Public Health Service estimates that, by 1980, we will have a shortage of 26,000 doctors, 56,000 dentists, 210,000 nurses, 432,000 allied health personnel.

The amendment I have offered seeks to meet this crisis. It would close the gap—the ever-widening gap—between what we now have and what we need in the health professions.

People are getting nowhere near the quality of health care they have a right to expect.

Those are the words of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert E. Finch.

HEW officials estimate that 64 percent of the children of the Nation's poor have never seen a dentist. Fifteen million of these children generally receive little health care and little, if any, preventive health care.

The Nation's medical schools can double their enrollments by 1973 without adding to their medical facilities and without hiring more teaching personnel.

The doctor shortage is one reason why people in 17 other countries have longer life expectancies than Americans and why the United States has a higher infant death rate than 13 other countries.

Ninety percent of the problems facing American medicine—inability to get care, high cost of medicine—result because there are not enough doctors.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered and which will be supported in specific areas by other members of this committee seeks to fill very important and essential needs that we have in the health area.

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

Mr. Chairman, this pains me—one of my best friends since he and I have been here is my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts. He knows it, you know it and I know it.

I saw his amendment. I have read it and, of course, heard it read just now by the reading clerk. It is very lengthy and, from the point of view of draftsmanship, very well done. But may I refer to Bobby Burns, a great writer and a great friend of the people from which we spring. I refer more precisely, to Holly Willie's Prayer.

After calling on the Lord not to heed the prayers of others, Holly Willie says:

But, Lord, remember me and mine w' mercies temporal and divine.

The context is—and I think you will

follow me—yes, I think you will, indeed. There are scenes behind scenes—things behind things.

So I quote:

Lord, in Thy day o' vengeance try him!
Lord, visit him wha did employ him!
And pass not in Thy mercy by them,
Nor hear their pray'r,
But for Thy people's sake destroy them,
An' dinna spare!

But, Lord, remember me and mine
Wi' mercies temporal and divine,
That I for grace an' gear may shine
Excell'd by name;
An' a' the glory shall be Thine—
Amen, Amen!

And Amen—Bobby Burns. I hope you want to hear why I oppose the amendment. Certainly I want to tell you.

Mr. Chairman, it pains me to have to oppose the proposals of my good friend from Massachusetts, especially when he has selected such worthy programs and objects. However, the fact is that this bill already makes ample provision for the items which he wishes to increase; in fact, the committee itself increased many of them over the President's budget. Mr. Chairman, we increased the appropriations for the Public Health Service by \$208 million over the President's budget request. This bill already increases the Public Health Service appropriations by \$313 over the amount available for 1970.

A large part of the money in the gentleman's amendment is for aid to medical schools. We are told that the medical schools are in serious financial difficulty. There is an enormous amount of money in this bill which will ultimately go to the medical schools. There is \$150.6 million for institutional support, compared with \$147.9 million in the budget, and \$128.9 million available in 1970. There is \$91.9 million for student assistance, compared with \$75.9 million in the budget, and \$68 million available for 1970. And there is \$126.1 million for construction of teaching facilities, which is the same as the budget request and the 1970 appropriation.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. That is far from being the full amount in this bill for medical schools. There is \$1,107,048,000 in this bill for the NIH Research Institutes. That is \$72.5 million over the budget request, and \$131 million over 1970. A very large share of that research and training money goes to medical schools.

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

(On request of Mr. YATES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government now provides the funds for over 50 percent of the annual expenses of the Nation's medical schools. Yet, we are told, the medical schools are going broke. Obviously, money alone is not the answer. Something else is wrong. I believe that there should be a careful study and a report to Congress on the financial problems of the medical schools, so that we can take appropriate action. The way things are going now, the Federal Gov-

ernment is giving the medical schools more and more money each year, but the schools are getting poorer and poorer.

Now, on some of the other specifics of this amendment:

The amendment would add money for student loans. The committee has already added \$16 million over the budget request for medical and nursing student loans.

This amendment would increase funds for traineeships. The bill includes \$22,270,000 for traineeships, an increase of \$1.6 million over last year.

The amendment would add money for the National Heart and Lung Institute. The committee has already added \$6,732,000 over the budget for the National Heart and Lung Institute, and we are \$17,430,000 over the 1970 level.

The amendment would add money for a special children's dental program. There is already \$180,000 in the bill to get this program started. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the committee tried to get this program started last year. Last year's report stated—

The committee is concerned about the lack of a coordinated program for the dental health of children while so many federal dollars are being spent under medicaid and similar programs to treat dental conditions in adults that could have been prevented. The committee will expect that some of the funds provided in this appropriation will be used pursuant to the authorization in section 510 of title V of the Social Security Act relating to special project grants for the dental health of children.

We are for this program and have provided funds to start it. The amendment would give them money for a very sizable operating program before the planning has been done—hardly an efficient way to operate. That type of financing is what has gotten many programs a black eye in the past.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that program did not get started last year because of the Cotton-Eagleton 2-percent reduction amendment which was placed on the Labor-HEW bill in the Senate, and which the House conferees were instructed to accept.

This amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) would add \$80 million for Hill-Burton grants. The committee has already added \$122.2 million over the budget request for Hill-Burton grants.

This amendment would add money for staffing community mental health centers. The committee has already added \$20 million over the budget for staffing of community mental health centers—for a total of \$80,100,000, which is an increase of \$32,550,000 over the 1970 level.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this amendment feel it necessary to add \$500,000 for the National Library of Medicine. There is \$19.8 million in this bill for the National Library of Medicine. Five years ago, the appropriation for the library was \$9.7 million. I think that shows that this committee has recognized the needs of the National Library of Medicine.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, we have conducted months of hearings on this

bill. We went over it carefully, item by item. We felt that there were a number of health and medical programs which were inadequately funded, and we have recommended increases over the budget in these cases. Our job is to try to cut up this pie in a responsible manner. We have to make many, many tough decisions. There are few items in this bill on which some Member of this House could not get up and make a heart-rending appeal for more money.

We understand the problems which are addressed in this "package" amendment, and we have already dealt with them generously but also responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. Chairman, like all Members of this body, I dislike finding myself opposing my longtime devoted and beloved friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I oppose him because the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is right. It is not only right from the point of view of the health of this Nation, its physical health, but it is also right from the point of view of the economic health of this Nation.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and other members of the committee will point out to the Members in detail the tremendous need for these additional funds for hospitals and medical schools and other health facilities in this country. I do not claim any expertise in that field, but for more than 20 years I have served as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and today I am a ranking member of that committee. For well over 10 years I have served as a member of the Joint Economic Committee. I consider myself as having been educated by the economists and the others who have come before these committees. I did not do it. They did it for me.

In 1946 this Congress passed the Full Employment Act, which, incidentally, created the Joint Economic Committee. The responsibility of that committee is for the economy of this country. So I direct my remarks to the economic necessity of this bill. I know that we will hear today that this is fiscal irresponsibility. I know that my dear friend, the gentleman from Michigan, of whom I am very fond and to whom I am very devoted, said from the White House steps that prospects of a recession are nil, and I know he will make the argument that Congress here again is defying the will of the President and bringing on increasing inflationary pressures.

Now, let us take a look at the facts. As Al Smith used to say, let us look at the record. This country right now, as I speak to the Members, Mr. Chairman, is in a recession. Euphoric statements emanating from the White House to the contrary notwithstanding, unemployment is going to rise during the remainder of this year. Dr. McCracken, the principal adviser to the White House,

testifying before the Joint Economic Committee this very week, flatly conceded that unemployment would increase. Already we have a million more people out of work than was the case when President Nixon became President. Failure of the labor force to grow indicates that there is a considerably larger amount of hidden unemployment, because workers who would normally enter the labor force are discouraged all over this country in trying to find employment. The reduced workweek has cut back on pay. Today a worker buys a home and pays \$20,000 for it, but when he is finished, he has paid \$35,000 including interest rates. He may lose it because it is mortgaged, and he may lose everything in it, because he loses his job.

Let us take a look at the bulk of President Nixon's deficit. Let us see what it is all about and where it came from. First, let me say this. In their calculations about a balanced budget, there are all kinds of fakery. No. 1, they include a postal rate increase. I have not seen a bill to provide for it. Second, they include a tax on leaded gasoline. It has got no chance whatsoever of being enacted. Third, they talk about a user tax on waterways. It has no chance of being enacted.

These are figures in their projected budget. They are imaginary. They do not exist as practical sources of revenue.

Here is where the problems come from. The \$1.8 billion has been caused by increased interest on the national debt, because of the fiscal policies of this administration, trying to rely on monetary policy alone to control inflation.

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

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I was about to ask that.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana's intention to address himself to the amendment in the next 5 minutes?

Mr. BOGGS. It is so; yes, sir. I am addressing it right now.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for its courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, \$1.8 billion is the result of increased interest charges. Imagine paying 7.5 percent on Government bonds. That is what the rate is today. That is \$1.8 billion.

An additional one-half billion dollars is due to the increased cost of unemployment compensation. What does that mean? That means that there are more people unemployed than we have had in many, many years.

Finally, due to the fall off in business and due to the rise in unemployment,

the Government revenues for fiscal year 1970 were under the estimate by a billion dollars. If the President Nixon recession continues, the estimates will be approximately \$3 billion off.

I am not pulling these figures out of the air. I have obtained them in the Ways and Means Committee from the Treasury Department.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore mandatory that we adopt the Boland amendment. It is not only in the interest of the Nation's physical health. Imagine a Nation with a gross national product approaching a trillion dollars saying it cannot build hospitals, it cannot educate doctors, it cannot train nurses. What a shortsighted philosophy. But, Mr. Chairman, the Boland amendment is also in the best interest of the economic health of our country. As I said at the beginning, we pledged full employment in the 1946 act. We do not have it today.

This House, together with the other body, has already acted in the field of water pollution. We increased the President's budget some \$150 million to \$500 million. And it was a good amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) was very instrumental in respect to that amendment. As the economists say, it is an ideal contracyclical device.

This amendment, the Boland amendment, the Stephens amendment, the override of the veto of the Hill-Burton funds, not only serve social goals that are necessary in this country, but also serve economic goals.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) will provide much needed public investment required to counteract the current contraction in the private sphere of our economy. If the minority leader, Mr. Ford, thinks that has not happened, I suggest that he talk to a homebuilder. If he thinks it has not happened, I suggest that he talk to the aerospace industry. If he thinks that it has not happened, I suggest that he talk to the lumber industry in the Far West or in the Deep South.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great Presidents of our Nation, President Roosevelt, came to power at a time when this Nation was at the lowest point in its history.

We had a gross national product then of \$54 billion. Today it approaches a trillion dollars. When Franklin D. Roosevelt became President 14 million Americans were out of work, and many of them were literally starving to death. President Roosevelt said this, and I quote him:

The greatest tragedy about unemployment is that it should exist at a time when there are so many things which need to be done. Surely in a country as great as ours the means can be found to put the unemployed to work doing those things.

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way in America. We have a great country. Today it is quite different from those bleak days of 1933 when President Roosevelt stood here on the steps of this Capitol Building and said:

The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

But let this be said: There are so many more things that need doing; there are so many slums that need clearing; there are so many rivers that need purifying; there are so many schools that need building; there is so much to do to improve the quality of American life. To argue here that we cannot do this is something that I just do not believe and I do not buy it, and I hope that the Boland amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say that I am delighted on this occasion to be associated with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) and to have as my opponent the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often, so I insist that the House be in order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I listened to the gentleman from Louisiana, and, as I said a moment ago, I am far happier being associated with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) than with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) on this issue. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is far more qualified to pass judgment on the merits of this controversy than my dear friend the gentleman of Louisiana (Mr. Boggs). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) spent the better part of 6 months as chairman of this subcommittee analyzing the testimony that has been given by those from the executive branch and outside witnesses. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), the ranking member on our side, for what I think is a first-class job in adjusting and revising some of the recommendations that have been made by the executive branch. These changes have been made in a responsible manner. The pending amendment is irresponsible and should be defeated.

However, if I might make an observation or a comment concerning some of the charges or allegations by the gentleman from Louisiana, let me start out by saying this: We have had this daily political observation and comment, if you can elevate it to that level, by the gentleman from Louisiana about the trouble in the economy. As a consequence I had someone on my staff go back and look at the record. In 1961, 1962, and 1963 I find that nary a word was said about the unemployment figures on the condition of the economy during the Kennedy administration. In 1961 there was a strange silence by the gentleman from Louisiana even though unemployment averaged 6.7 percent in that year under a Democratic administration. The figure of 6.7 percent unemployment in 1961 was almost 2 percent higher than the unemployment figure at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, my researchers have been unable to find a single word from the gentleman from Louisiana in 1962

when unemployment was 5.5 percent under a Democratic administration. Then, I had someone on the staff take a look at the record in 1963 and nary a word from the gentleman from Louisiana about the economic troubles we were having that year when the unemployment rate was 5.7 percent.

So, I assume the gentleman on this occasion is trying to be more than a little political. He could not defend the administration in those days and he is trying to make politics out of the circumstances in 1970.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, the record shows that today there are 79 million employed Americans, which is 1.5 million more than a year ago. The employment a year ago was the highest in the history of the United States. It is a credit to this administration that we have been able to reduce the military manpower active duty strength in the last year and a half by over 300,000.

It is to our credit that we have been able to absorb so many through employment in other fields of those connected with the defense industries who have lost their jobs in the last year or two.

I might say, as the gentleman from Louisiana well knows, most of the efforts to cut defense spending, to cut space spending, have come from the Democratic side of the aisle. So, if there is any loss of employment in the defense industries or the space industries, the gentleman's political party is responsible for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us talk about the substance of this particular amendment.

The administration recommended \$619,742,000 in these nine programs, which represented a reduction of approximately \$80 million from the fiscal year 1970 appropriations. Most of that came in what we call the Hill-Burton part of the health and welfare budget. But, at the same time the administration, as it sought to cut down the direct grants programs, provided for the subsidization of interest for hospital construction which is a far more flexible and better way of helping local communities build those facilities that they badly need in your district and my district. In addition, 2 years ago in the housing bill an amendment sponsored by myself provided for FHA financial backing for local, nonprofit hospitals.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. FOREMAN) Mr. GERALD R. FORD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The net result is that the administration's request for outright grants programs, the interest subsidy programs, the FHA financing program is a far better way of building more hospitals than a continuation and expansion of the direct grant program under the Hill-Burton Act.

So, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the administration request for \$50 million for this program was justified.

On the other hand, I support the com-

mittee and particularly the subcommittee for including the amount that they have allocated in their recommendations.

Now, let me make another statement of fact and let us get the record straight, as the gentleman from Louisiana said. In seven out of the nine programs which we are considering here the administration asked for increases in fiscal 1971 over fiscal year 1970. For this I think the administration ought to be congratulated and not condemned. Furthermore, the committee in every instance in its recommendations either held the line comparing fiscal year 1971 with fiscal year 1970, or increased the amounts made available. The net increase over and above the amount of last year is \$87,374,000.

This is a rather substantial increase of about \$120 million over the President's recommendation. But I am going to support the subcommittee because, when you take into consideration the other adjustments that they have made in other programs, it seems to me that the committee has wisely used judgment in trying to more properly allocate our available resources.

Let me talk for a minute about the particular amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). If the Committee of the Whole and later the House approves this amendment, it will add \$360,454,000, which is a 50-percent increase over the amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 1970. And it seems to me that such an expansion is not responsible or wise at this time. We have a far better solution with the recommendations of the subcommittee under the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) and therefore I hope and trust that we follow his advice and not get into the political atmosphere of my friend, the gentleman from the State of Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

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

Who, Mr. Chairman, can be opposed to better medical care? Who could be opposed to more doctors? Is it not a very attractive package we are offered, and they intend it to be. They gave it a very attractive name, an emergency health amendment. You all have been receiving the telegrams, I am sure, saying "Support the emergency health amendment."

Now, let me tell you something: In this bill, counting everything in the bill, there is \$77 billion of the taxpayers' money.

Now, I have heard some gentlemen say that they do not know what a billion dollars is. Let me give you one graphic illustration of what a billion dollars is. If you can get hold of enough of them—

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

Mr. CASEY. Not at the moment.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman said \$77 billion?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman spell that out?

Mr. CASEY. If you read the report, and not on my time, you will find it. Just use your pencil and add it up.

Mr. BOGGS. How much of that is for social security?

Mr. CASEY. You read the report. I am telling you how much of the taxpayers' money is in here. Am I wrong on that?

You are on the Committee on Ways and Means, and that is the committee that raises the social security taxes.

Mr. BOGGS. You are talking about trust funds.

Mr. CASEY. All right. Some of it represents trust funds, but where did they come from?

Mr. BOGGS. They happen to have been appropriated previously; this is just a mere formality.

Mr. CASEY. All right, but the money came from the taxpayers, and that is what I am talking about.

Mr. BOGGS. So what?

Mr. CASEY. Now, as I was saying before I was interrupted, if you can get hold of enough dollar bills, and stack those dollar bills up flat, one on top of another, to the top of the Washington Monument, you will have \$1 billion. There are 77 stacks in this bill, 18 of them for this particular program on health and welfare—18 of those stacks.

Does that sound like this committee has been a little tight? Sure, there are portions of this bill that I would like to see larger. But we do have a responsibility to remain within some reason, in spending the taxpayers' money for these very worthwhile programs.

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

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Does the gentleman not have several very eminent medical schools in his own district and is he not quite well acquainted with the needs of those schools?

Mr. CASEY. Yes, sir; and I wish we could give them more money. Everyone of them wants more money. But we have to be within reason. I dare say the other body will add money to this. We never come back with a figure lower than ours whenever we have gone to conference as you well know.

Were we tight with them? Were we tight? Let me tell you this, and this is a fact. I am not talking to you about social security or the trust funds—I am talking particularly about the health and medical appropriations in this bill.

This committee increased that particular section of the bill over \$208,960,000. That is almost a quarter of a billion dollars—almost a quarter of the way up the Washington Monument in \$1,000 bills.

We increased substantially the following:

Environmental control	\$1,800,000
Mental health	21,860,000
Communicable diseases	400,000
Medical facilities construction	92,200,000
Biologics standards	198,000
National Cancer Institute	25,000,000
National Heart and Lung Institute	6,732,000
National Institute of Dental Research	694,000
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	6,187,000

National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke	\$3,835,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	3,030,000
National Institute of General Medical Science	17,696,000
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	1,133,000
National Eye Institute	5,300,000
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	777,000
John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences	918,000
Health manpower	18,700,000
Research resources	2,500,000

I am not critical of my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for wanting to do more. We all want to do more as well as his colleagues and associates who are cosponsors, so to speak, of this amendment.

I dare say that he and his friends who are advocating this are going to get a shining star in their crown for their attempt to try to put more money in this. We on the committee are going to be called dogs because we will not accept an amendment adding \$360 million more.

This bill is \$92 million over the budget and \$208 million over the budget in this specific field.

Now I do not want to get involved in this political sparring that has been going on here ahead of me. I do not intend to. I hope you will not get involved in it.

I hope you will work as this committee has worked—not as partisan Members of the House, but as people who have a job to do—a job that we wanted to fulfill the best we could and at the same time show some sign of fiscal responsibility.

We have increased this bill. We hear moans and groans about the increases. We think, we feel, and we know, that we have brought to you a bill that you can be proud of, because we have increased it and tried to give priorities where they belong. We made shifts in these funds.

I urge you, do not be stamped by a classic name of emergency health amendment. Do not be stamped by the telegrams. You can rest assured that this committee has done a good job and intends to continue to see that our medical schools and our professionals that are to be trained receive the support that they need. I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the sponsors of this amendment to increase funds for health facilities under the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1971, and to indicate my strong support for it.

Funds for medical manpower, hospital construction and modernization, community mental health facilities, and other health programs provided for in

H.R. 18515 are among the most important of our domestic needs. I was shocked as was the Committee on Appropriations, at the totally inadequate sums suggested for these health programs by the President. I support the action of the Appropriations Committee in increasing the funds available for these programs beyond the President's request. But the crisis that we face in the field of medical care argues strongly for even more generous funding. We can wait no longer to begin to bring our medical care facilities up to standards appropriate to the most affluent Nation on earth. Most importantly, we must develop adequate facilities and personnel to insure that every American has access to a full range of professional medical services.

I am particularly impressed with the need for increased attention to the problem of mental health. The incidence of mental illness is increasing rapidly in our fast-paced society, and only a fraction of those who need care for such illnesses are currently receiving it. The problem of drug abuse is only one example of the extent of mental and emotional disorders requiring professional medical attention.

I note that Mrs. Ruth Bushong Fallick appeared before the committee in support of increased funding for community mental health facilities. Mrs. Fallick is active in a number of mental health organizations and programs in areas of the Bronx, N.Y., which I represent. Mrs. Fallick and many other interested citizens in New York are doing excellent work to expand mental health care opportunities and draw attention to the mental health problem, and I feel strongly that these efforts should be fully and generously supported.

I am also impressed by the need to provide additional support to our medical schools for the training of additional doctors which are already in desperately short supply in many areas of the country.

In view of these considerations, I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to increase committee recommended funding for health manpower programs, Hill-Burton hospital grants, community mental health centers, and the National Institutes of Health by \$360.5 million.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, in passing I want to allude to the remarks of the distinguished minority leader only momentarily. I think he needs some new researchers. Apparently they forgot to tell him about the Eisenhower depression in the years 1953, 1959, and 1960, and how much higher unemployment was in those years than it was in the year 1960, 1961, and 1962 to which he referred. The minority leader did not tell the House that unemployment began to decline after the Democrats assumed office in 1960, and continued to decline in the years he mentioned.

Second, if the Nixon administration's recommendation of \$50 million for Hill-Burton was adequate, as the minority leader said it was, why, then, does he say he is supporting the committee bill that tripled that amount? That is exactly

what the committee did. Instead of the \$50 million that was recommended in the budget, this committee approved \$172 million, more than triple the amount the President recommended. If the minority leader is so determined to stay within the budget as he urges the House to do, how can he reconcile that position with his support of the committee bill?

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

Mr. YATES. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. There has been a great deal of verbiage here about telling us we ought to stay within the President's budget. None of us likes to exceed that budget. And if it provided for America's needs, we would never exceed the budget, but the fact is that the administration's recommendation for various HEW programs did not adequately meet the needs of this country. That is why Republicans and Democrats alike on this committee voted to exceed the President's budget by \$92 million.

Today there is much talk about priorities. All of us have our priorities, the programs we consider to be of top level importance. All of us have our hangups about what we consider to be essential—essential enough to justify our going above the President's budget. The minority leader, for example, has a hangup on military matters. He was willing to go \$100 million over the budget for planes for the Nationalist Chinese Government. My own hangup is for programming to help our people in health, education, housing, antipollution, the problems of the Nation's cities. I am willing to train doctors, laboratory technicians, and to do it in this bill to provide funds to train doctors, laboratory technicians, X-ray specialists, paramedical personnel, to build medical schools and hospitals, to fight the killers and cripples of mankind through research programs. That is what the Boland amendment will do in much greater measure than the committee bill.

Our beloved Speaker put it best when he spoke to the House at the time we overrode the President's veto of the Hill-Burton bill. He said:

Certainly an issue is involved. To me it seems whether we are going to vote for dollar values today or for human values—

Dollar values or human values. Yes. That is the issue today.

What is so sacrosanct about the figures in a budget which provides a paltry \$50 million for the Hill-Burton program?

What is so sacrosanct about a budget which the committee itself exceeds for at least four different programs? The Appropriations Committee rarely does that.

What is so sacrosanct about an administration budget which we know will not nearly meet the medical manpower shortage?

Do the Members realize the amount available for Hill-Burton in this bill is less than it has ever been before? In spite of what my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, says to the contrary, that is the truth. In 1968, \$293 million

was made available for Hill-Burton. In 1969, \$258 million was made available for Hill-Burton, \$50 million less. In 1970, \$172 million was appropriated for Hill-Burton, and the committee put a comparable amount in this year.

I say it is less for a number of reasons. One is the inflationary bite. There is a 6-percent inflationary factor which will decrease the amount available by almost \$10 million under last year.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment with respect to the gentleman's most recent remark, because when Hill-Burton was enacted, it was to help the more rural areas of the country get on with hospital construction. It was only in this past year when the legislation was modernized to meet the everyday needs and particularly the urban centers, and that is why we have seen a decline. From this point on, when we can combine the grants with loans, we can provide more than we have ever had before, and we will see these increases.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I think essentially his statement is correct except that the fact remains we must deal now with this year and this bill does not do so. The hospital needs of the country have been rising at the same time the Hill-Burton funds have been going down. And the funds are less this year than last and the hospital deterioration grows.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, talked about the interest subsidization program as expanding Hill-Burton by \$166 million. Ask the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) about the interest subsidization program, and what it does. Ask him how enormous the interest indebtedness is likely to be. Ask him how the interest subsidization program would work. He told me he was against it, because of the hundreds of millions of dollars of interest costs to be paid over the life of the mortgages, costs that could be saved by expanding the grant program. Direct grants will save money.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman pays mortgage on his house or anything else he borrows for, do we not pay interest on amounts of money?

Mr. YATES. That is correct, but if the gentleman read this morning's paper, he saw in it the item respecting the new increase in the cost of living. He noted, I am sure, that the greatest contributing factor to that increase was the cost of medical care. The interest subsidization program will continue that inflationary trend because it will add to the costs that must be shouldered by those using the hospitals.

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

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, on this interest subsidization when we start looking to the local government, the tax base for the local government does not increase.

Mr. YATES. Of course not.

The Members know what it costs to build a hospital—and I would like to have the attention of my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) as we talk of interest costs. Do the Members know what the interest costs are on building a hospital today? They are 8 percent and 9 percent in most States, and they are 12 percent in southern California. How many hospitals will be built when they are faced with that kind of financing? To meet that burden the committee recommends an interest subsidization program that subsidizes only 3 percent of that interest cost. What happens as a result?

The hospital groups which will be building new hospitals or modernizing existing ones will have to pay 5 percent or 6 percent, or 10 percent in a southern California location, over the program subsidy. And who is going to pay those interest costs? The public. They are going to be paid by the people who use the hospitals. As a result, the costs of the hospital care are going to continue to mount and the cost of living index will continue to rise and inflation will continue to plague us.

That is why I say that the Boland amendment, which provides for additional grants and does not require payment of exorbitant interest, is a much more desirable procedure than the one recommended by the committee.

Another factor showing that the amount available for Hill-Burton is less than last year relates to the fact that the authorizing committee provided for a \$50 million fund for direct loans for public hospitals of the country. Under the law, the public hospitals cannot use the subsidized interest program. The committee knows that. That is for private hospitals only. And as a result, what happens? \$186 million dollars in applications pending with HEW, requests from public hospitals, from county hospitals, from township hospitals and city hospitals.

Does your county or township hospital need modernization? It will have to compete with the private hospitals of the country for the amount of money put in this bill for grants. Mr. Chairman, that is obviously another decrease in the amount made available for the Hill-Burton program.

The action of the committee must be corrected. That is why we offer the Boland amendment.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. In the budget figure there was \$30 million for direct loans.

Mr. YATES. But that was stricken out by the committee.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate that, because the grant money was increased

from \$50 to \$172 million. It was just a question there of whether or not the overall figure was going to be in the form of grants or minus \$30 million for direct loans.

The gentleman certainly does not mean to leave the implication that all the hospitals around the country are built by Federal grant money?

Mr. YATES. No; I do not.

Mr. MICHEL. Of course not.

Mr. YATES. But the point is that most hospitals need help these days and taking away direct loan funds as the committee did decreases the amount of the grant program to that extent.

The gentleman will recall that I offered an amendment in the committee for almost the full authorizing amount for Hill-Burton, because I believed the House indicated by its override of the President's veto that it wanted adequate money for Hill-Burton. The committee has not done that. I am sure the House wants a greater allocation for Hill-Burton than the committee allowed.

The Boland amendment adds only \$80 million, but at least it provides more money than the committee bill, and I am for it.

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, that is an arbitrary figure the gentleman is using. We can shoot the moon.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is using no arbitrary figure nor am I engaged in shooting the moon. There is an authorizing limitation in the basic legislation, \$382 million, I believe.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman has no official statistics from the States, other than this overall need.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will not take my statement, let me tell the gentleman what this administration's Under Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare said the overall need was. Is he official enough? He said the need was \$11 billion at the present time, and that need is going to go up, not down.

The gentleman knows his testimony well. The gentleman knows what Under Secretary Veneman testified to on the Nation's need for new and modernized hospitals. It was \$11 billion. Even knowing that huge sum, the Nixon administration requested only \$50 million for this program. That is how the Nixon administration met what President Nixon last year called the greatest medical crisis in our history.

The Boland amendment should be approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This is not a question of whether we provide funds for mental health, cancer research, the training of additional physicians, or the construction and modernization of hospital facilities.

The bill contains funds for all of these purposes. It contains more than was recommended by the administration—more than was included in the budget for each of these items. This bill exceeds the President's request for these items by \$186 million.

This is a question of politics—nothing else. It is an attempt to force the bill high enough to see if they can precipitate a veto and then campaign that the Nixon administration is antihealth.

Now if that was the only harm that it caused—it would not be too much of a problem. Campaign issues are a way of life for most of us, and—as I pointed out yesterday—the Nixon record for spending for health, education, and manpower speaks for itself. It exceeds that of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

But something other than a campaign issue is involved. Yesterday my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, emphasized that we should take the Federal budget out of politics.

Why—I will tell you why—the word is inflation. It results from spending more money than we have to spend.

The education bill was \$453 million above the amount budgeted.

If we continue to appropriate funds in excess of the revenue-producing capacity of our tax system—as happened particularly in 1967 and 1968—we will produce the same result—the same inflation that we all know takes difficult and painful measures to eliminate.

Inflation that would not help 25 million people fighting a losing battle to make their social security checks cover the cost of living.

Inflation that would not help 9 million people on public assistance.

Inflation that would not help millions of middle-class Americans caught between taxes and an ever increasing cost of living that is only now beginning to level off.

The fiscal year 1971 budget proposed legislation that would provide \$4.6 billion of additional revenue. As of today, more than \$4.3 billion of those requests have not been acted upon.

For those who are interested only in politics—I remind you that inflation will also be an issue this year.

Those who vote to add almost \$400 million to a bill already containing almost \$200 million of increases over the amounts requested may also have to do some explaining.

The administration and this Congress have made reductions in military and space expenditures—\$6 billion.

We have changed our national priorities and are now spending more for human resources than defense—for the first time in 20 years.

We have taken this action because we are concerned about the health, education, and welfare of our people.

It is this concern that prompted the increases contained in the bill.

Irresponsibly adding almost \$400 million to these increases is a very poor course of action at this point in time.

I urge the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, with the dramatic discovery of new drugs and their expanding use in State mental hospitals, a virtual revolution has taken place in the care and treatment of the mentally ill people of this Nation. Coincident with the discovery of these wonder drugs has been a brilliant reorganization of our concept of caring for mental patients, one main feature being the development of community mental health centers.

As a result, using these drugs and developing community mental health centers has literally drained off approximately 40 percent of those mentally ill patients who had theretofore been required to be confined to live in mental hospitals.

As if this were not sufficiently dramatic, the number of beds required in our mental hospitals has reduced these past years notwithstanding the fact that an ever-increasing number of people in this country have been diagnosed as mentally ill requiring mental treatment.

In 1963, recognizing this revolution in the care of the mentally ill, Congress acted to assist communities in the development of community mental health centers. This help has come in the form of assistance in capital construction grants as well as paying approximately 30 percent of the staffing costs for these centers.

At the present moment, the importance is not the brick and mortar that would produce new buildings, but rather the skilled and complete staffing of these centers so that the services can be brought directly to our mentally ill on an out-patient basis.

In this year's budget, the administration has unfortunately failed to recommend sufficient Federal expenditures in this area of Federal assistance to the staffing of mental health centers. In his budget for fiscal 1971 the President recommended only \$60.1 million. On the other hand, the Appropriations Subcommittee, backed up by the full committee, has recognized the shortcoming of this small budget request and has increased this item for staffing by \$20 million, making the total \$80 million.

While this action of the subcommittee and the full committee is commendable, it still falls short of the requirements the experts who testified believe must be met in the next fiscal year.

In reviewing some of the testimony and information on this subject it appears to me that there are some 49 community mental health centers that have been recommended for staff funding, but have not been funded for lack of funds. It also appears that there are approximately 80 applications for assistance in staff funding in the pipeline, most of which will be approved before the end of the fiscal year, but for which there will be no staffing funds.

Under these circumstances it was recommended by the National Association for Mental Health, that at least \$100 million would be required for Federal assistance in staffing centers ready to go into business in this fiscal year, and the

National Council of Comprehensive Community Mental Health Centers has estimated this sum to be at least \$110 million.

Included in this package amendment, therefore, is an additional sum of \$20 million which, when combined within the \$80 million contained in the bill, should almost make it possible for the Federal Government to honor its commitments to those community mental health centers that are now approved or will be approved in the fiscal year 1971.

Mr. Chairman, most States in this Nation are attempting to move ahead in this development of community mental health centers. Thousands of volunteers, both professional and laymen, are carefully putting together their plans for their earliest possible opening. Eighty more are expected to be approved for staff funding this fiscal year.

It would be tragic, indeed, if any significant number of them could not be opened because staffing funds were not available at the time of approval.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the committee to approve the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as was said before, the subcommittee in this bill added \$209 million above the budget. Now it has been proposed to add another \$360 million, which would bring the total for the bill to \$569 million over the budget. It would be so visible as to invite a veto.

Now, I am not against fighting vetoes when we can win, but before we start voting on an amendment like this perhaps we should look at the history of such amendments.

Traditionally we in the House committee have gone through, item by item, and reshaped the HEW appropriation bills according to what we thought the House would want. Then it passed the House substantially in that form. Then it goes to the Senate. If somebody can show a weakness in our bill, he goes to the Senate committee, and the case is made there. They adjust the bill accordingly. Then we go to conference after that, and we come back with a balanced bill that is written by the Congress. Under that procedure we made great progress.

That has been the history until last year. But a year ago next week this subcommittee came to the floor with the HEW bill. Some people—the same people who support this amendment—decided they were going to up it very visibly.

You know what happened then. For the following 9 months from a year ago next week we went up and down the hill with all kinds of motions and resolutions and we ended up in here with a bill in March that had been reduced by the Senate by \$347 million below the figure the committee had recommended in July. Lo and behold, the same people were down here with a white flag saying, "Surrender to the Senate." The motion was made to agree to the Senate figure and it carried. Health appropriations were reduced to \$115 million below the figure the committee had recom-

mended in July. Now, is this the kind of action that really makes for solid progress in health? We could have gone to conference and gotten the money back in 5 minutes, but they did not want to do that. Surrender to the Senate was the cry at that time, on March 3.

Mr. Chairman, here are some of the items that were reduced, and they are the items in this amendment today. Construction of community health centers, grants, \$1.3 million below the amount we had in July. Hospital construction, \$82.2 million below what we had in July. Medical-dental student assistance \$4.78 million below what we had. Nursing student loans \$5.5 million below what we had in July. Is that the kind of friends of health you want to follow again?

Do you want to go down that primrose path with them again and follow the same people and probably end up below what we have in this bill? Before we do that you ought to take a good look at what is in this bill and the procedures we used when we have made progress in this House on health appropriations.

It has been alleged here today that there is a doctor shortage. Everybody admits that. But it does not necessarily follow that money is the answer. In some schools, there are 10 applicants for each medical school slot now. You can give them all free education, and that would not alone increase the number of doctors. Let us get to the cause of not having enough medical services in this country and try to deal with those. That is what the subcommittee did, and that is why we increased 18 items by 209 millions of dollars where we thought it would do some good. We are willing to do more where we believe we can get results and where it can be shown that we will get results. There will be increases in the Senate and we will agree to some of them. But I say that this amendment will not get the results claimed because this amendment does not go to the heart of the problem. We do have good care at a high price in this country for anybody who is seriously ill and who can get to a hospital before they die, but what we do not have is preventive care except for the urban wealthy. In the non-metropolitan areas where 30 percent of the people live, there are only 12 percent of the doctors. Those areas have only 8 percent of the pediatricians. People who work for wages are also in need of preventive care. People that are working cannot afford to take a half a day off to go to the doctor's office. It is not the \$10 for the doctor's call as much as it is the \$20 or the \$30 that they lose in wages each time they do it. They just cannot afford to take the time to go to a doctor's office and wait several hours to secure a tetanus shot for a puncture in the hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. YATES) Mr. SMITH of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Now, the sponsors of this amendment today assume that you can secure enough doctors so that

there will be plenty of doctors everywhere. I believe they are just laboring under an illusion. The problem is not as a practical matter solvable that way. It just does not work that way. That is what the witnesses before our committee told us that if we give them all of the money they want, they could increase the turnouts of doctors only 10 percent in 6 years. That is not nearly enough doctors to provide the preventive health care needed. If you are going to labor under the assumption that we can solve this problem with money, you are just mistaken. So what do we do? We import into this country foreign trained doctors. Fifteen percent of our doctors come from foreign countries. They have received 6 years of education compared to nine required in our schools. But have our medical schools been doing what is needed in order to get more doctors and get other kinds of professional people that are necessary so that we can have clinics established in these rural areas under the direction of a doctor in a nearby city, perhaps? No, they have not done that. That is what we need to do. The only hope of substantial improvement in this preventive health field is to revise the whole medical delivery system. We need clinics. We need bachelors of medicine. We need nurse practitioners who can operate a clinic under the direction of a doctor. A clinic where preventive medicine is available near home in off hours for people who work and without long waiting periods. When a patient needs to go to a doctor, the bachelor of medicine or nurse practitioner who knows his own limitations can tell the patient to do so and arrange an appointment. The doctors will not need to be so tied up with work paramedical personnel can do that the patient needs to wait for hours. With more preventive medicine, they won't need to be tied up so much on corrective medicine.

This will require changing some State laws and a new curriculum and courses for health schools. So, instead of pouring more money into the system as it exists now which will not provide what is needed, I say we should reward those that want to make the changes that are needed in this country and we should not continue to assume that increasing the scholarship program can solve the problem.

It requires reform in the medical schools and State laws. An example of what I am talking about is with reference to Howard University. They have a unique opportunity to do something in this health field. They are now operating right here in Washington, D.C. They do not have to change a State law which limits outpatient service by paramedical personnel under some supervision of a doctor as is the case in some of the States. The Congress could make certain changes in the laws if we need to do that. They can do things which they need to do and we have told them we support such programs and have made funds available to them. However, they have not hardly looked at the real problem here. They have not even gone thoroughly into it.

You can look at the hearings and you will see on page 938 of part 4, that they have not made the needed effort to provide personnel for clinics. They have found time and added several social courses but they have not made the effort to add to or change the curriculum so as to provide better medical services.

We will not accomplish the desired results merely by pouring out more money to Howard and other such universities, when they are not moving in the direction that is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, if Members want to support a program to accomplish the objective of more health services, we must have a change in the delivery system instead of merely supporting the present inadequate system.

Mr. Chairman, we increased these 18 items to the extent of \$208,960,000. The committee recognizes that we do need facilities and expansion of the present ones. We cannot get more doctors without the facilities, and the increase in facilities is a prerequisite to some extent. But we will not get but 10 percent more doctors of medicine in the next 6 years even with an increase of medical facilities unless the curriculum is reduced for some who will work in a limited capacity.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion we ought to increase the facilities program more. But, I can assure members that when we come back from the conference with the other body, we will have increased it probably by 50 percent over what is contained in this bill or the amount that is justified.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, we need adequate loans for students, not because there is a shortage of students, but for social reasons so that the less wealthy can go to medical school as well as wealthy ones. We need enough so that those people can get into the medical schools and the committee stands for this principle.

We put into this bill a 23-percent increase in loans for medical students and a 130-percent increase for nursing students. And, if they can show they need more, I am sure it will be provided under the committee approach. If needed, we will agree to more in the orderly way these sums have previously been provided until last year. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the usual system for handling appropriations for HEW for under it we have made solid progress. Therefore, I submit that the amendment which is now pending before the committee diverts attention from the real needs and that the way to make solid progress is to pinpoint money toward a new delivery system and for the case against any weakness in the committee recommendations to be made on individual items in the Senate. In the usual way, worthy adjustments will survive.

I urge you to use the procedure which in the past made progress instead of the dramatic big amendment shotgun approach which was used last year when we lost \$145 million in the final bill below the amount our committee originally recommended. If any item is shown to be insufficient on its own, we will come back with a conference report that will shape

this up and provide some progress instead of going backward.

Do not go down the primrose path on a package amendment again which strikes individual items from the bill or you may end up like last year with some good programs below the amount in the committee bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

As the gentleman has indicated there are serious failures in the medical delivery system and which must be eliminated. We have to bring more new young men into the medical schools. And we must broaden the social and economic class base of our medical students. That is why I support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) because I feel that the medical schools are in a crisis from which they will emerge intact only with considerable congressional understanding and support.

Young men in the third and fourth years of their medical college training have to drop out simply because there are not sufficient funds to grant them the needed loans. Next year even more will be turned out of the medical schools at a time when we need every doctor we can train.

Just today a medical school dean told me that the lower-middle and the middle-class students will suffer more this year than last year. Precisely those economically deprived youngsters that we want to get into our medical schools simply cannot get in because they do not have the funds or cannot obtain the necessary loans.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Well, we will increase the amount for that purpose to the extent needed in order to provide all the loans they need.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, but at the present time those loans are in an inadequate amount.

In fiscal year 1969, 39,156 students of all medical professions were aided by the health professions student loan program.

In fiscal year 1970, just ended, this number dropped to 32,203.

Under the administration's budget, that number would have dropped to 28,168.

Wisely, the committee has increased the funds for loans. But anything short of full funding for programs of medical student loans, which will be repaid to the Treasury eventually, is intolerable if we believe our own words, or the President's of last year, about the "massive crisis" of our medical care system.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

The gentleman from Massachusetts has eloquently explained the emergency

health amendments. I do not need to tell the Members of this House that the health care system of this Nation is under increasing stress. The recent report of the Committee of One Hundred calling for a national health plan is the latest manifestation of this stress. It is reported that there will be legislation introduced this week that will attempt to get health services into the inner city and into rural areas.

These steps may be feasible, but I submit that they are predicated on the assumption that there will be adequate medical manpower available. Based on the latest estimates from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this assumption cannot be made. HEW projects that by 1980 there will be these shortfalls: 26,000 doctors, 56,000 dentists, 210,000 nurses, and 432,000 allied health manpower.

Some of the elements of the emergency health amendment are primarily directed at this manpower shortfall, and I will explain them. With the funds provided in this amendment, we can narrow the manpower gap.

Before I develop one aspect of the medical manpower section of the health emergency amendment, it is important for the Members to realize that there are other elements in this package. These components are designed to handle critical gaps in the appropriation bill. For example, the funds for Hill-Burton and community mental health staffing are designed to handle crucial demands and needs in hospital construction and staffs of community health centers.

I just want to point out that this package is only \$360 million over the committee recommendation, but its significance lies not only in this small dollar increase but in the programs it more adequately funds.

I would like to focus on the funds directly aimed at the medical manpower area.

In fairness, I must point out that the Nixon administration is not unaware of these medical manpower problems. Indeed, Dr. Roger Egeberg, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health, has suggested that \$150 million be appropriated to attempt to close the medical shortage gap. This was supported by the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee itself in their memo of July 15, 1970. Thus the administration has admitted a problem exists and is attempting to solve it. But I would respectfully suggest that there is no need for new programs. The existing legislative authority is designed to meet these manpower shortages. What is needed now is dollars—money.

Dr. Egeberg put the question squarely:

If the government does not help the medical schools and the medical students soon, we'll have a doctor shortage for the next 20 years.

I applaud the efforts of Dr. Egeberg but I do not feel that, as Members of Congress, we can allow proposed solutions to this manpower medical crisis to be left to the workings of the executive budgetary process.

We in the House know the needs. We have passed the legislative authority and we need now to fund this authority. This is the "crunch." The Appropriations Committee has provided some increases, but more are necessary even to maintain our insufficient health care system.

I know that some Members might argue that there is a problem in the distribution of medical personnel. I agree that there is a problem in this area. But it remains an unassailable fact that if we do not have the necessary medical manpower pool, we cannot work at redistribution. These projections that I have cited indicate a substantial shortfall in needed medical personnel.

Incidentally, I am aware that the President has blasted the "spendthrift" Congress, but I fail to see how any impartial observer could fail to notice that the burden of our anti-inflation policy is being borne by the workingman. I note for all the Executive anguish over increases in vital education funds, social security payments, and hospital construction funds, the administration was not the least bit hesitant to bail out Penn Central or Lockheed.

Also the administration has not forwarded any revenue schemes. As the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has pointed out over and over again, this initial budget surplus that was hailed by the administration rested on some tenuous economic assumption. But this debating back and forth has little to do with the issue before the House today.

This amendment adds only a meager \$360 million to the Appropriations Committee figure. Surely no one could insist that this small, but necessary, figure in a potential trillion-dollar economy will spell economic disaster. But it can be reasonably argued that a breakdown in our Nation's medical system would have disastrous results domestically.

From the medical manpower aspects of this amendment there are two central provisions of this package. The first pertains to the institutional support for schools of public health and students' funds; the second pertains to the construction of medical facilities. The first of these two central medical provisions was explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). I would just like to point out that one of the 107 existing medical schools, 43 are in serious financial trouble. They need institutional support. Also there has to be more money for scholarships. According to the latest estimates, it costs \$50,000 for 13 years of training to become a doctor. Thus, there is a need for additional loans—not only for doctors but for other medical personnel.

I would like to spend the remainder of my time explaining the second central provision of this manpower package, that is, the construction of medical training facilities. In this package we are asking for \$100 million for the construction of medical facilities. This is \$33 million less than the authorization but it would be a beginning for the \$400 million backlog of already approved HEW grants.

I mentioned the projections for medical manpower for 1980. I could go on with other statistics, but I think it is significant that for every qualified medical school applicant who is accepted, two are turned away for lack of the schools' capacity to train them. In the 1968 legislation, Congress sought to remedy this situation by authorizing substantial appropriations for construction projects over the following 3 years, but unfortunately the amounts authorized have not been appropriated.

For fiscal year 1971, a total of \$225 million is authorized for the construction of schools of medicine, dentistry, et cetera. The administration, however, is requesting an appropriation of only \$118.1 million, or about half as much as is authorized. This would be understandable if the need for more construction funds was not evident. But this is simply not the case. As of April of this year, applications for construction grants totaling nearly \$400 million have been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and have been approved for funding, subject to the availability of money. In addition, another \$248 million worth of applications have been received and are being reviewed by the Department.

The same sad story is reflected in the administration's budget request for the program of construction grants for schools of nursing. Thirty-five million dollars is authorized. Applications for more than \$37 million has been received, but the administration is requesting an appropriation of only \$8 million.

This amendment will not cover the projected shortfalls in medical personnel, but it will begin to close this manpower gap.

For example, American medical schools are now admitting 10,000 medical students per year. To meet the current shortage, to keep up with increased requirements for the future, this number of admissions must be doubled as soon as possible. To do this will demand sizable increase in the capacity of the existing schools and the establishment of from 10 to 25 new schools. There still remain five States in the Nation without medical schools. There are many locations throughout the Nation which have both the population base and the academic capability of initiating new medical educational centers.

To deal with this problem will require a substantial expansion of our construction efforts. This must begin with increased appropriations for this purpose. The funds that would be made available by the appropriation now before the House are totally inadequate for this task to be undertaken.

Let me make this perfectly clear. In this bill, the funds provided for the construction of health educational, research, and library facilities total \$126,100,000. Of this amount, \$94,500,000 would be available for the construction of medical and related teaching facilities; \$23,600,000 for dental teaching facilities; and \$8,000,000 for nursing and allied health. In contrast to these proposed amounts, this Congress, in passing the health man-

power amendments of 1968, authorized \$180 million for the construction of medical and related teaching facilities in 1971; \$45 million for dental; and \$55 million for nursing and allied health, or a total of \$280 million. But even more telling than this contrast is the fact that the National Institutes of Health—NIH—now has on hand approved applications for construction assistance from medical, nursing, and allied health schools totaling \$400 million at the very beginning of the year for which the administration is requesting, and the committee passed, only \$126,100,000.

In the fact of the urgent needs for health manpower, which can be met only by continued expansion of the medical educational plants of the Nation, \$126,100,000 is a travesty.

The health emergency amendment would add \$100 million to the administration's appropriation request for this urgently needed construction. This \$100 million would increase the funds available for the construction of medical and related schools to \$170,100,000; for dental schools to \$42 million; and for nursing and allied health schools to \$14 million, amounting to a total for the appropriation of \$226,100,000.

This increase in the appropriation for construction of teaching facilities for these critical health professions is only a minimum measure of response to the urgent need to expand the teaching facilities of this Nation if we are to meet the demand for physicians and other trained health professionals which this country faces.

The figures—the shortfalls—are there for all to see. We need facilities to train doctors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel. We must add construction funds to build and modernize medical training facilities. We cannot continue to delay and procrastinate. This package offers tangible and immediate help in lessening our Nation's medical crisis.

Another action by the administration which poses a serious threat to the unified planning and development of the Nation's medical centers is the proposal to transfer support for construction grants to teaching hospitals to the budget item for the Hill-Burton program, which is financed under the appropriation "medical facilities construction." This transfer involves a program reduction of \$33 million in the planned obligation level for the appropriation "Construction of health educational research and library facilities" as a result of this transfer between appropriations.

Furthermore, it appears to be the clear intent of the administration to substitute to the maximum extent possible guaranteed loans as a basis of providing construction funds for teaching hospitals rather than construction grants, which is the present pattern of program support in this area. For some unaccountable reason, the Appropriation Committee in its report supports the transfer of teaching hospitals to the Hill-Burton account. This section will have several alarming effects:

First. It will gravely complicate the

process of planning and funding in a coordinate and unified manner the complete array of facilities that now constitute an academic medical center. The whole design of the Health Professions Education Assistance Act was to provide a single source of funds for the educational, research, and teaching hospital facilities required for medical educational purposes. Only through such a single approach is it possible both for the institution to expeditiously and economically plan and carry through its program of construction and for the Federal Government to efficiently review and make judgments about the adequacy and appropriateness of the entire facility complex for which Federal support is being sought.

Second. The transfer to the Hill-Burton account of teaching hospital construction and the prospect of shifting such construction support to loans will, in effect, exclude from access to Federal support for teaching hospitals the several States whose statutes prohibit borrowing or the funding of capital expenditures by depreciation processes. Such State institutions could not utilize guaranteed loan mechanisms; but perhaps even more fundamental an objection to such a proposal is the fact that more teaching hospitals will operate at substantial losses. These losses effectively prohibit them from using the depreciation devices as a means to amortize loans, because these funds are required to cover operating deficits.

In acting on the amendment now before the House, we would like to make it clear that this action constitutes a repudiation of the administration's device to shift this construction support for teaching hospitals to the Hill-Burton budget and any devices of guaranteed loans.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge this Chamber to adopt the emergency health amendment today. This House must assume its responsibilities in attempting to alleviate our Nation's critical medical manpower crisis and appropriate this \$360 million figure.

I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, only 2 days ago this Nation celebrated the first anniversary of one of the most extraordinary scientific accomplishments in history. One might expect that a country capable of such a monumental achievement would have long ago mastered the relatively simple scientific problems of keeping newborn babies and their mothers alive. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

The American people spend more per capita on health care than the people of any other country in the world. Yet our public health statistics place us below most Western countries. Among industrial nations, the United States ranks 18th in life expectancy for men, 11th in life expectancy for women, 14th in infant mortality, and 11th in the percentage of mothers that die during childbirth. The death rate for American men between the ages of 40 and 50 is higher than anywhere in Western Europe. The fact is that our unmatched expenditures

on medical services and health care are yielding inadequate progress and results. Despite the fact that American researchers have revolutionized medical science several times over, our vital statistics show that being an American may be hazardous to your health.

The demand for extensive health care has drastically exceeded the supply, particularly among the very young and the very old. There is a critical shortage of medical service personnel; it is currently estimated at around half a million positions, and is expected to increase. By 1975, America will need 43 percent more physicians than it had in 1965, but the number of doctors will increase by only 17 percent. Even more dramatic shortages of dentists and nurses are also projected.

These shortages translate into the almost universally experienced crowds, lines, and delays encountered by those trying to see a doctor. They translate into the harrowing frustrations encountered by parents trying to find a doctor to make a house call for a fevered child. And they translate into the incredible fact that approximately 1 out of every 50 Americans cannot obtain the services of a doctor under any circumstances.

The shortage of hospitals, day care centers, mental institutions and nursing homes illustrates another aspect of our present inability to meet the demand for better medical care. The rise in health care costs—in particular hospital costs—are so outrageous that the cost of the cure is in many cases a greater misfortune for the victim than the illness itself. The American Hospital Association recently told the House Ways and Means Committee that the average daily room rate would rise to nearly \$100 a day by 1973, and in some teaching hospitals, already exceeds that figure. The costs for physicians' services rose 9 percent in 1967, and the cost of medical care, drugs, and equipment rose by 7 percent that same year. The cost of a major illness is such that 9 out of every 10 Americans are medically indigent. Health expenditures today amount to \$294 for every man, woman, and child in the country. For some middle Americans, this means spending 10 to 25 percent of their incomes on health and medical services. For the poor, this means turning to Government assistance programs, or simply failing to obtain help.

The rising demand for medical service, the slow growth in the supply of physicians, the increasing wage costs in hospitals without commensurate rises in productivity, the increasing complexity of medical care, and the need to incorporate new techniques and equipment, have all contributed to the rise in medical prices. Elimination of the problem requires two key steps. We must eliminate the shortage of medical personnel and facilities on the one hand, and improve methods by which an individual can bear the costs of health care on the other.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have the chance of making some progress. The health emergency amendment will increase the HEW health appropriation by

\$360,454,000 for use in reducing the health manpower shortage, improving the quality of instruction, and providing grants for needed facilities. This bill will in large measure make up the difference between the amounts this body authorized earlier this year and the sums the administration and the committee now wants it to appropriate. Specifically:

Earlier this year, this body authorized \$255,500,000 for institutional support of health schools. Now that the time has come to make an actual appropriation, however we find the administration and the committee requesting only a fraction of that amount.

The program of direct loans to needy students of medicine, dentistry, nursing and other health professions is one of the most crucial steps in fashioning a long-range solution to the shortage, and the administration has requested less than half the authorized amount. This cut comes at a time when our 107 medical schools have files bursting with loan applications. Projecting this cut, only 14 percent of students would be aided in 1971 under the administration budget. Only 2 years ago, 37 percent of these students received financial aid. New students will be forced to look elsewhere for their careers—present students will be forced to drop out of school.

The administration requested less than half of the \$260,000,000 authorized for construction of new teaching facilities and improvement of existing facilities. Right now, there are almost \$600,000,000 worth of approved but unfunded applications for the construction of medical and dental teaching facilities. The health emergency amendment would provide \$226,100,000 as an inroad to the construction backlog.

One of the more hopeful programs Congress has undertaken for assistance in the mental health area is the program for community mental health centers which is designed to reduce the number of patients in mental hospitals by emphasizing outpatient care in the local community. The greatest initial need of these centers is for money to staff the facilities adequately. The committee and administration requests for funds are admittedly inadequate to keep even existing centers operating. To allow such programs to fall short, after extending hope to local communities that they themselves can begin to eliminate the disgrace of mental health treatment facilities, is a retreat which may eventually be paid for by the psyche of the Nation.

We clip the wings, tell the bird to fly, and then wonder why she is grounded.

This country has produced more than enough men and women with the intellectual capacity to meet its medical needs. It is a question of building schools and financially assisting people undergoing the extended and rigorous training. We can begin to do this today by funding projects at a realistic level.

But much can also be done without additional financial assistance to utilize existing resources more efficiently, including: greater use of outpatient clinics and treatment centers to keep expensive hos-

pitalization to a minimum; improvement in design and operation of hospitals with an emphasis on patients doing as much as possible for themselves; greater coordination and integration among the various health services, with an aim toward eliminating duplication of costly equipment.

To help meet the rising costs of medical care, it seems that almost any extension of Government subsidized insurance programs to greater numbers of Americans would be appropriate. Americans already within or nearly within the coverage of the current medicare and medicaid programs probably are the ones in greatest need of assistance. But these programs are far from generous in their provision of benefits. As the New York State Social Services Commissioner George Wyman testified:

To add a provision for an eligible recipient to pay twenty percent of the cost of the outpatient services is placing a burden on him to pay something which we have already determined he does not have. . . . A study by our department has shown that we are providing care to a significant number of persons who are just above the public assistance levels. We are actually requiring the recipients to spend themselves into poverty.

Obviously, adequate provision of medical services to our poor and elderly Americans should be the first priority of business.

That does not mean there should be room for complacency about our present system of providing medical care to other Americans. Only 50 percent of all Americans have taken out health insurance policies, and many of those policies do not guarantee comprehensive benefits at that. Almost any of the myriad of proposals dealing with subsidized insurance would improve the situation, including several proposals that are being studied by this body. The alarming spiralling of costs demands more than half measures, however. We must develop a comprehensive scheme of insurance that would be the sine qua non to the achievement of a rational allocation of scarce medical resources.

Today we are again at one of those junctures where we can commit our compassion, expertise, and determination to the improvement of the splotchy health record of our country. That some Americans suffer from health problems is inevitable. That some suffer from health problems that could be averted or eased by wiser use of our national resources is a disgrace.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the emergency health amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. I particularly endorse the \$104.8 million increase in institutional support of medical schools.

Many of the Nation's medical schools have obtained grants which are in danger of not being funded without the new increases. For example, in my home state the University of Florida submitted grant applications for \$395,661 in dentistry and \$1,950 in pharmacy. These applications have been approved but their future is in serious doubt. Dr. E. M. Papper, vice president and dean of the University of Miami's School of Medicine, has strong-

ly urged support for the passage of this amendment.

In testimony before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs, stated:

We place the highest priority on the need to overcome the great manpower shortages that are literally crippling the American health care system.

Today we have an opportunity to reduce these great shortages. We face a serious health crisis in the near future unless the Congress takes immediate and positive action to increase funds for student loans, medical construction, and other vital programs. I firmly recommend the passage of the emergency health amendment.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, in his state of the Union message, the President stated:

America, which has pioneered in the new abundance, and in the new technology, is called upon today to pioneer in meeting the concerns which have followed in their wake—in turning the wonders of science to the service of man.

The efforts of the healing arts will be severely diminished in their thrust and effectiveness if they cannot reach the people for whom they were intended. Our Nation is in the midst of a severe manpower crisis in the health fields. The innovative hospital construction bill recently passed by the Congress will be a hollow monument to our scientific ingenuity if we do not have the physicians, nurses and technicians adequately to staff the new facilities.

The present crisis can only be met by increasing our training capacity for health manpower and strengthening our schools and hospitals which train future physicians. With projected shortages in the health manpower personnel from 227,000 in 1967 to 322,000 in 1975, additional funding above and far beyond the \$242,234,000 requested in the President's budget for fiscal year 1971 must be appropriated to attract, train and retain such qualified personnel.

The Budget request of \$12,000,000 for direct loans to student physicians means a \$3,000,000 cut in loans, and the committee has decided to increase the budgeted amount by \$10,000,000. I support the fullest possible funding for direct loans to our student physicians and nurses. I urge support of the Boland-Yates amendment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support for the amendment offered by my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), and I want the entire House to know how deeply I appreciate the leadership that he has shown all of us in this current debate. I know the deep commitment that my colleague has in this important area of health manpower education.

I have, several times over recent weeks, spoken out on this important subject of our need for a new and massive commitment in the area of medical education and manpower training. Just last week, I held a meeting of the entire Maryland delegation with representatives from the

affected Maryland institutions in order that we in the House could discuss with them the nature of their problems. At that meeting, representatives from Johns Hopkins University clearly illustrated the plight that this institution faces. The School of Public Health of Johns Hopkins University relies directly upon Federal support for 86 percent of its budget. Fifty-eight percent of Johns Hopkins School of Medicine's total budget is also directly related to Federal funds. Last year this institution, which I submit is world renowned in the field of medical training, incurred a deficit of \$2.5 million. There is no doubt that this deficit will continue to grow unless we act with resolution to restore the money that is so badly needed for these programs.

As I have said time and time again, we in the Congress simply must take the proper action to reverse the mistake in judgment that has been made by the administration in submitting to us inadequate requests for funds for these programs. The Nation, and particularly my State must have more trained medical professionals. The hospitals and medical centers in all of our communities are responding to greater requests for community services. This is especially true in those institutions which, like ours in Baltimore, are located in the ghetto areas of the inner city. While these institutions and their dedicated staffs are trying to cope with the grave burdens of the communities in which they are located, they are at the same time attempting to carry out their traditional role in furnishing highly educated and badly needed trained health care professions. We, in the Congress, simply must make a maximum effort today to assist them. By voting for the Boland amendment, we can go a long way in lightening the load that these dedicated institutions are now carrying valiantly and at the same time we will preserve for the Nation's future these most valuable institutions.

I should like to include at this point a letter I sent this morning to Members of the House hopefully clarifying the confusion concerning the allocation of Hill-Burton moneys contained in the bill:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1970.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The House will consider, shortly after noon today, the HEW appropriations bill.

In the debate on the Boland Health Emergency Amendment on the floor yesterday, there seemed to be some confusion about the Hill-Burton portion. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to report the following facts:

1. The Hill-Burton bill, which the Congress recently passed and then re-passed over the President's veto, authorizes \$317.5 million in construction grants for fiscal year 1971. The FY 71 Labor/HEW appropriations bill recommended by the Committee contains only \$172.2 million for Hill-Burton construction grants. The Boland Health Emergency Amendment would add \$80 million, producing a total of \$252.2 million for construction grants—still \$65.3 million short of the amount recently authorized by the Congress.

2. The Director the Hill-Burton program, Dr. Harold Granning, originally recommended to HEW an appropriation of \$295 million for

construction grants (see page 981, Part 2, of the Labor/HEW Subcommittee Hearings) for FY 71. Even with the Boland amendment added to the Committee's bill, the appropriation for hospital construction grants would fall \$42.8 million short of the amount recommended by Dr. Granning.

3. The amount recommended in the Committee bill for construction grants in fiscal year 1971, \$172.2 million, is the exact amount allocated to the States in FY 70 for this purpose and is \$95 million less than the amount allocated to the States in FY 69.

The attached exhibit, pages 1034 and 1035 of the Subcommittee Hearings, shows the allocations made to each State under the Hill-Burton formula for FY 69 and FY 70 (the FY 71 column is no longer valid, since the Committee changed the HEW request). The Boland amendment would bring the appropriation for construction grants up to within \$15 million of the FY 69 allocations and the amounts allocated to the States in 1969 approximate those for 1971 under the Boland amendment.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

EXHIBIT I

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION—ALLOCATIONS TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION OF HOSPITALS AND RELATED HEALTH FACILITIES

	Fiscal year—		
	1969	1970	1971
Total.....	267,200,000	172,200,000	80,000,000
Alabama.....	7,005,701	4,350,943	2,040,991
Alaska.....	750,000	750,000	250,000
Arizona.....	2,467,602	1,656,199	716,573
Arkansas.....	3,891,932	2,554,781	1,151,434
California.....	14,779,536	10,238,841	5,236,743
Colorado.....	2,682,931	1,755,543	804,022
Connecticut.....	2,610,629	1,497,679	647,631
Delaware.....	750,000	750,000	250,000
District of Columbia.....	753,261	750,000	250,000
Florida.....	8,946,150	5,796,957	3,268,453
Georgia.....	7,685,927	4,903,527	2,480,525
Hawaii.....	918,430	762,436	283,941
Idaho.....	1,176,508	883,241	355,560
Illinois.....	9,624,188	6,123,740	2,966,106
Indiana.....	6,339,872	3,988,147	2,110,566
Iowa.....	4,141,118	2,350,760	1,138,468
Kansas.....	3,208,948	2,030,019	1,040,107
Kentucky.....	5,803,489	3,665,450	1,583,044
Louisiana.....	6,408,161	4,250,683	2,037,198
Maine.....	1,720,767	1,078,682	411,188
Maryland.....	3,808,534	2,358,744	1,138,676
Massachusetts.....	6,418,828	3,966,314	1,743,194
Michigan.....	9,776,282	5,785,780	2,769,911
Minnesota.....	4,965,955	3,101,058	1,425,570
Mississippi.....	5,215,299	3,115,171	1,562,563
Missouri.....	6,522,793	4,094,288	1,878,165
Montana.....	1,207,709	818,782	309,839
Nebraska.....	2,129,987	1,214,719	529,698
Nevada.....	750,000	750,000	256,321
New Hampshire.....	1,026,781	781,445	295,897
New Jersey.....	6,780,060	4,311,839	1,926,414
New Mexico.....	1,627,754	1,160,105	482,599
New York.....	16,269,443	10,603,987	5,234,727
North Carolina.....	9,590,783	5,972,147	2,641,340
North Dakota.....	1,162,397	823,436	311,468
Ohio.....	12,482,715	7,684,355	3,499,662
Oklahoma.....	4,070,651	2,643,383	1,264,316
Oregon.....	2,435,829	1,624,095	728,882
Pennsylvania.....	15,993,888	9,807,233	3,981,546
Rhode Island.....	1,106,654	810,289	306,929
South Carolina.....	5,389,551	3,420,560	1,763,132
South Dakota.....	1,294,255	850,895	320,803
Tennessee.....	7,775,041	4,757,268	2,268,206
Texas.....	17,041,903	10,972,317	5,208,621
Utah.....	1,525,267	1,136,577	464,868
Vermont.....	872,692	750,000	251,647
Virginia.....	7,077,729	4,498,586	1,931,077
Washington.....	3,563,420	2,267,889	1,068,381
West Virginia.....	3,640,110	2,290,219	995,913
Wisconsin.....	5,353,621	3,362,670	1,505,086
Wyoming.....	750,000	750,000	250,000
American Samoa.....	69,233	51,175	125,000
Guam.....	394,908	375,000	125,000
Puerto Rico.....	7,069,778	4,577,046	2,161,949
Trust territories.....			125,000
Virgin Islands.....	375,000	375,000	125,000

¹ Includes \$30,000,000 for direct loans.

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. Chairman, I support and I earnestly hope a very great majority of the Members will approve this emergency health amendment to

sensibly and moderately increase the funds, in this Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare bill, for urgently needed medical manpower programs, Hill-Burton hospital construction grants, community mental health centers, and the National Heart and Lung Institute.

These and other item increases in this bill are recommended as the minimum amounts necessary to help relieve the critical national shortages in medical manpower, hospital space, and research projection.

Among the very long and most impressive list of medical and other organizations urging the adoption of this amendment are the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Public Health Association, the American Dental Association, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Nation's Health Crisis, the AFL-CIO, the UAW, the Urban Coalition, and the Center for Community Affairs.

These, and others, are authoritative and persuasive witnesses by themselves, but most of us in the Congress also have personal knowledge of the extreme shortages that presently exist in medical manpower facilities and research. For instance, in my home city of Worcester, Mass., the new and urgently needed University of Massachusetts Medical School has an approved outstanding, but unfunded, health manpower grant in the amount of \$16,540,000 that is vital to the school's operation. The Framingham, Mass., Heart Disease Epidemiology Research Study is being phased out by the National Heart and Lung Institute, for lack of some \$100,000 in funding, despite and against the advice and recommendations of the foremost cardiovascular authorities in the Nation who have openly and publicly stated that this heart study is at the peak of its generating point of special and invaluable medical benefit return, for the very moderate investment involved, to the American people; and many hospitals and community centers in our State and region have a woeful lack of space and professionally trained personnel to even come close to responding to the ever-increasing medical care and treatment demands being made upon them. The same situation exists in almost every other area of the country.

Let it be clearly understood that all the respected and responsible authorities, individual and organizational, who are advocating and supporting this amendment are well aware of the economic circumstances that surround us today, and they are not lending their prestige and reputations in favor of an imprudent and unwise projection of government spending. On the contrary, they are striving to focus administration and congressional attention upon the economic and social urgency of establishing and choosing priorities of spending in the public and national interest. They very deeply believe, as so many of us do, that when money is tight, either in the family or a government, basic human needs must come before doubtful and unnecessary material needs.

According to accepted and acknowledged experts, there is a tremendous urgency for additional funds in this bill

to even provide for the minimum health requirements of all of our citizens. The increases suggested and recommended in this amendment are rock-bottom amounts and constitute only a "low profile" response to the medical care crisis enveloping our Nation today. No one has to tell anyone in this country about the staggering advances in medical costs, at all levels, that have occurred in our society in modern times and which seem to be almost daily mounting. The funding action we are suggesting now will obviously serve, in the long run, to encourage the quickest possible minimum increase in the desperately needed nationwide supply of health care and will also serve to head off the medical cost spiral that tops the list of inflationary pressures on the current economy. Let us, then, in common sense and common concern, dedicate our efforts, in these times, to continuing reductions in areas of unproductive, doubtful, and not immediately essential exploratory and experimental spending areas while we take prudent and responsible action, here, today, to meet the minimum health and medical care requirements of the great majority of the American people by overwhelmingly adopting this pending emergency health amendment.

Mr. VANIK, Mr. Chairman, I will cast my vote in favor of the emergency health amendment which will attempt to provide increased appropriations for the vital health programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The acceptance of this amendment will be the very minimum that we can do to meet the very real medical care crisis facing America.

The extra money provided by this amendment will do a great deal to provide an increased supply of trained health workers and professional personnel. By increasing the supply of health workers and facilities it will help head off further increases in the spiraling cost of medical care.

We in the Greater Cleveland community are acutely aware of the enormous pressures which exist in the area of medical training. Case-Western Reserve Medical School in my congressional district has been among the most severely affected because of lack of adequate funding. Fortunately, the State of Ohio has provided a degree of emergency funding for this year. But the financial situation at this medical school, and others, for the coming semester is indeed very bleak. Even if this proposed level of funding were to become effective immediately, the shortage of facilities, trained teachers and scholarship assistance is so severe that it will be impossible for our medical schools significantly to increase the number of enrollees because of increased operations costs and development time required to become fully operational.

It is inconceivable to me that the administration would in the name of fighting inflation, seek to cut back the funding for this vital bill, in light of the severe shortage of trained medical personnel and vast increase in the need for medical services. As far back as October of 1965, I pleaded that the Government assist with vastly increased training and scholarship

programs in medical training to meet the predictable increases in need for services because of the implementation of the medicare and medicaid programs. There was no such response.

Simultaneously, large numbers of aging medical training facilities became unusable. Medical services for the general population of this country increased dramatically and what is worse, the number of available skilled medical personnel remained relatively static.

There are, Mr. Chairman, only four medical schools in the entire State of Ohio, the fifth largest State in the Union. I am continually chagrined at the high number of fine, academically talented young men and women who are unable to enter a medical school because the schools' places have been entirely filled. Time and again, Mr. Chairman, these rejected students must turn to other professional studies since it is impossible for them to defer further education while they await an opening at some unspecified time in the future.

Our community and the Nation cannot allow this shameful denial of education

and training to continue when we so badly require thousands of doctors and other trained medical personnel to meet present medical service needs.

The money provided for the training of future physicians today, the money provided for expanded health research now, will pay off tomorrow in thousands upon thousands of lives being saved.

We are in a health crisis.

We are the richest nation in the world and yet we permit ourselves to rank 13th in terms of infant mortality.

Seven years ago it was estimated that we needed \$3.2 billion to modernize our Nation's hospitals. Today we need \$11 billion to modernize our Nation's hospitals.

In manpower, this country needs 48,000 more doctors than it has today. We need 17,800 more dentists; 150,000 more nurses; 266,000 more "allied health personnel"—technicians, therapists, and other medical aides.

Yet we are failing to meet this health crisis.

For example, the President recently vetoed this year's amendments extending

the Hill-Burton hospital construction program and providing for an expanded program of emergency room improvement, loans to hospitals for expansion and other needed improvements. Fortunately, the Congress repassed that legislation over the President's veto. Despite this evidence of the Congress's concern for health programs, the administration requested only \$50 million for hospital construction grants in fiscal year 1971—the fiscal year that began a month ago. The Appropriations Committee of the House is to be commended for increasing this figure to \$172 million. And yet this figure is totally inadequate when you consider that in 1968 almost \$300 million was appropriated for this program, \$250 million in 1969, and \$172 million—the same amount as recommended by the committee for this 1971 fiscal year—in fiscal year 1970. Each year the figure has gone down, but the need, the demand, has gone up.

The following community hospital needs of Cuyahoga County are being deferred because of the severe limitations of Federal funds:

PROJECTS WHICH COULD BE APPROVED UNDER THE HOSPITAL MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, IF THERE WERE NO LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL FUNDS— FISCAL YEARS 1971 AND 1972

STATE: OHIO

[Listed by category—Example: All general hospitals listed together, all long-term care facilities, all PHC, etc.]

Category of facility	Location		Name of facility	New facility	Re-model and re-place	Addition	Addition and re-model	Addition and re-place	Addition, re-place and re-model	Re-model only	Re-place only	Beds provided	Estimated cost (in thousands) Federal share		
	County	City											Total cost	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972
General (equipment only)	Cuyahoga	Cleveland	Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital						X			4,100	1,367		
Do	do	Garfield Heights	Marymount Hospital			X						75	17,500	1,667	
Do	do	Parma	Parma Community Hospital			X						76	2,500		833
Do	do	Cleveland	Forest City Hospital				X					16	5,034	1,678	
ODH—Medical facility	do	do	do									98			
Do	do	Bay Village	Bay View Hospital			X						102	8,000		2,667
Modernization	do	Cleveland	Polyclinic Hospital								X	60	6,000	2,000	667
Do	do	do	University Hospitals							X		200	9,000		3,000
Do	do	do	St. Luke's Hospital							X		304	22,500	7,500	
Do	do	do	Brentwood Hospital							X		280	1,365		453
Do	do	do	Southwest General Hospital							X		67	1,000		333
Do	do	do	University Hospitals						X			160	8,000		2,667
Rehabilitation	do	do	United Cerebral Palsy	X									12,500	4,167	
Long-Term	do	Warrensville Heights	Brentwood Hospital							X			1,842	829	
Do	do	Chagrin Falls	Divine Redeemer Manor					X					51	1,000	333
Do	do	Cleveland	Scidem Nursing Home				X						81	1,500	500
Do	do	Cleveland	Scidem Nursing Home				X						120	2,400	800

1 Phase I.
2 Phase II.
3 Additional.

4 Modernize.
5 ECF.

In the area of health manpower there has been a similar failure. The administration requested \$12 million for direct loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and other professional health fields. This figure is approximately half that carried in the 1970 fiscal year appropriation act. Similarly, the administration requested \$9.6 million for direct loans funds for nurses—down \$6.7 million from last year. Although this is an area where we desperately need trained professionals and although this is an area where the cost of training is very high, the percentage of students being helped has declined drastically. In 1968, 37 percent of all health professional students were receiving assistance. Under the administration's proposal, that percentage would decline to 14 percent.

The emergency health amendment, a package amendment being offered today and which I hinted to support would provide the following increased assistance in the following areas: Medical manpower institutional support and student loans, health educational facilities construction, Hill-Burton direct grant program, community mental health centers, staffing grants, National Heart and Lung Institute, pilot dental care projects for needy children, grants to medical school libraries.

This is expensive; this is costly. At stake is the quality of health care for each of us and those we care about, now and in the future.

This package amendment, providing additional sums to meet the emergency medical crisis facing the Nation, has

been put together after careful study by members of the House Appropriations Committee. The men sponsoring this amendment have given careful study to the Nation's health needs. This extra money can and will be used carefully and wisely to save lives and improve the health of all of us.

I would like to commend the Appropriations Committee for their general support of the National Institutes of Health. The committee has supported each of the divisions of the National Institutes so that the program levels of last year can be maintained and in many cases improved. The administration requested a 6-percent increase in the research components of NIH which, as the committee stated in its report, "is likely not enough to offset the inflation which af-

fects research costs even more than those of other activities." It stated:

For regular research grants, the main source of support for biomedical research throughout the country, the budget allows an increase of less than 3.4 percent. For research training grants, a prime investment in the future, there is virtually no increase at all and funds for research fellowships are actually decreased by 4.2 percent.

The process of slow attrition has already resulted in slowing the pace of research.

The committee demonstrated its concern over this curtailment of research on cancer, stroke, arteriosclerosis, arthritis, diabetes, epilepsy, lobar pneumonia, and countless other terrible and deadly diseases by providing that all NIH research components were restored to at least their fiscal year 1970 program level.

The committee made special increases in the funds available for the National Cancer Institute. It provided \$25 million more than the administration requested and nearly \$50 million more than appropriated in fiscal 1970. This extra money is particularly important in light of recent findings of cancers caused by chemicals. We are exposed to a large number of chemicals in our polluted environment—and new chemicals are being added to the environment nearly every day. Approximately 1,000 chemicals produce cancers in animals and some 30 of these are cancer causing in man. We must maintain adequate research to detect those chemicals which are cancer causing and to prevent their wide-scale deployment in our industrial society.

The committee is also to be commended for its continued support of the National Heart and Lung Institute. Each year some 160,000 men under age 65 die from heart attacks. It is estimated that this figure could be substantially reduced if arteriosclerosis—the degenerative blood-vessel disease, characterized by a gradual narrowing of vital blood channels by fatty substances—could be prevented or its damage reversed. Recent NIH study on primates has shown that arteriosclerosis can be reversed. A great deal of research remains to be done, however, before we will know whether this process can be reversed in human blood vessels. The money for that research must not be denied.

The committee has also continued support for research by the National Institute of Dental Research. Dental decay remains one of the major American health problems. For every 100 Army inductees, it has been found that 600 fillings, 112 extractions, 40 bridges, 21 crowns, 18 partial dentures, and one full denture are required. The Institute of Dental Research is working on ways of ending the dental decay problem which affects 98 percent of our population. They have been working on methods of protecting teeth, modifying elements in one's diet, and combatting bacteria—perhaps through a new form of immunization.

The list of vital, life-saving research carried on by the National Institutes goes on and on. The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases is working on improvements in artificial

kidney processes, on gout, arthritic disorders and diabetes. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke has made remarkable gains in the cure of Parkinson's disease and is working in the field of epilepsy. The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases is doing remarkable work in an effort to be helpful to the some 22 million Americans who are plagued with some form of allergy—and some forms are extremely troublesome and disabling. This Institute is also working on new vaccines against viruses, tissue transplant rejection, hepatitis, and lobar pneumonia, the latter of which claims the lives of between 25,000 to 40,000 Americans each year.

The bill before us today continues appropriations for many vital programs. In terms of human happiness, in terms of the removal of human suffering, nothing is more important than the continued, expanded, drive to improve the capabilities and quality of American health care.

We must fight inflation and the spiraling cost of government, but we must also fight against ill health and the crippling and deadly diseases which cut short the productivity and the useful and precious lifespan of man.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to increase the appropriation under H.R. 18515 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

This legislation provides the House with an opportunity to affirm our commitment to a new system of domestic priorities which recognizes social programs, particularly in the health and education fields, as high on our agenda for increased activity. The bill before us today contains appropriations for a number of basic programs, including the Hill-Burton and health manpower programs.

The growing concern in our Nation over the health crisis is warranted and increased expenditures to meet this crisis are urgently needed. The enactment of medicare and medicaid in 1965 have caused an increased demand for health services and have pointed up a critical shortage of hospital beds and skilled nursing across the country. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated an immediate need for \$11 billion to build new beds and modernize existing beds.

This shortage is a serious problem in the southern part of Queens County, N.Y., where there are no hospitals. The recent closing of Howard Beach Hospital which served 200,000 residents of this area and the conversion of the facility to a drug treatment center by the Governor of New York have aggravated the problem. The only way in which our community can meet the need for hospital beds is through the Federal assistance program. The community itself cannot meet the expense of construction nor can normal philanthropic sources cover this cost.

The Hill-Burton program is the proper vehicle for assuring both the necessary

funds and the proper regional planning for health facilities. Unless we fund this program adequately, we will simply make the hospital bed shortage more critical and increase the costs of solving this problem in the future. Construction and modernization requirements have already tripled in the last 10 years.

Manpower needs must also be met by increased appropriations for the shortage of health personnel is the root cause of the health crisis. The statistics have been quoted over and over again. We need 50,000 more doctors, 18,000 more dentists, 150,000 more nurses, and 270,000 additional allied health personnel. These shortages will increase at rapid rates unless we commit ourselves to a meaningful program of action today.

These are some of the serious problem areas which H.R. 18515 should be attempting to solve and I support the Boland amendment as a needed boost to the purpose and intent of this appropriation measure as I supported these amendments in full committee as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment to add funds to the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill in order to meet the bare minimum needs of nine important health programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I particularly call attention to the area of mental health care. There is a crisis in health care in this country and we must do something to meet it. The \$360 million added by these emergency health amendments will be a beginning of an effort to do something to close the gaps that exist in health care.

It is only a beginning, but it is a step we must take if we are to meet the national goal, as stated by the Nixon administration a year ago:

Effective and dignified health care for every American no matter what his station in life or where he lives.

As that administration report on the Nation's health stated on July 10, 1969:

We cannot accept anything less in this the most affluent society in the world. As long as there are people in this country who are denied essential health services because of poverty, or race, or lack of access for any reason, we have fallen short of our promise as a Nation.

It will be difficult enough, in my opinion, to fulfill the promise of that fine statement even if the amendment is accepted. Without the amendment and the additional emergency funds it will provide, I do not see how we can begin to meet our commitment.

We have many pressing needs in the health area in this country. Our infant mortality rate, while improving, still ranks 16th or so in the world. The infant mortality rate of our nonwhite population is shamefully high and would rank far lower in the nations of the world. We have a shocking shortage of medical personnel. We have a need for twice as many more doctors than we are presently producing. Many of the hospitals of our country, particularly those in our large metropolitan areas, are in a decrepit condition and desperately need

financial assistance if they are to remain open and able to serve their communities. Great municipal hospitals in Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, to name just a few, are having serious problems maintaining their accreditation because they have not been able to secure sufficient funds to modernize obsolete and worn-out facilities.

The emergency health amendments will add the needed funds to help meet these problems. These amendments will also give additional funds to the National Heart and Lung Institutes which is carrying on valuable work in searching for ways of cutting down the toll from the Nation's leading killer, heart disease. These amendments will aid in the construction of educational, research, and library facilities in the various fields of health. Funds appropriated by these amendments will assist the National Library of Medicine in its important programs of support for medical libraries throughout the country.

In addition to providing funds to combat physical illnesses, the emergency health amendments will support the continuing battle against mental illness, our Nation's No. 1 health problem. When one considers that more than one-half of our Nation's hospital beds are occupied by mental patients, the enormity of the problem becomes apparent. Since 1963, when the community mental health centers program began, we have made enormous progress toward the goal of making comprehensive mental health care available to all Americans, at centers not far from their homes.

Continuing provisions for mental health care, however, especially staffing grants must be included or this progress to date will be stymied. Particularly will the development of the community mental health center program suffer if the \$60 million currently proposed for staffing centers and \$20 million carried over from last year for construction of centers are passed without substantial increase. The former sum is insufficient to continue fully the present staffing commitments and will not enable the operation of a single new center.

Since Queens is the only major borough in New York without a mental health center, I am greatly concerned about the crippling effect such a limiting of funds would have. The proposed Jamaica-South Flushing Mental Health Center will never reach fruition if the increase is not appropriated, and the work of hundreds of concerned Queens residents, and the hopes of thousands will not be realized. It would be indeed sad for the mental health of our communities if such a promising law as Public Law 91-211, passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress, would be thwarted by failure to appropriate sufficient funds to implement it.

Though the need for mental health care is great, at times the cost may be discouraging. However, when the cost is put into perspective and one considers the cost in dollars as compared to the cost in human suffering, it appears that mental health programs are indeed a

bargain. We must keep this perspective and continually provide the necessary support.

These are all important health programs, and they do not get adequate funds under the appropriations bill as it has been reported to this body. If we, as a House of Congress, are going to do our part to help fulfill the promise of the United States as a nation dedicated to the idea that health care should be a right accessible to all, then we must support this amendment. I shall vote for it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 18515) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to the bill, H.R. 18515.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why we are leaving the House at 4:30 o'clock in the afternoon when we are really in the middle of our workday. Can someone tell me why we are dropping this important discussion in midstream? I would like to know the reason. Why must we adjourn this early and come back early tomorrow morning? Is there any answer to this?

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Of course, I accept the comment of the gentleman from Ohio in the spirit in which he asks the question. The answer is that the President of the United States has asked some Republicans, about half of us, to come down to the White House for a reception.

Mr. VANIK. Is that the reason we adjourned early yesterday? I was shocked to find the House adjourning at 4:30

o'clock yesterday afternoon, again in the middle of a very important matter of business. Was there something going on yesterday?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; the answer is the same.

Mr. VANIK. I would certainly hope that these items of entertainment or whatever else goes on would occur in such a way that it would not interfere with the business of the House. We are here, first of all, to legislate and to get our business done. I just do not feel happy about having our work terminated in the middle of the afternoon.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am very happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I was wondering—I was told that rather than a reception, it was a picture-taking session. Would that be correct? What my father refers to as a sheepdip?

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE)?

There was no objection.

HONEST DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an article, dated July 11, 1970, written by Mr. Ray Marton, associate editor of the Dominion News, a newspaper published in the city of Morgantown, W. Va.

It occurred to me that the Members of the House would be interested in reading this informative article which substantiates the fact that in America, there is always room for an honest difference of opinion.

While I was not present and, therefore, do not have any knowledge concerning the meeting held in Black Eagle, W. Va., I do fully agree with the report of this meeting as outlined so clearly by Mr. Martin.

The fact remains that there are three members of the board of trustees who administer the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund. One member represents the United Mine Workers; one member represents the coal producers who pay into this fund from royalties; and the third member represents the public interest and, as such, has been designated to serve as administrator of this program.

As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that when the contract between management and labor is signed, it is required that the name of the members of the board of trustees be included in the contract.

This article further points out that some of those promoting dissension in the coal fields have their eyes and minds on something other than the health and welfare of the miners and, in my opinion, the existing contract should be

honored by both sides in view of the urgent need for the continued production of coal which is absolutely vital to our Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do include this informative article written by Mr. Ray Martin for all to see:

PHONY MINERS IMPERIL NATION

(By Ray Martin)

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.—It is not possible to cast your eyes down the boardwalk of this oceanfront community, which is celebrating its 100th birthday, and look at the string of lights and assorted devices, which depend on electricity, hence coal, without being reminded of the trouble brewing in the coal fields of West Virginia and other coal producing states.

As the battle cry was sounded in southern West Virginia for a new round of pickets to appear at the mines Sunday night, I couldn't avoid recalling some of the factual discoveries I've made during the past few weeks.

The willingness of some of the persons promoting this strike to distort facts is absolutely incredible.

For instance, miners who met in Black Eagle, W. Va., were told that there could be no increase in pension benefits because W. A. (Tony) Boyle spent UMWA Welfare and Retirement Funds in his campaign to defeat the late Joseph (Jock) Yablonski. This statement was designed, of course, to make the miners madder than a school of piranha fish.

If there was a shred of truth in that particular charge against Boyle, I'm sure that the other two trustees of the UMWA Welfare Fund would have exposed the UMWA president by now and had him placed in a padlocked cell. I suggest that the coal industry and the Fund put that yarn to rest in the following fashion: 1. The industry, through the National Coal Association, prepare a list of company remittances to the Fund starting in 1969 and continuing up to date. 2. That the Fund issue a statement of its income and expenditures for the same period of time, with a detailed accounting for monies spent for other than pension checks and payment of miners' medical bills.

I wonder how many miners and mines were the victims of a fraud when the effort was made to close the mines last month? I use the word "fraud" in its truest sense. Some of the mines were closed by persons who probably never saw a piece of coal, except to shovel it into a furnace—if then. Miners at the various mines would do themselves a favor if they requested to see the picket's dues card.

In that regard, I disagree with the suggestion made by a Wheeling newspaper that Boyle should oust the dissident members of the UMWA. Even if a majority of those involved were card-carrying unionists, such a move wouldn't solve the current problems.

I'm just about convinced that some of those promoting dissension in the coal fields have their eyes and minds on something other than the health and safety of the miners on whose backs they're walking and jumping. Why do they show up at meetings with current lists of coal reserves at electrical power plants? Why are some of them trying to discredit me in the eyes of miners who have fought tooth and nail for increased safety? Why are they trying to drive a wedge between this writer and the Yablonski family? Why are these people trying to divide the loyalties of the miners?

While members of the Yablonski family and I do not agree completely with each other's theories with respect to Jock's murder and a few other items, there's a mutual respect for the right of each of us to stick with our own individual thoughts.

I suspect that one of the major causes of dissension in the coal fields today is the

handiwork of a chap who is quite adept at impersonating key personalities on the telephone. The FBI should catch up with this fellow any day now.

As for those persons who are trying to close the mines down as some sort of tangential move related to the cause that Jock Yablonski espoused, I would remind them of his admonitions against striking at the rally at Sophia, W. Va. He did an excellent job at halting a strike that day that some of the very same coal field proachers, who are at work today, tried to foment.

The coal miners of West Virginia and the nation have many valid complaints against their union, some elements of the coal industry and the government itself. With proper action, these complaints can be resolved. Blind obedience and response to persons with ulterior motives is not the course to success, however.

Mike Trbovich, national chairman of Miner's for Democracy, has assured me that he is not a candidate for the presidency of the UMWA, if and when a new election is ordered by the court. This should put to rest one of the gimmicks being used to divide miners in West Virginia.

Kenneth Yablonski, speaking for himself and his brother, Chip, said they have no candidate for the union presidency. "We are not partners to a dictatorship, that's what our father fought. We want the miners to have the right to pick their own candidates," Yablonski said.

J. Richard Lucas of Carmichaels, Pa., will bow out of the picture as President Nixon's choice as the successor to Bureau of Mines Director Jack O'Leary. Besides being too close to the coal industry, key senators decided his span of knowledge was too limited for the post to which he was appointed by the President. A direct announcement of Lucas' withdrawal should also ease tension in the coal fields.

The current best bet as O'Leary's successor is Thomas A. Henrie, director of the Bureau of Mines Metallurgy Lab at Reno, Nevada.

The real shocker of recent days is a decision by Judge Howard F. Corcoran in the U.S. District Court in Washington. He rejected a petition filed by Joseph L. Rauh Jr. which sought to compel the UMWA to pay his legal fees for representing Jock Yablonski during the union's election campaign. During the campaign, Rauh publicly said he was serving as Yablonski's attorney without pay.

In rejecting Rauh's request, the judge said: "This court is not satisfied that the suits instituted by Yablonski and dismissed by the court were intended to or did benefit the union except in the most indirect and theoretical way. Rather, the suits were brought with the primary purpose of aiding Yablonski in his election bid. Accordingly, there is no basis for the award of attorney's fees and they will be denied."

MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT TRUST FUNDS

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, staff writer Hobart Rowen quoted an unidentified White House official who indicated that the deficit in fiscal 1972 may be so large that the administration has started a study of how it might control the so-called uncontrollable portion of Federal spending.

The official is credited with suggesting that among things which might be considered is a suspension of the Government's obligation to pay interest into some of the trust funds.

This suggestion that the Government reduce its expenditure for interest by withholding interest to the social security, medicare, and unemployment trust funds accounts is a reprehensible attack on the integrity of the trust funds. These trust funds belong to the contributors and are set aside for inviolate purposes. To withhold interest on the public debt held by these funds would constitute a betrayal of the trust responsibility.

If it should become Government policy to "rob" the trust funds of their legal and proper interest—the Government will prove itself an unfit trustee of special funds.

The article is as follows:

WHITE HOUSE MULLS BUDGET BASE CUTS

(By Hobart Rowen)

A White House official said yesterday that the administration is so fearful of a large budget deficit in fiscal 1972 that it has started a study of how it might control the so-called "uncontrollable" portion of Federal spending.

The official said that he was willing to attack even the interest on the national debt, normally considered the most automatic cost item in the budget.

"Even if we make just a little dent in it (the interest cost), it would be worthwhile," he said. He suggested that something might be done "on the money management side." Among questions which might be raised is the Government's obligation to pay interest into some trust funds.

He conceded he did not know how much might be saved, "but when you're dealing with sums of that size, you have to look at all possible devices." He indicated that a study already has been "launched" at the Office of Budget Management.

He also warned against looking for further budget cuts on the military side, because they would have to occur "in the basic funds for the security of the country." Even if there were to be a Vietnam ceasefire within a few months, he added, virtually no more money would be saved out of the current year's fiscal budget.

"There just isn't very much left that is connected with Vietnam," he said. He added later that "a great deal (of cutting expenditures) has already been done in anticipation (of the end of the war)."

The interest cost of the national debt for fiscal 1971 currently is estimated at \$20.8 billions.

Other Government programs considered uncontrollable that the official said would be examined closely for possible savings are: health, social security, farm subsidies, and veterans benefits. In some of these cases, he noted, payments may be based on formulas that are no longer valid. In almost all cases, the Administration would have to go to Congress to accomplish its purpose.

The somewhat desperate move against the uncontrollable part of the budget (estimated to be 68 to 70 percent of the total) is part of an Administration effort to focus attention on its charge that Congress is letting spending get out of hand.

One Administration spokesman said that if Congress continues to pass appropriations bills running far beyond the President's recommendations, "new taxes (for the fiscal 1972 year) will be the only choice."

Another official, however, said "higher taxes would be the very last thing that I want to come to in any circumstances."

Coincidentally, the Administration passed the word that the Housing and Urban Development appropriation, which runs to \$1.2 billion above the Nixon recommendation, is "a ripe candidate for a veto."

IT IS TIME TO GET THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT OUT OF CONFERENCE AND PASS IT SO THAT WE CAN PROVIDE MILITARY HELP TO ISRAEL BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to express to my colleagues in the House my very profound conviction that we must move swiftly in this Congress to get the Foreign Military Sales Act, H.R. 15628, out of the conference committee and get it promptly enacted into law, because it happens to be the only practical, realistic, and effective way to supply the planes and other armaments which Israel desperately needs to preserve her independence in the Middle East today in the face of Soviet aggressive pressure.

Time, in that vital area of the world, Mr. Speaker, is in my judgment, fast running out.

It has long been obvious that Israel cannot survive in the Middle East against the combined pressure of the Arabs and Soviet military power, unless the United States is prepared to supply Israel—as the Russians have long been supplying the Arabs—with the military hardware, especially the high performance jet aircraft, which are essential for her survival. I have repeatedly urged President Nixon over the past several months to provide Israel with the 50 Phantom F-4 jets which we have promised to deliver to her.

My information today is that we have now begun to release these jets to her, on a dribble-by-dribble basis, surreptitiously, apparently so as not to upset the Russians, who somehow never seem to worry about such niceties. The trouble with this snail's pace supply line is not only that it moves much too slowly to meet Israel's desperate needs. What is even more serious, by keeping our decision to complete our deliveries to Israel secret, we lose all the very beneficial results of letting the Russians and the Arab world know clearly and unequivocally that we are behind the Israelis and do not intend to let them go down the drain for lack of sophisticated, modern military hardware. In other words, we are deliberately throwing away the deterrent power of our action and thereby, ironically, increasing rather than decreasing the chances of war in the Middle East by our pussyfooting tactics.

Once the 50 Phantom deal has been completed, however, we will have run out of legislative authority to finance further sales of military hardware unless the Foreign Military Sales Act is speedily enacted into law. This is the bill the House passed back on March 24, 1970, with an amendment specifically backing up our commitment to Israel and providing the vitally needed legislative authority to provide arms to Israel on other than a strict cash-on-the-barrelhead basis, in fact setting up the working machinery required for us to provide to Israel what she needs and must have to protect herself.

That bill passed the House over-

whelmingly by a vote of 351 to 26. Curiously the minority of 26 included my distinguished opponent, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BURTON) who recently made a mass mailing in the 29th District to voters of the Jewish faith in which he strongly expressed his support for military aid to Israel but carefully refrained from telling these voters of his March 26 vote against the legislation which would provide the practical financing for this assistance, as well as explaining to them how he could at the same time favor aid to Israel yet be opposed to the only piece of legislation which could make that assistance a reality. How one can face two different ways on this issue is beyond me.

But those Members of the House who seem to think you can somehow make bricks without straw will have another opportunity—and I hope it will be an early one—to vote for Israel as well as issue releases for Israel. The Foreign Military Sales Act is the one that was held up in the Senate for 7 weeks while the so-called Cooper-Church amendment on Cambodia was debated at extended length. It is now pending in a House-Senate conference committee where the Cooper-Church battle threatens to delay it even further.

Perhaps if the vital correlation between this bill and the future of Israel were better understood, perhaps if some of those Members who propose to support Israel would also support the legislation that would make this defense possible, instead of voting against it and loading it down with controversial amendments, we might get this measure enacted into law before the situation in the Middle East has deteriorated beyond the point of no return.

FEDS IN THE SCHOOLHOUSE DOOR

(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, on Friday of last week Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina, in a speech before the U.S. Senate, soundly denounced the Nixon administration's announced policy, proposed by the Justice Department, to send, in the Senator's language "100 carpetbagging lawyers into the South for the purpose of assuring forced integration of public schools."

Mr. Speaker, I join the Senator from South Carolina in his opposition to this proposal which certainly indicates a lack of confidence in school officials in my State and throughout the South in their efforts to abide by the edicts of the Federal courts.

The one thing that we need least in my State is Federal agents snooping around and poking their noses further into the operation of our school system. Alabama officials, from the Governor of my State on down through the county superintendents of education and the members of the county and city school boards are doing their very best to comply with the court orders. I strongly urge the President to rescind this announced intention of the Justice Department.

In connection with this, the Montgomery Advertiser's lead editorial "Feds in the Schoolhouse Door" points up in a most enlightening manner that we have no need for these proposed Federal school watchers.

FEDS IN THE SCHOOLHOUSE DOOR

Back in the early days of school desegregation, southern politicians were properly denounced, in their states and nationally, when they recklessly predicted trouble before schools opened under new integration orders.

We were among those who said this was an open invitation, inciting the lawless. It was designed to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. If individuals didn't take the cues, governors were then obligated to intercede to prevent the "trouble" they had predicted. This happened in Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, etc.

That era has largely ended. The South is perplexed and angered to the extreme by sectional enforcement of the law of the land—Dixiland, that is. But as a general statement, most recent school desegregation orders, however resented, have been obeyed.

Now the federal government has announced, well in advance of school opening, that it will stand in the schoolhouse door, by sending platoons of Justice Department attorneys and other gaudiers to the South, including Montgomery.

The announcement was perhaps intended as a deterrent to trouble, but it is of a piece with the aforementioned predictions by southern politicians in years past.

Thus it is an incitement which is unwelcome and unwise, and can only exacerbate the resentment of a people who see themselves beset from all sides by the zealous imposition of Reconstruction II. (Some "southern strategy.")

It would have been normal prudence for the Justice Department to have contingency plans and personnel on standby alert in the event of any efforts by a small band of thugs to frustrate court orders. That is standard procedure.

But to announce the dispatch of a kind of new Freedman's Bureau to the Deep South is so provocative we can only conclude that the Justice Department is either very stupid or so intent on having some rebellion to put down it may want one—just as our southern demagogues wanted trouble in those early days of integration.

Montgomery, specifically mentioned as one of the beachheads for the feds, without the prior knowledge of United States Attorney Ira DeMent, is particularly offensive. Time and time again Montgomery has been praised for complying with court orders and for working out acceptable plans. The school board—and, by clear implication, all citizens—has been lavishly complimented by Judge Johnson and the Judges of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

But the integration hawks in the Justice Department have been itching for a piece of the action. Peace and order by compliance are not to the liking of the gung-ho recruits who see in the southern campaign a chance to win their battle stars and ribbons for heroism in a conquered but still hostile province.

We hope and trust they will be disappointed. But we say to them as we said to other demagogues years ago: if there is trouble, you are responsible by reason of deliberate and provocative announcements.

INTRODUCTION OF FOOD STAMP BILL

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Committee on Agriculture by a vote of 27 yeas, 6 noes, and one present, favorably reported the general farm bill to which I made reference yesterday. The committee then voted unanimously to instruct the chairman to introduce a food stamp bill which had been approved as to wording and substance some time ago.

I am today introducing this bill and I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a brief summary of the provisions of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

FOOD STAMPS

The committee has amended in significant fashion H.R. 12222, the Administration sponsored bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended. Foremost among the changes are (1) inclusion of an amendment which would require able-bodied adults to register for and, if available, accept employment as a condition precedent to obtaining stamps; (2) to require payment of at least 50 cents per person per month for program participation, and; (3) to require States to pay a small portion of the cost of the program. A brief summary of the measure follows:

Section 1 broadens the policy of the basic Act by recognizing that limited purchasing power is related to hunger and malnutrition.

Section 2 of the bill consists of definition changes occasioned by substantive amendments, the most significant of which are to expand the program to Puerto Rico, and define "elderly" persons.

Section 3 contains authority to simultaneously operate Food Stamp and Commodity Programs, however individual participants are precluded from simultaneously receiving dual benefits.

Under Section 4 the Secretary of Agriculture in conjunction with the Secretary of HEW is directed to establish uniform national standards for participating households. Separate standards for the American Territories newly covered by the Act, are proscribed.

This section also provides that an able-bodied person between the ages of 18 and 65, except those persons responsible for the care of others, register for and accept employment if it is offered as a condition of eligibility for the household of which he is a member to be eligible for program benefits. No person would, by virtue of the requirement, be forced to accept employment at a struck plant.

Section 5 contains authority for establishing the value of coupons with a minimum monthly payment of at least 50 cents per person per month required of each participant. Outside sources would not be precluded from making the required payment. Authority for the purchase of stamps, on other than a monthly basis, is also contained in this Section, however, it would not allow participants to use that vehicle as a means of obtaining more stamps than they would otherwise be entitled to receive.

The educational outreach provision of the bill is contained in Section 6. Under this section State agencies are directed to initiate educational programs designed to inform potential participants of the program. Deductions for public assistance checks for coupon allotments are also authorized under this Section.

Finally, the Section authorizes persons 60 years of age or older who are participating in the program to use stamps to purchase

meals delivered to them if prepared by an instrumentality of a political subdivision or a nonprofit organization.

Section 7 amends and strengthens present enforcement provisions.

Section 8 of the bill revises the formula by which the Federal government reimburses State agencies for administrative expenses incurred in implementation of the program. The new formula recognizes the need for insuring prompt hearings for aggrieved households who have heretofore been denied an adequate opportunity to appeal denial of entitlement to benefits of the program.

Section 9 of the bill requires participating States to finance a portion of the amount by which the value of coupons issued to households exceeds the amount paid by such households. The rate of State sharing would be 2½ percent for the first year; 5 percent for the second; 7½ percent for the third; and, 10 percent of the fourth and ensuing years.

Section 10 authorizes open-ended appropriations for the program through fiscal year 1973.

Section 11 contains authority to allow ongoing programs to continue to exist until brought into conformity with this bill and gives the Secretary additional authority to extend food assistance to communities without programs.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the committee will meet tomorrow and it is my hope that we may favorably report this bill.

EXCESSIVE SPENDING LOOMS AS CALCULATED IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the big spender label seems to be pinching a little bit, because a lot of the big spenders are squealing and squeaking around here today.

My attention has been invited to an editorial that appeared in the Sunday, July 19, Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch entitled "Excessive Spending Looms as Calculated in Congress." The editorial states:

EXCESSIVE SPENDING LOOMS AS CALCULATED IN CONGRESS

Strange mischief is afoot in the Congress of the United States with regard to needed appropriations to run the federal government. Only one of the 14 bills required to finance national affairs has reached the White House.

There is a growing school of thought that the Democrat-controlled Congress, acutely aware this is an election year, is not as concerned with fiscal responsibility as it is with embarrassing the titular head of the opposite political party, Republican President Nixon.

Leaders of Congress are heard more and more to moan that the President is "ignoring new priorities" while expounding that federal legislators are "responding to the needs of the people."

This is not a new political tactic. In the early 1930s, as the nation was trying to find a way out of the devastating Great Depression, we had a Republican president, Herbert Hoover, and the House was controlled by Democrats.

Then, as now, there were compelling political considerations. And there was mischief. While Mr. Hoover tried to meet necessary obligations, he also attempted to avoid

economic disaster by keeping the federal government solvent.

He sought a reasonably balanced budget. Yet, Treasury Department records show that by the time congressional leaders completed their manipulations, federal expenditures were double actual receipts.

Further, they ignored recovery recommendations by the Hoover administration, but revived many of them after the inauguration of a Democratic president, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1933. History shows the FDR regime accumulated much credit for its so-called "New Deal."

But history also shows the FDR regime planted the seed for excessive government-spending, a mischief being practiced by too many leaders in Congress today.

A tell-tale example of the current thinking is embodied in the recent hassle over aid to hospitals, a highly-emotional issue. The President favored the measure but not the excessively high figure. And especially, he opposed a stipulation that he be "required" to spend the \$2.8 billion total amount within a set period of time. He vetoed the bill, but was overridden by the "new priorities" line of thought.

We are not, as was the case in the early 1930s, fighting our way out of a Great Depression. But there is a very good chance that following a deliberate and calculated path of excessive spending will plunge us into an economic situation far more damaging than a depression.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 18573

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1970, I introduced legislation designed to help law enforcement agencies to cope with the menace of bombings and bomb threats which have afflicted our country in recent months. Twenty-eight of my colleagues joined me in introducing the measure. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary is now conducting hearings on this legislation.

The hearings have demonstrated more than ever the necessity for new measures to control the activities of the anarchists who are using explosives as instruments of terrorism across the land. According to a survey conducted by the Department of the Treasury, between January, 1969 and April, 1970 more than 40,000 bombings, bombing attempts, and bomb threats were reported to law enforcement agencies. The actual bombings, which number more than 4,000 in that period, were responsible for the deaths of 43 people and for \$22.6 million of property damage.

The bill which I introduced in March, H.R. 16699, approaches the problem by providing increased penalties and a broadened scope of the existing Criminal Code provision, 18 U.S.C. 837. This is a necessary approach, but not the only one, if we are to solve the bombing problem. In addition to the deterrence of the criminal statute, we must make it more difficult for the criminal to obtain the materials he needs to make his bombs. There is no doubt that the ease of access to explosive materials has been a contribut-

ing factor in the rash of bombings which we have experienced.

The legislation which I introduced yesterday, H.R. 18573, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior is the proposed Explosives Control Act of 1970. It would complement H.R. 16699 by regulating the importation, manufacture and sale of explosives. Major features of the new legislation, which will be administered by the Secretary of the Interior because most explosives are used in mining operations, are:

Issuance of licenses to importers, manufacturers and dealers in the explosives industry.

Issuance of permits to commercial users of explosives.

Licensees must obtain and record positive identification of purchasers of explosives.

Prohibitions on the sale of explosives to minors, felons, fugitives from justice, drug addicts, and mental defectives.

Prohibitions on the sale of explosives to persons, other than licensees or permittees, who are nonresidents of the State in which the sale is made unless they are residents of a contiguous State that permits such a sale.

Penalties of up to 10 years imprisonment for violations of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there can no longer be any dispute about the need for control of the distribution of explosives. I urge my colleagues to give the legislation which I have introduced prompt and careful consideration.

ELIMINATING AN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION INEQUITY FOR EX-SERVICEMEN

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House a bill that will amend title 5 of the United States Code to eliminate an inequity that some ex-servicemen have run into after their discharge from the military. My bill will change section 8502(b) of title 5 to provide that for the purposes of unemployment compensation all the States shall treat accrued leave of ex-servicemen as wages for past services rather than as current wages constituting a bar to benefit payments. In effect, passage of this proposed legislation would alter the treatment for unemployment compensation purposes of ex-servicemen in 28 States. Today these States deny or hold up unemployment insurance benefits to those men again in the civilian labor market, who receive pay for unused accrued leave. Such pay is considered wages and under that rationale these States deny unemployment benefits for a period determined by the number of days of accrued leave paid by the Federal Government.

This situation was brought to our attention by Henry L. Lacayo, president of Local 887 of the UAW in California.

CXVI—1599—Part 19

It, in turn, had been brought to his attention when one of his local's members was denied unemployment compensation for a 47-day period since he had been paid for 47 days of unused accrued leave—leave to which he was entitled for his 3 years in the armed services, including duty in Vietnam. This young man had resumed his civilian life by returning to work at North American Rockwell where he was previously employed prior to induction into the U.S. Army. Unfortunately, due to economic problems in the aerospace industry and this gentleman's lack of seniority, North American Rockwell was forced to lay him off.

Consequently, he applied for unemployment compensation but was turned down due to the State of California's reading of section 8524 of title 5.

In providing for unemployment insurance coverage for ex-Federal employees and ex-servicemen, it has been the policy of Congress, with respect to the conditions of eligibility for benefits, to require that the provisions of the State unemployment insurance law apply. Section 8502(b) of title 5 of the United States Code requires that:

Compensation shall be paid by the State to a Federal employee in the same amount, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as the compensation which would be payable to him under the unemployment compensation law of the State if his Federal service and Federal wages . . . had been included as employment and wages under that State law.

Section 8521(b) extends the same principle to ex-servicemen.

Congress made an exception to this general rule, however, by specifically requiring that payments for unused accrued leave be deemed to continue the employment of the individual "during the period after the termination with respect to which the individual received the payment." The exception was subsequently deleted with respect to ex-civilian employees of the Federal Government but not with respect to ex-servicemen. An identical provision in both the House and Senate versions of H.R. 14705, a bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program would delete this exception with respect to ex-servicemen by repealing section 8524 of title 5 of the United States Code.

Repeal of section 8524, however, would only delete the requirement that States deny unemployment compensation to ex-servicemen during periods with respect to which the individual received payment for unused accrued annual leave. It would not provide or require States to provide compensation during such periods. Our bill would require the States to treat accrued leave of ex-servicemen as wages for past services. This, in turn, would necessitate uniformity of treatment of these ex-servicemen throughout the United States and stop a form of discrimination that has resulted in part from Federal Government action.

The State legislatures have taken diametrically opposite views as to unemployment compensation eligibility during periods covered by terminal leave.

The laws of 24 jurisdictions consider unused accrued leave to be wages for past services constituting no bar to current benefit payments. The laws of 28 other jurisdictions consider unused accrued annual leave to be current wages constituting a bar to benefit payments; under this concept, the individual is considered to remain fully employed throughout a period with respect to which the unused annual leave is paid and does not become unemployed and eligible to receive benefits until the expiration of such period.

I cannot agree that it was the intention of Congress to penalize ex-servicemen who have honorably served their Nation and who cannot find employment after their discharge. To allow some States to discriminate against these individuals while others take cognizance of the true meaning of payments for accrued leave appears to be a prostitution of the principles underlying such payments. Since we are both in a recession and the number of men discharged from the military grows yearly, revision of existing legislation is necessary. As President Lacayo recently stated:

To deny unemployment benefits to veterans who have chalked up sufficient earnings to qualify is . . . a heartless attitude and a brutal "thank you" for men, many of whom have recently risked their lives in service to their country.

Passage of H.R. 14705 and the repeal of section 8524 of title 5 was a step in the right direction. Enactment of my amendment to section 8502 would result in the States and Federal Government treating those who have completed military service for the United States in a manner more fitting of our Nation. I urge rapid enactment of the bill introduced today.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1970

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the near future this House will have an opportunity of voting on S. 3154, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1970.

In anticipation of that time, I thought Members might be interested in the comments of Mr. James C. McConnon, chairman of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, and two related editorials. Mr. McConnon's remarks, made before the House Republican Task Force on Transportation on June 6, are most pertinent to the problem of urban mass transit and I recommend them highly to my colleagues.

The items follow:

STATEMENT BY JAMES C. MCCONNON

As Chairman of Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, known locally as SEPTA, I appreciate this opportunity to talk with you as you seek to aid the Congress in responding to the urban-transportation challenges of the 1970's.

We in this region, Mr. Chairman, are especially proud of, and grateful to, the "Law-

rences" of your Task Force. These two Pennsylvanians, Congressman Coughlin and Congressman Williams, have worked effectively and tirelessly to improve and strengthen public-transportation facilities in South-eastern Pennsylvania.

Congressman Williams, as you may know, served with distinction for two-and-a-half years as a member of the SEPTA board. Congressman Coughlin was one of the Authority's earliest supporters.

And although he sits on the other side of the aisle in Washington, we would be pleased in not expressing here our appreciation for the efforts in behalf of better transportation of another area worker, Congressman William A. Barrett, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

SEPTA, an agency of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is located near the midpoint of the populous northeastern corridor stretching from Boston to Richmond. It was created to preserve, improve, expand and coordinate public transportation in the City of Philadelphia and the surrounding Pennsylvania counties of Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery, a region with a population of more than four million persons.

SEPTA's transportation system not only serves this region but also interchanges passengers with the Lindenwold rapid-transit line of the Delaware River Port Authority operating in the South Jersey area. SEPTA also operates bus service in New Jersey and, by contract, bus lines in the State of Delaware.

SEPTA-owned facilities and those with which it has contractual relations embrace 166 routes, with 3,200 vehicles operating more than 270,000 miles daily. On a typical weekday passengers number one million one hundred thousand. These facilities comprise the nation's third largest urban-transportation network and include railroad, subway, elevated, bus, trackless-trolley and surface-rail lines.

In the six years of its existence SEPTA has worked to preserve and, to the extent possible, improve commuter-rail and transit services in the region. This has been a demanding task, calling for the reversal of a downhill course shaped by four decades of belt-tightening and neglect on the part of private transportation operators.

In this task we have had the indispensable support of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the City of Philadelphia and the counties of Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery. These have supplied the money needed to keep in being essential railroad services, together with certain suburban bus lines. Local funds to match some \$23 million in federal grants for improvements to commuter-rail facilities are being provided largely by the same sources. And needless to say, gentlemen, we are most grateful for that federal aid.

The City of Philadelphia and Delaware County, it should be noted, have made available the credit backing that enabled SEPTA to acquire from Philadelphia Transportation Company and Philadelphia Suburban Transportation Company the area's two largest transit networks.

The SEPTA region has made extensive local outlays for public-transportation improvement and expansion. The City of Philadelphia, with SEPTA's financial commitment, is building and planning extensions to its Broad Street Subway system at a cost of well over \$100 million. Other locally financed projects have included nearly \$50 million in rapid-transit and commuter-railroad improvements, \$15 million in surface-lines betterments and the excellent \$94-million Lindenwold line.

This metropolitan region has passed the point, however, at which fare-box revenues and the resources of local government are adequate to support acceptable standards of

service and equipment. Thus we must look hopefully to the House of Representatives as it considers the Administration's transit-aid legislation embodied in Bill S. 3154 passed by the Senate last February.

This bill, as you know, would authorize \$3.1 billion over five years, with contract authority, for capital improvements and demonstration projects. For this all urban transportation operators would be grateful.

Even so, the transportation needs of metropolitan areas are so great that they exceed those S. 3154 could satisfy. Thus our first plea to the members of this Task Force is for favorable action on the Administration's transit-aid legislation, S. 3154, now before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. This legislation, gentlemen, must be enacted, as the first step toward adequate support of the nation's urban transportation systems.

An indication of the requirements of the SEPTA region is given by our six-year capital-improvement program. This program, which includes projects of the City of Philadelphia, totals \$613 million. More than \$200 million of this amount must come from the federal government.

This program represents a minimum appraisal of the needs of Southeastern Pennsylvania. It includes urgently needed new railroad commuter cars, streetcars and buses; improvements to railroad stations and subway stations, many of them well over a half-century in age; expanded station parking; railroad and rapid-transit extensions, including a line to the airport; an underground connection between center-city commuter railroad terminals; improved communications facilities, and other necessary projects.

Urban-transportation systems are the providers of needed mobility to countless people, chiefly workers, shoppers and students. To lower-income groups, the elderly and the handicapped, they are especially essential.

These systems, however, exert influence well beyond the bounds of transportation. There is scarcely a major urban problem that cannot be eased to some extent by a strong and healthy local-transport structure.

Good public transportation can link low-income jobseekers with employment opportunities, afford accessibility to new and better city housing, cut down air pollution, reduce traffic congestion, ease student tensions, preserve real-estate tax values, minimize the dislocated business and uprooted homes of expressway construction, maintain the vitality of central business districts and bolster the local economy in many ways.

Thus public transportation has a many-sided involvement in urban society and a potential for mitigating some of its most vexing problems. Because of this, and because local resources (which have been generously committed in this region) are not adequate to the task, we believe there is justification for urging the Congress to provide whatever share of the nation's resources is required to support and improve urban-transportation systems.

To us it is clear that this share must be sufficient to meet not only capital needs but operating costs as well. The latter have risen sharply, as wage rates and prices of materials have spiraled upward. There are big-city systems today on which labor costs alone exceed the entire farebox revenue; here in Philadelphia, on SEPTA's city transit division, the labor-cost proportion has reached 80 per cent.

To attempt to meet this situation by slashing service or boosting fares would defeat the very purposes for which public-transportation agencies exist. Such measures would drive away some passengers. They would inflict inconvenience and additional expense on others, many of whom are already hard-pressed to make ends meet. And a still more harmful imbalance would be

created between travel by public transportation and by the less efficient and more costly-to-the-community method represented by the private automobile.

For example, the public-support program administered by SEPTA has resulted in a 42 per cent increase over the past ten years in ridership on the region's 13 rail-commuter lines. This is a most significant achievement, brought about during a period when the use of virtually all urban-transportation systems was declining. It would cost at least a half-billion dollars to build the necessary additional highways if these railroad commuters were to travel by automobile, an amount many times greater than the cost of the public-support program.

And so, gentlemen, the very preservation of the values of urban transit systems, to say nothing of the improvement of those systems, depends upon sources of support beyond that of the fare-box.

In a little over three weeks a new Department of Transportation will come into being in Pennsylvania combining, under a single administration, several state agencies now functioning in that field. This department, we are certain, will pursue a policy according full recognition to the needs of transit and commuter-railroad users. We believe that such a policy should make provision for some form of broad-based state-tax support for urban transport. This tax, among other things, would provide local matching funds for federal grants.

In summary I would urge the Task Force to consider the following specific points which we feel are vital to the long-range solution of the urban ground-transportation problem:

1. A substantially greater amount of federal money must be invested in mass transportation. While it is indeed impressive that President Nixon has proposed and the Congress is now considering a federal mass-transportation program providing \$3.1 billion for the next five years, which is more than five times greater than the amount of federal spending for this purpose during the past six years, a larger commitment is needed. The major underlying problem we face is the great lack of capital investment over many years, which has not only reduced available operating equipment and reduced service and ridership but has caused the virtual disappearance of the important supporting manufacturing industries so necessary to developing new technology in mass transportation.

2. The amount of local matching funds needed to obtain federal funds should be lowered. Highways funds are available locally on the basis of a 10 per cent investment. There is no reason why mass-transportation funds should require a 33 1/3 per cent, or even 50 per cent, local investment. If there is any justification for the expenditure of federal money for mass transportation, and no one denies that there is, then it should not be siphoned on an artificially restrictive basis which prevents its application where most needed.

3. In considering local funds needed to obtain federal monies for mass transportation, full credit should be given for the past investment which a community has made to keep its transportation system alive. The SEPTA region, comprising the City of Philadelphia and the counties of Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery, has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in capital projects and operating subsidies in order to maintain the network of mass-transportation facilities. This expenditure should be recognized for what it is; namely, an exercise of local responsibility which serves to reduce by vast amounts the outlay of federal money required to rescue mass-transportation systems.

Local communities should be given further credit for the amount of their past local investment in the matching of federal funds.

4. The artificial limitation of 12½ per cent on the amount that any state can receive from federal mass-transportation funds should be removed from Bill S. 3154. The states that have done the most to preserve mass transportation at their own expense, the states which have the greatest total need, such as Pennsylvania, are arbitrarily discriminated against by this artificial limitation. Federal funds should be placed where they are needed to deal with the problem for which they are required.

5. The federal government should continue to recognize and should formally acknowledge the importance of local control of mass-transportation programs. Urban mass-transportation is truly local in nature. While the problem in New York City is similar to the problem in Philadelphia and to the problem in Detroit, Chicago and Los Angeles, none of the urban transportation problems in each of these localities has any effect on any of the others.

The operation of urban transportation is essentially local in nature. This fact has been recognized in Pennsylvania in the establishment of SEPTA under the Metropolitan Transportation Authorities Act of 1963. It was more recently emphasized in the legislation just enacted creating the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation which explicitly provides for local participation in mass-transportation planning and programming.

SEPTA serves as a local regional agency responsive to the requirements of the local governments and people of the region and is further sensitive to local requirements through its cooperation with the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, which is likewise a local regional agency responsive to local problems and needs.

6. The Congress should insist that all revenues derived from interstate activities relating to transportation should be made available in some measure to meet the transportation problems of the region from which the revenues are derived.

In this region the Delaware River Port Authority collects a special use tax in the form of bridge tolls across the Delaware River. It has recently committed these revenues to the construction of the \$94-million Lindenwold Line in South Jersey, an important and valuable public-transportation project. These revenues and all similar interstate revenues should be made available on the same basis to enable the regional transportation agencies to deal with their pressing transportation problems.

This Committee, serving as a Task Force on Transportation, is an important acknowledgement of the responsibility of the federal government in this area. It must be recognized that the billions of dollars which are being spent to develop the highway system that the country needs must be met with comparable expenditures for mass transportation.

Public-transportation systems are the only way to deal with the high peak-hour traffic experienced in metropolitan areas. It is a simple fact that an urban expressway generates more traffic than it can carry. It is a corollary to this fact that unless efficient mass-transportation systems are developed in our urban areas, the vast expenditure of federal funds to build highways in these areas will be wasted.

We wish you gentlemen of the Republican Task Force every success in your important undertaking. Thank you.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, June 8, 1970]

TRANSIT'S CAPTIVE RIDERS

The welcome emphasis now being placed upon urban public transportation is usually linked to the need for persuading travelers

to use commuter trains and buses rather than their automobiles.

But there is a large segment of the urban population for which there is no such choice. This is the group, estimated in and around Philadelphia at more than 500,000 persons, who do not have the use of private automobiles to get to and from their jobs, schools or markets and are thus public transit's captive fares.

Philadelphia's transit engineer, Edison L. Tennyson, makes a needed and telling plea on behalf of these transit riders. And one of the points he makes is that these individuals suffer more as federal and state governments devote their efforts and funds to gigantic highway projects and slight or ignore completely the urgent need for improved public transportation.

Mr. Tennyson suggested to a Republican Party congressional task force on transportation that those who must depend upon public transportation to get from one place to another do not insist upon exotic, super-sophisticated cars and other facilities. What the captive riders need, he explained, is reliable, clean and efficient transportation at a price they can afford.

Here, indeed, is a message for the Republican task force to carry back to Washington. The federal government should move at once to correct the present imbalance in its transportation efforts to provide immediate and adequate assistance to the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority and to the Penn Central, Reading and other urban transit lines.

The Nixon Administration has proposed a program providing \$3.1 billion nationwide for the next five years. A far larger amount of federal money is needed and the annual appropriations should not be dependent upon the moods of Congress.

SEPTA chairman James C. McConnon suggested to the transportation task force that the amount of local matching funds required to obtain federal grants be lowered and that credit be given for past investments made by communities to improve their transit system. These are valid requests. They deserve favorable action in Washington.

The best way to assure that the nation's urban transit systems receive the federal help they need and deserve is to eliminate the separate Highway Trust Fund, which provides assured financing of highway projects, and establish instead a single Transportation Trust Fund.

It is clear by now that the country, and especially its cities, can no longer afford to treat each kind of transportation separately—either in planning or in financing.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 14, 1970]

BOTH SIDES OF THE RIVER

Equitable allocation of all available revenue for mass transit purposes is essential to the development of a balanced and coordinated system of public transportation in the Philadelphia metropolitan area.

Chairman James C. McConnon of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority made some excellent suggestions in this regard in testimony at a hearing in Philadelphia conducted by the Republican Task Force on Transportation of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The SEPTA chief, warning that local governments are unable to provide all the financial assistance necessary to develop and maintain good public transit at reasonable fares, urged state and Federal officials to give greater recognition to transportation needs.

He noted, for example, that the Federal Government pays up to 90 percent of the cost of highway projects but only one-half to two-thirds of the cost of mass transit programs.

Especially significant, we believe, was Mr. McConnon's comment relative to the distribution of Delaware River bridge tolls for mass transit purposes.

"Congress should insist that all revenues derived from interstate activities relating to transportation be made available in some measure to meet the transportation problems of the region from which the revenues are derived," the SEPTA chairman said.

"In this region the Delaware River Port Authority collects a special use tax in the form of bridge tolls across the Delaware River.

"It has recently committed these revenues to the construction of \$94,000,000 Lindenwold line in South Jersey, an important and valuable public transportation project.

"These revenues and all similar interstate revenues should be made available on the same basis to enable the regional transportation agencies to deal with their pressing transportation problems."

Mr. McConnon's point is well made. Use of bridge tolls to finance the high-speed line in South Jersey is commendable, and there is no doubt that Philadelphia derives benefit from the project, but transit projects on the Pennsylvania side of the river also should share in bridge-toll revenues.

CAPTIVE NATIONS—THE CRY FOR FREEDOM IS BEING HEARD

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last week we marked the 12th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. We recognized the tyranny and oppression of Communist rule in the once free countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. This observance showed our unified support for the peoples of these dominated lands, who are denied the freedom and basic human rights that we have cherished since our forefathers founded this Nation.

It is gravely important that we continue to demonstrate our solidarity with the 100 million oppressed people of East and Central Europe. Many thousands of American citizens today are refugees from Iron Curtain countries that are continuously purged by the dominant forces of Communist oppression. Many thousands of our people have brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers, and other loved ones still being forced to live under the tyrannical domination in the captive nations of Europe. The only hope for these people is America, the land of the free. This observance afforded us an opportunity to fulfill our moral obligation to the principles of freedom, equality, and equal opportunity, and to give support to those denied these principles. I am heartened that the plight of the captive nations is not forgotten in these times of glamour issues and instantaneous controversy.

There appears to be no end to the oppression in Eastern and Central Europe in sight. The Soviet Union seems willing to take any risk in order to preserve their domination of this bloc of countries. With increased Soviet buildup in the Middle East, apparently risking the outbreak of a major military conflict, it is

appropriate that all Americans show their deep commitment to the plight of the oppressed people of the captive nations dominated by the Soviet Union. This signal of support greatly heartens the people of these nations.

In the town of Ashland, N.H., a captive nations observance saluting America was held Sunday, July 19. A proclamation from the Governor of New Hampshire and messages from the New Hampshire congressional delegation were read. Mrs. Howard Ball of Claremont presided as mistress of ceremonies for the eighth annual observance. Observances of this type that were held throughout our country help to instill hope in the people of the captive nations.

Observances such as those of last week are necessary to show our support for the plight of the oppressed people of the captive nations. However, I feel that the House of Representatives should continue to review the plight of the captive nations. Therefore, I renew my suggestion to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations and insert my resolution, House Resolution 349, in the RECORD at this point:

H. RES. 349

Whereas, on the issue of colonialism, the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas, following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy, and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Rus-

sian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas, in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth, we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas, in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the Presidential proclamations, it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1970.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

HOUSING: NEW YORK OR SAIGON

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it appears as if we are on the verge of starting another chapter in the sad history of our involvement in Vietnam.

As reported earlier this month, President Nixon, in a letter to President Thieu of South Vietnam, stated that the United States will finance 20,000 new houses each year for the next 5 years for the families of South Vietnamese soldiers. Already our military support of the Thieu regime has drained off countless sums of money as well as thousands of lives while our urgent domestic needs have been neglected.

Despite this, the President has apparently decided that we ought to expand our financial support to other areas of South Vietnam's society in order to prop up a regime that continues to imprison political opponents and balks at independently meeting such pressing social needs as land reform. This is bad enough but when at the same time we are failing to provide decent housing for our own citizens, the logic of our building public housing for the Vietnamese is perverse.

Our 1968 Housing and Development Act contained the recognition that every American family should have a decent home and envisions 26 million units during the following 10 years. But this program has never been fully funded and the houses are not being built because our resources are being spent on overheated military operations particularly in Vietnam. The result is that this country is in the midst of a housing crisis and New York City best illustrates this condition. With over 500,000 standard housing units in this city, with an estimated 30,000 units being abandoned or demolished each year, Government sponsored public housing has provided the meager number of approximately 1,000 new units per year over the past several years. When compared to the city's estimated annual need of 35,000 to 40,000 new units each year, the proportions of our predicament become clear. Our housing needs can never be met without greater funding from the Federal Government and greater commitment from the administration. Yet this administration has indicated a willingness to finance annually 20 times more housing for Saigon than for New York City.

The result of such a twisted commitment is the continued decay of our urban centers and the continual disillusionment and bitterness of our citizens, of every social class and race, causing the rising tensions in our country. There are 135,000 low-income families in New York City alone on the waiting list for public housing. How long can we ask these peo-

ple to wait? Tens of thousands of our citizens, who could afford moderate- and middle-income housing at reasonable prices find that none is available. Only luxury housing starting at \$100 per room is being built. Are the needs of the poor and the middle class to be ignored while our Government builds houses in Saigon? Would it not be better if the White House worried about housing here at home? Would it not be sensible for Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, to support full funding for the 1968 Housing and Development Act?

FEDERAL RESERVE REPORT ON THE PROPOSED PENN CENTRAL LOAN GUARANTEE

(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, slowly the facts about the ill-fated loan guarantee to the Penn Central Transportation Co. are coming to light.

Last night, I received—out of the deep recesses of the Federal bureaucracy—a copy of the long-hidden credit report prepared by the Federal Reserve on the Penn Central Transportation Co.

The reason this report has been kept from public view so long is now apparent. The report makes it plain that the administration had planned to proceed with the loan guarantee despite the most serious questions raised by the Federal Reserve. It is obvious that the administration was willing—prior to a last-hour reversal—to risk hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money in a highly questionable scheme.

The administration was willing to toss several hundred million dollars into the wind despite the fact that the Federal Reserve made it plain that it was unwilling to certify Penn Central's ability to repay the loan.

The closing paragraph of the credit report of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York states:

From the viewpoint of protection against possible financial loss, it is our view that the financial risk to the guaranteeing agency cannot be measured at this time in view of existing uncertainties in respect of the available pool of collateral, the nature and timing of legislation and the success of new management in its programs.

Earlier in the same report, the Federal Reserve stated:

We are not sufficiently informed at this time as to the existence of adequate free collateral to assure that in the event of default by the Company the United States would be able to recover its investment from the sale or other disposition of the collateral within a reasonable time.

Even more important is the fact that the Federal Reserve Bank of New York found that the \$200 million or the \$225 million being sought under the guarantee was only the beginning of the welfare program for this giant corporation. Significantly, the Federal Reserve report states:

The cash needs of the Company through the year 1971, could, in our estimation, reach

or exceed one-half billion dollars. The proposed V-loan financing in the amount of \$200 million maturing on October 31, 1970, of itself, would provide inadequate assistance to the Company and, in all likelihood, merely postpone the institution of proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve report confirms what many in the Congress suspected—the Administration was not risking just \$200 million, but possibly up to a half-billion dollars of the taxpayers' money.

The Federal Reserve report is written in polite terms and in places, it obviously leans over backward to be friendly to its allies in the Administration and to give them every out possible. But in the end, the report makes it plain that the Government is embarking on a highly risky scheme without assurance that the taxpayers will be protected.

Mr. Speaker, it is startling that high officials of the administration would have, for a moment, considered making this loan guarantee in the face of the findings of the Federal Reserve. But this report was in the hands of administration officials at a time when Members of Congress were being lobbied by the administration to support the loan guarantee and to support other legislation providing more funds for the Penn Central Transportation Co. I was called by administration officials urging my support for the loan guarantee; yet, I was not informed that the administration was in the possession of such an adverse report from the Federal Reserve.

The Federal Reserve report on the credit worthiness of Penn Central was necessary under the Defense Production Act and it was flown to Washington by courier on the evening of June 17 and hand carried to officials in the administration. The implication throughout this period was that the administration had received a favorable report from the Federal Reserve and that there was some type of assurance that the Government would be protected if it went through with the guarantee. The Federal Reserve report which I am now making part of the public record makes it plain that no such assurance was contained in the credit findings.

It should be remembered that I, along with other Members of Congress, was informed on Friday morning, June 19—2 days after the Federal Reserve report had reached Washington—that the loan guarantee was to be made by the administration sometime that day. Before the day was out, this approval was withdrawn.

However, the question remains—How could the administration go this far down the road in a plan to throw hundreds of millions of dollars out the window without the slightest assurance of repayment? Who are the officials within the administration who looked at the Federal Reserve report and said, "The public be damned"? What prompted public officials to act in such a manner with public funds? Where are these officials now and what positions of responsibility are they carrying out?

The Federal Reserve report makes it obvious that the high officials for the

administration were willing to go along with a plan which placed the Federal Government's rights alongside those of the last class of lenders—the unsecured lenders to Penn Central. The Government would have only had a second lien on the capital stock junior to the existing liens in favor of commercial banks. The Government was being asked to undertake an extraordinary step in the Penn Central case, and it seems that the administration should, at a minimum, have insisted on primary claim to the assets in event of default. All in all, it appears that the administration took a rather casual—if not callous—attitude about the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am also greatly disturbed by the fact that the administration appeared on the one hand to bring the Congress into its confidence while at the same time withholding essential documents such as this Federal Reserve report. Such a procedure does not enhance the confidence of the Congress in the administration. If the administration wanted our cooperation in this loan guarantee, certainly it was incumbent on it to let us in on the credit findings of the Federal Reserve.

In one of the early reports on the loan guarantee—made at a time when the administration was seeking congressional approval—the Federal Reserve stated:

The Company's cash needs for 1970 and 1971 to be met through borrowing are great. Such needs could reach or exceed, in our estimation, one half billion dollars. There is no assurance that more will not be needed in years subsequent to 1971. There is no likelihood of early repayment of outstanding or new advances. Indeed, there is no assurance of repayment of those advances over the long term unless there is a fundamental improvement in the operating experience of the Company, coupled with financial assistance in the amount of the estimated need of approximately one half billion dollars and a sufficient period of time in which to correct the underlying situation. Accordingly, given the existing circumstances as set forth in the original V-loan application and the proposed loan terms, we would not have recommended approval of the subject application on the basis of factors normally considered in appraising credit risks.

In our view, further financial assistance to the Company in the limited amount of \$225 million would have provided no significant relief to the Company. At best, it would have resulted in a brief delay in the instituting of proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act. The apparent inadequacy of the proposed financial aid to the Company under the original V-loan agreement presented the likelihood of substantial loss to the guaranteeing agency.

One of the most significant points brought out by the Federal Reserve report is the fact that the Federal Reserve did not have the time to carry out a real credit investigation. The Federal Reserve makes this very plain in the following quote:

The Company is part of a complex holding company structure involving three tiers of holding companies. Many of the assets of the Company and of its affiliates appear to be encumbered by covenants and liens contained in a variety of complex bond indentures and other credit arrangements. We estimate that, to perform the kind of credit analysis that we have performed in the past with respect to prospective V-loan borrowers could take

several months. Clearly, it could not be performed in time for a V-loan to save the Company from bankruptcy proceedings, if the condition of the Company is as represented to us.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other quotes that could be lifted from the Federal Reserve document, but I think the entire report should be read by the Members of Congress. I place in the RECORD a copy of the reports on the Penn Central Transportation Co. as issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and made available to the administration:

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., June 17, 1970.
Re F.R.B. of N.Y. Defense Production Loan
No. 392.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C.

Attention: Mr. E. Ralph Massey, Chief, Discount Operations Section.

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to our letter of June 17, 1970 with which we forwarded copies of an application dated June 16, 1970 for the issuance to First National City Bank, New York, New York, on behalf of itself and a group of participating banks, of a V-Loan Guarantee Agreement pursuant to Regulation V, to cover 100% of a revolving credit providing for advances, under certain conditions, up to \$50 million to be made to Penn Central Transportation Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

We enclose two copies of our summary report dated June 17, 1970 in respect of the application for guarantee of this interim V-loan credit.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. TIMLEN, Jr.,
Vice President.

SUMMARY REPORT ON APPLICATION FOR V-LOAN GUARANTEE OF INTERIM FINANCING OF PENN CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION CO. PENDING ISSUANCE OF V-LOAN GUARANTEE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$200,000,000 TO THE PENN CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION COMPANY

On June 2, 1970 First National City Bank, New York, New York (the "Agent Bank"), on behalf of itself and a group of participating banks, made application for the issuance of a V-loan guarantee agreement pursuant to Regulation V of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to cover a proposed loan to be made to Penn Central Transportation Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (the "Company"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Penn Central Company, a publicly-owned company. Subsequent negotiations developed a revised proposal for a 100% V-loan guarantee of a loan in the amount of \$200,000,000 to mature October 31, 1970 and to be secured, in part, by (1) the pledge of various assets of the Company, (2) the assignment of the Company's accounts receivable, and (3) a second lien on the capital stock of a subsidiary of the Company.

This Bank, in its "Summary Report on Application for V-Loan Guarantee in Connection with Loan to Penn Central Transportation Company", dated June 17, 1970, commented on the proposed V-loan as follows:

"The revised terms of the V-loan were developed in the expectation that the outlook for timely legislation affording broad assistance to the railroad industry would be favorable and in the expectation that this loan and other bank loans to the Company would be extended and additional guaranteed loans would be available as indicated above. Based upon the revised terms of the proposal, the expectation of timely favorable Congressional action on the proposed legislation, the recent and proposed changes in senior management of the Company designed

to improve its performance and prospects, the V-loan which has been applied for could provide time for a coordinated effort by the Government, the participating banks, and the Company to work out plans designed to restore the Company to health and to enable it to repay the indebtedness at some time in the future.

"From the viewpoint of protection against possible financial loss, it is our view that the financial risk to the guaranteeing agency cannot be measured at this time in view of existing uncertainties in respect of the available pool of collateral, the nature and timing of legislation and the success of new management in its program."

On June 17, 1970, the Agent Bank, on behalf of itself and a group of participating banks, made application for the issuance of a V-loan guarantee agreement pursuant to Regulation V to cover 100% of a proposed loan up to the aggregate amount of \$50,000,000 to be made to the Company, to be payable on demand but not before June 29, 1970 and to be secured by specified assets of the Company. The purpose of the proposed \$50,000,000 loan is to provide funds to the Company on a short-term basis pending the preparation of the V-loan agreement and other documents required in connection with the proposed \$200,000,000 loan. The \$50,000,000 loan would be repaid from the proceeds of the \$200,000,000 loan. Accordingly, a guarantee on the \$50,000,000 loan should be issued only if it is determined that the guarantee will be issued with respect to the \$200,000,000 loan.

In view of the information available as to the current cash position of the Company, the proposed \$50,000,000 loan appears to be a necessary intermediate step to achieve the objectives contemplated in connection with the proposed \$200,000,000 loan and other substantial long-term financing, with Government guarantees, under proposed legislation which, we are informed, is expected to be enacted. From this standpoint, the comments of this Bank with respect to the \$200,000,000 loan appears applicable to the \$50,000,000 loan.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF
NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., June 17, 1970.

Re: F.R.B. of N.Y. Defense Production Loan
No. 391

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C.

Attention: Mr. E. Ralph Massey, Chief, Discount Operations Section.

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to our letter dated June 2, 1970 with which we transmitted two copies of an application for the issuance to First National City Bank, New York, New York, on behalf of itself and a group of participating banks in process of being formed, of a V-Loan Guarantee Agreement pursuant to Regulation V, to cover 100% of a proposed revolving credit and term loan in the aggregate amount of \$225 million to be made available to Penn Central Transportation Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

We now enclose two copies of our report dated June 17, 1970 entitled Summary Report on Application for V-Loan Guarantee in Connection with Loan to Penn Central Transportation Company, which contains a summarization of the principal terms and conditions of the proposed financing arrangement after giving effect to modifications in a number of substantive respects.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. TIMLEN, Jr.,
Vice President.

SUMMARY REPORT ON APPLICATION FOR V-LOAN GUARANTEE IN CONNECTION WITH LOAN TO PENN CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION CO.

On June 2, 1970, First National City Bank, New York, New York (the "Agent Bank"), on

behalf of itself and a group of participating banks in process of being formed, submitted to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York an application for the issuance of a V-loan guarantee agreement pursuant to Regulation V of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to cover 100% of a proposed revolving credit and term loan in the aggregate amount of \$225 million to be made to Penn Central Transportation Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, (the "Company") a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Penn Central Company, a publicly-owned company. In meetings with representatives of counsel for the Company and bank lenders to the Company, it was represented that (1) absent an ability to further borrow money the Company would be unable to meet its current obligations in the early part of the month of June and would be forced into reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, and (2) existing bank creditors of the Company were unwilling to make further loans to the Company without the protection afforded by a 100% guarantee by the Government.

In subsequent negotiations between the Agent Bank, other major existing bank creditors of the Company, representatives of the Government, and this Bank, attention was focused on a proposal for a 100% V-loan guarantee of a loan in the amount of \$200 million of various assets of the Company, (2) the assignment of the Company accounts receivable, and (3) a second lien on the capital stock of a subsidiary of the Company. The terms of the proposed loan were developed in the light of expectations of the enactment of Federal legislation that would result in additional substantial funds being made available to the Company for extended periods with Government guarantees and that the maturities of the proposed loan and of other indebtedness of the Company to commercial banks would be extended for comparable periods. The proposed V-loan would thus serve as interim financing pending the arranging of more substantial assistance for longer periods that would permit the development of plans designed to produce a viable Company at some future time.

This summary report discusses the financial position of the Company, reviews briefly the original V-loan application, and comments on the proposed V-loan that has been developed as a result of the negotiations between the Agent Bank, other major existing bank creditors of the Company, representatives of the Government, and this Bank.

RECENT EVENTS LEADING TO PRESENT FINANCIAL CRISIS

On April 21, 1970, Penn Central Company announced a first quarter loss for 1970 of \$62.7 million, sharply greater than the \$12.8 million loss in the corresponding 1969 period. Most of the loss in the first quarter was attributed to railroad operations. Following shortly after the disappointing earnings reported for the calendar year 1969, the April 21, 1970 announcement impaired the ability of Penn Central Transportation Company to roll over maturing issues of its commercial paper, close to \$200 million of which was outstanding on the date of the announcement of the first quarter loss. Between that date and May 22, 1970, maturities and payments of commercial paper exceeded sales of commercial paper by \$78 million. Back up lines of credit provided by banks were utilized to cover maturing commercial paper; those lines have been exhausted. Additional loans to cover subsequent maturities of commercial paper—\$25 million prior to June 30 and the balance of \$75 million prior to December 16, 1970—are not available in the ordinary course.

Pennsylvania Company (Pennco), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company, had scheduled a public issue of \$100 million of 25-year debentures on June 2, 1970. The proceeds from the sale were to be used to

repay a \$50 million loan from a group of banks (the Chemical Bank loan) due June 11, 1970, made in anticipation of the sale of the debentures, and the balance was to be made available to the Company. On May 29, 1970, the \$100 million debenture issue of Pennco was postponed indefinitely because of inability to market the issue.

SUMMARY OF BASIC PROBLEMS OF PENN CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION CO.

We quote from the representations of the prospective V-loan borrower submitted in support of the application for loan guarantee:

"Penn Central Transportation Company, like a number of other railroads, is in grave economic difficulty. The Railroad's financial condition is accentuated by the relatively large part of operations in passenger service. Penn Central, as the largest railroad in the East, experienced a very difficult two years in 1968 and 1969. In 1969 the loss from rail operations amounted to \$220 million, following a loss of \$140 million in 1968. Income of \$137 million in 1969 and \$116 million in 1968 derived from real estate and subsidiary company operations was used to subsidize the railroad. During the first quarter of 1970 the unfavorable trend in operating results accelerated. Loss from rail operations amounted to \$100 million. Thus, in two and one-quarter years the Railroad lost \$459 million from rail operations.

"Consolidated ordinary earnings of Penn Central Company amounted to a loss of \$22.1 million in 1969 compared with a profit of \$68.3 million in 1968. The reduction in earnings for the year was attributable primarily to the deficit of the Railroad. The principal factor which depressed Railroad Earnings in 1969, and in recent years has resulted in a loss from rail operation, is the impact of higher costs that was not covered by freight rate increases. In 1969, the Railroad's wage level increased 7%, or by \$74 million. However, it was not until November 18, 1969 that the Railroad obtained a 6% increase in freight rates. As a result additional revenues fell far short of absorbing increases in operating costs. The same lag is taking place in 1970."

PRESENT BANK CREDITORS AND HOLDERS OF COMMERCIAL PAPER

There follows a summary of the major groupings of bank creditors, which in total number approximately 70 institutions.

Penn Central Transportation Co., debtor

1. \$300 million secured revolving credit and term loan—First National City Bank, New York, New York, as the lead bank, and 51 other banks, under a credit agreement dated April 1, 1969 which provides for a revolving credit of \$300 million available at the prime rate until January 1, 1971, on which date outstanding loans are convertible into a term loan repayable in annual installments from January 1, 1972 through January 1, 1976. As security, the borrower pledged all the stock of its wholly-owned subsidiary, Pennco. Pennco operates as an investment company, with its principal interests in companies not directly related to the railroad operations of the Penn Central System. Pennco's principal investments include holdings in Norfolk and Western Railway Company and other railroads, all of the common stock of Buckeye Pipe Line Company and controlling interests in two real estate development companies, Great Southwest Corporation and Arvida Corporation.

2. \$50 million unsecured revolving credit—First National City Bank as the lead bank, and eleven other banks, under a Eurodollar Revolving Credit Agreement dated November 14, 1968, with a maturity of October 31, 1973.

3. \$30 million unpaid balance of unsecured loan made by First National City Bank and

another bank under a letter agreement dated May 6, 1965, with a maturity of January 31, 1971.

4. \$12.5 million in unsecured loans made by Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, New York, New York, and Cleveland Trust Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

5. \$46.5 million in unsecured loans made by a total of 26 banks under lines of credit arranged by the Company with the individual banks as support to the issuance of commercial paper. Maturities are understood to range from advances payable on demand to advances payable in ninety days.

6. \$108.3 million in commercial paper outstanding as of June 2, 1970, held by a large number of banks (in some cases for the account of customers) and other investors, including mutual funds, insurance companies, industrial companies and educational institutions, and maturing at various dates through December 16, 1970.

Pennsylvania Co., debtor

1. \$50 million revolving credit provided in February 1970 by Chemical Bank, New York, New York, and nine other banks, in anticipation of, and to be repaid from, the proceeds of the \$100 million debenture issue, the sale of which was postponed indefinitely on May 28, 1970. These outstanding loans matured on June 11, 1970 but their maturities were extended on that date to June 11, 1972. Proceeds of these loans were made available to the Transportation Company.

2. \$2.5 million term loan due February 1, 1971 made by Chemical Bank and Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

Penn Central International (N.V.), debtor

1. \$59.2 million in loans denominated in Swiss francs obtained from European banks and other lenders, guaranteed by Penn Central Company, and maturing at various dates from February through April 1971.

WEAKNESSES IN PENN CENTRAL DEBT STRUCTURE

The observations in this report concerning the financial position of the Company relate solely to its obligations on commercial paper and under the financing arrangements with banks described above. No analysis or appraisal has been attempted because of time limitations of bonded indebtednesses, obligations under conditional sales agreements and equipment leases, borrowings by real estate development subsidiaries, etc.

The imminent likelihood of acute financial involvement is based upon the inability of the Company to repay its commercial paper maturing during the month of June and subsequently, when its cash resources will be exhausted. The non-payment when due of any obligation of the Company for borrowed money constitutes an event of default under the \$300 million credit, and presumably under other credits described or referred to above.

In view of the developing situation, the two major New York City banks which have been lead banks in the financing arrangements established for the Company and its subsidiary, Pennco, proposed to take steps forthwith to better secure the positions of the bank creditors they represented.

PROPOSED FINANCING UNDER ORIGINAL V-LOAN APPLICATION TERMS

In brief, the originally proposed financing in an aggregate amount of \$225 million, in part a revolving credit and in part a term loan would have been secured by pledge of the Company's accounts receivable and unbilled revenue, and had an interest rate the same as the prime rate of the Agent Bank (presently 8% per annum), a commitment fee of 1% per annum, and a maturity of December 31, 1976. The loan proceeds were to be used in meeting the Company's estimated cash requirements, totaling \$263 million, for the period from June 1 through December 31, 1970, to cover operating losses, capital expenditures for the railroad, commercial paper maturities and other debt re-

tirement, and miscellaneous cash requirements.

PROSPECTS FOR REPAYMENT

The \$225 million financing as originally proposed was represented in the application for loan guarantee as "deemed sufficient on basis of present forecast for balance of 1970" (italics supplied), a statement qualified by the Agent Bank's letter of transmittal dated June 2, 1970 questioning whether the Company would be able to borrow any of the additional amount of \$25 million to \$38 million needed to meet its total estimated needs of \$263 million for 1970. The 1971 financial forecast reflects an estimate that \$126 million in financing, other than for the acquisition of equipment, would be required to meet the cash needs of the railroad after giving effect to \$53.3 million in funds received from the sale of property and salvage and \$22 million in advances from subsidiaries.

Representations, related to repayment of the financing, were made with respect to major areas of potential improvement in rail operating results in 1970 and 1971. Stated briefly, these areas are:

1. Two 6% freight rate increases before the end of 1970.

2. Assumption by State and local governments of the financial responsibility for operating commuter facilities.

3. The discontinuance or cutback of long-haul passenger service.

4. Economies effected through reductions in work force.

5. Savings to be realized out of the 1968 merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad.

We note that the three areas first mentioned, which may hold the greatest prospect for significant improvement in railroad operating results, are in large degree outside the Company's control.

COMMENT

The Company's cash needs for 1970 and 1971 to be met through borrowing are great. Such needs could reach or exceed in our estimation, one half billion dollars. There is no assurance that more will not be needed in years subsequent to 1971. There is no likelihood of early repayment of outstanding or new advances. Indeed, there is no assurance of repayment of those advances over the long term unless there is a fundamental improvement in the operating experience of the Company, coupled with financial assistance in the amount of the estimated need of approximately one half billion dollars and a sufficient period of time in which to correct the underlying situation. Accordingly, given the existing circumstances as set forth in the original V-loan application and the proposed loan terms, we would not have recommended approval of the subject application on the basis of factors normally considered in appraising credit risks.

In our view, further financial assistance to the Company in the limited amount of \$225 million would have provided no significant relief to the Company. At best, it would have resulted in a brief delay in the instituting of proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act. The apparent inadequacy of the proposed financial aid to the Company under the original V-loan agreement presented the likelihood of substantial loss to the guaranteeing agency.

REVISED V-LOAN PROPOSAL

Following submission of the original V-loan proposal intensive negotiations on a virtually continuous basis have been conducted between representatives of the Government, the Agent Bank, and this Bank, together with their respective counsel, to develop terms and conditions for a V-loan agreement acceptable to all parties. In a departure from usual procedures, representatives of the Government participated directly in the negotiations as to the terms of

the proposed V-loan agreement, indicating the readiness of the Department of Defense to guarantee the proposed V-loan if terms satisfactory to the representatives of the Government could be developed. Basic to the development of the terms of the proposed V-loan were the understandings reached as to the need for an extension beyond October 31, 1970 of the maturity of that loan and the extension of the maturities of outstanding bank loans to the Company, as well as the expectation of the enactment of Federal legislation that would make available substantial, additional financial assistance to the Company through a program of Government guarantees.

TERMS

The meetings between the representatives of the Government, the Agent Bank, and some of the major bank creditors and this Bank developed a revised proposal, the principal terms of which are as follows:

Amount of V-loan: \$200 million (Revolving Credit).

Guaranteed Percentage: 100%.

Maturity: October 31, 1970, with possible extensions under comparable Government guarantees, until June 1972.

Interest Rate: Prime rate in effect from time to time at the Agent Bank (presently 8%).

Guarantee Fee: The guarantee fee to be paid by the Company (at present, this would be 3%).

Commitment Fee: 1/2 of 1%.

Collateral: (1) Pledge of various assets owned by the borrower as may be determined to be readily available for pledge and as having material collateral value. (2) Assignment of borrower's accounts receivable. (3) Second lien on the capital stock of Pennsylvania Company (junior to the existing lien in favor of the lenders under the \$300 million credit).

The security interest in the foregoing would apply not only to the V-loan but also to all subsequent direct or indirect Government financing to an aggregate of \$500 million including the V-loan.

Guarantee by Penn Central Company: There will be a guarantee by the Penn Central Company, owner of 100% of the outstanding capital stock of the borrower, with the guarantee to be collateralized after the \$59.2 million Swiss franc loan is paid. All presently existing unsecured bank loans will be similarly guaranteed, and the loans under the \$300 million secured credit will also be similarly guaranteed for any deficiency after collection on their collateral.

Standby Agreement: All present bank creditors of the borrower and its subsidiary, Pennco, will agree to standby so long as the V-loan (and any other Government financing) is outstanding and unmaturing but in any event for a maximum of two years. The standby would be terminated in the event of insolvency and/or bankruptcy.

Participation in V-Loan Collateral: (1) All unsecured bank lenders (banks providing the loans and credits described in numbered paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 on Page 5 of this report) will share pro-rata, with the bank lenders participating in the V-loan in the collateral enumerated under the caption "Collateral" above. (2) Banks participating in the \$300 million credit will also have a lien interest on the assets primarily securing the V-loan and unsecured bank creditors, but only to the extent repayment of the \$300 million credit is not obtained from its primary collateral security, i.e., the stock of the Pennsylvania Company.

Other Terms and Conditions: As may be agreed upon by the financing institutions, the borrower, the Guarantor and this Bank, including provisions to assure the normal flow of dividends from Pennco to the borrower (which would, however, also prevent undue transfers of assets from Pennco, and the up-

ward flow of proceeds from the sale of assets by Pennco, to the borrower).

COMMENTS

Penn Central Transportation Company, the largest railroad in the Northeast, has experienced severe operating difficulties since the merger of its two predecessor railroad companies. In the two and one-quarter years to March 31, 1970, losses from rail operations totaled \$460 million (on the basis of accounting required by the Interstate Commerce Commission) and although operating income from other than rail operations has reduced such losses, continuing deficits have contributed to the need for financing during 1968 and 1969 aggregating \$933 million. The Company cannot raise additional funds in the financial markets in view of the magnitude of its debt obligations relative to the circumstances in which it finds itself at present.

The problems of the Company are deep-rooted and not susceptible of simple and prompt cure. There have been doubts that the Company's management (at least prior to the change in chief executive officers on June 12, 1970) can turn the Company around in its railroad operations so as to substantially reduce the magnitude of its present losses. Its financial condition at present is precarious and proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act could result from the exhaustion of cash resources and borrowing power. In consideration of the extension of further credit, present bank creditors have demanded a 100% guaranty by a Government agency on new advances. In addition, to further secure existing outstanding loans, bank creditors have been demanding additional, collateral in the nature of liens on what perhaps are the most valuable assets from a collateral standpoint.

The Company is part of a complex holding company structure involving three tiers of holding companies. Many of the assets of the Company and of its affiliates appear to be encumbered by covenants and liens contained in a variety of complex bond indentures and other credit arrangements. We estimate that, to perform the kind of credit analysis that we have performed in the past with respect to prospective V-loan borrowers could take several months. Clearly, it could not be performed in time for a V-loan to save the Company from bankruptcy proceedings, if the condition of the Company is as represented to us. We are not sufficiently informed at this time as to the existence of adequate free collateral to assure that in the event of default by the Company the United States would be able to recover its investment from the sale or other disposition of the collateral within a reasonable time. The Agent Bank and this Bank are in the process of appraising the value and availability of a pool of assets of the Company which, on the basis of values reflected on the books of the issuer only, totals in excess of \$1.2 billion. The degree of protection such pool of assets, serving as collateral to the proposed V-loan, would afford the guaranteeing agency cannot be determined accurately pending further legal and credit analysis.

As stated above, the cash needs of the Company through the year 1971, could, in our estimation, reach or exceed one-half billion dollars. The proposed V-loan financing in the amount of \$200 million maturing on October 31, 1970, of itself, would provide inadequate assistance to the Company and, in all likelihood, merely postpone the institution of proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act. However, in the course of their negotiations with the Agent and other participating Banks, the representatives of the Government expressed confidence in the outlook for the passage of legislation to assist in preserving the country's railroad systems through the establishment of a Government loan-guarantee program. If, as contemplated

by the representatives of the Government, such legislation is enacted by the Congress and financial assistance by the Government to the Company is made available for extended periods and in the suggested amount of \$500 million, it would seem that the management could have adequate time and funds to effect a major improvement in the Company's situation.

The management of the Company has recently been changed by the replacement of its chief executive officer. In a recent statement the new chief executive described his plans to recruit a new management team, with particular reference to obtaining a proven chief operations officer and a proven chief financial officer. He also discussed his plans for a reduction of 10 per cent in the Company's work force over the next several months, a significant reduction in corporate overhead, and the elimination of unprofitable long-haul passenger service. The prompt accomplishment of these objectives would significantly improve the Company's position.

The revised terms of the V-loan were developed in the expectation that the outlook for timely legislation affording broad assistance to the railroad industry would be favorable and in the expectation that this loan and other bank loans to the Company would be extended and additional guaranteed loans would be available as indicated above. Based upon the revised terms of the proposal, the expectation of timely favorable Congressional action on the proposed legislation, the recent and proposed changes in senior management of the Company designed to improve its performance and prospects, the V-loan which has been applied for could provide time for a coordinated effort by the Government, the participating banks, and the Company to work out plans designed to restore the Company to health and to enable it to repay the indebtedness at some time in the future.

From the viewpoint of protection against possible financial loss, it is our view that the financial risk to the guaranteeing agency cannot be measured at this time in view of existing uncertainties in respect of the available pool of collateral, the nature and timing of legislation and the success of new management in its program.

HE GETS BY WITH A LITTLE HELP FROM HIS FRIEND

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service has just issued an important ruling. Ordinarily, the public reacts with favor when anyone is successful in eking a favorable determination out of the parsimonious tax bureaucracy. In this case, however, some special facts have come to light which should cause a different reaction.

Over two decades ago Roy Crocker, founder and president of Lincoln Savings & Loan Association of Los Angeles, headed the campaign of an aspiring politician. As a consequence of Mr. Crocker's ambitious activities that politician was elected to the Congress. In the two decades that followed, Mr. Crocker generously supported this rising political star. He supported the candidate in successful bids for the U.S. Senate, the Vice Presidency, and the Presidency of the United States.

In light of Mr. Crocker's erstwhile support for Richard Nixon, I suppose it

should come as no surprise that Mr. Crocker has been made the benefactor of the largess of Presidential power. No one would question the President inviting Mr. Crocker to the White House for dinner. Probably no one would seriously challenge the wisdom of the Presidential decision to reward Mr. Crocker's political steadfastness with an appointment to a high executive or ambassadorial post. However, it would appear that either Mr. Nixon was not content to bestow such humble rewards or that Mr. Crocker felt his long service entitled him to special sinecure. Whichever was the case, Mr. Crocker and the savings and loan which he heads has been rewarded with what must be one of the most extraordinary rulings ever issued by the Internal Revenue Service. President Nixon's longtime fundraiser has been given a special lift in his efforts to raise funds for his business, the Lincoln Savings & Loan Association. Mr. Crocker's savings and loan association has been given a private revenue ruling which permits it to establish a program of tax deferred savings. The association is the only financial institution in the United States with authority to engage in such activity. A number of other savings and loan associations and commercial banks have sought similar IRS sanction. To the surprise of no one their requests have been denied.

The importance of the preferential revenue ruling given President Nixon's old crony is that it permits Mr. Crocker to outbid competitors in the savings market during a period of unprecedented money tightness. The ruling is worth millions to the association Mr. Crocker owns and controls.

The manner in which the ruling was given is particularly revealing. Although it has far-reaching effects on Federal tax policy, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy was not consulted before it was handed down. While the ruling has important implications in terms of the Federal Reserve Board's regulation of rates paid by depository intermediaries on savings accounts, there is no record that the Federal Reserve Board was consulted prior to the ruling being issued.

Loyalty is a personal quality which we much respect in our society. However, I fear the President's sense of proportion is—to understate the point—somewhat distorted. His action in bestowing this immense advantage on a political pal is a blatant and arrogant exercise of Presidential power. The act of the President makes clear the high moral tone the President has sought to establish is for public consumption, not personal application.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAVY LAUNCHING OF POLARIS A-1 FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE FROM THE NUCLEAR SUBMARINE U.S.S. "GEORGE WASHINGTON"

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an event that marks a significant an-

iversary for the American people and, indeed, all the people of the free world. Ten years ago this past Monday, July 20, this country crowned a remarkable technical and industrial achievement when the U.S. Navy launched a Polaris A-1 fleet ballistic missile from the nuclear submarine U.S.S. *George Washington* as it cruised, submerged, off the coast of Florida near Cape Kennedy.

This event was a milestone in U.S. technology, where literally millions of Americans combined their talents and dedication to take the fleet ballistic missile and the submarine which carries it from concept to reality in just 4 years—5 years ahead of the original target date.

But even more significant about that launch of Polaris on July 20, 1960, I believe, was our reaffirmation of tenets upon which this Nation was founded. Polaris was not developed to wage war—it was developed to prevent war. Polaris became the cornerstone of our policy of deterrence—we made it clear that this country would never initiate nuclear war; but we also intended to maintain a force which could rain swift and total devastation on any nation which launched a nuclear attack upon the United States. Thus, Polaris along with this Nation's mix of strategic deterrent weapons has a purpose unique in the history of warfare: to prevent nuclear war.

How successful has Polaris and our policy of deterrence been during the past decade? Our Nation has not been at peace much of that time, but I am confident that the specter of nuclear holocaust is more remote today than it was 10 years ago. The reliability of the FBM weapons system has remained unchallenged. A fleet of 41 nuclear submarines, each capable of carrying 16 missiles, has been built, commissioned and sent on peace-keeping patrols. The more advanced A-2 and A-3 Polaris missiles have replaced the A-1. And Poseidon, a completely new fleet ballistic missile, developed by the same Navy-civilian team which produced Polaris is about to become operational.

We cannot mark this day without sharing a deep debt of gratitude to the thousands of American Navy men who have given a remarkable account of themselves during the past 10 years. When you consider the fact that Polaris sailors have made almost 800 deterrent patrols, which adds up to more than 130 years of submerged time, the enormity of their job becomes evident. Their dedication and sacrifice has made a valid and lasting contribution to this Nation's search for peace.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

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 honey. In 1968 the United States produced 200,000,000 pounds of honey. This was 2½ times more than the second leading producer, Mexico.

AMERICAN CASUALTIES DROP

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, even a single casualty would be one too many, if this were an ideal world we live in. But the heartening downward trend in the number of Americans killed and wounded in Vietnam is something in which we can all rejoice.

Weekly U.S. casualty reports this month continue to reflect a downward trend, evidence that the destruction of enemy supplies during the Cambodia operation and the success of the Vietnamization program have lived up to the President's expectations.

Statistics show that from the first half of 1968 to the first half of this year, American deaths in Vietnam have been reduced by two-thirds, 66.7 percent. The number of Americans wounded has likewise been reduced by a similar margin, 66.9 percent. Deaths for the first half of 1969 contrasted with the first half of 1968 show a reduction of 38.8 percent; and from 1969 to 1970, by 49.7 percent.

The number of Americans wounded the first half of 1969 as contrasted to 1968 shows a reduction of 25.8 percent; from 1969 to 1970, 55.4 percent. Approximately one-half of those classified as "wounded" are not hospitalized and remain in the field for treatment. The figures for the first two quarters of each year are used because 1970 is only half over.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. PELLY, for the week of July 27-31, on account of official business.

Mr. RHODES (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. HUNT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), until 4 p.m. today, on account of a personal matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, on account of personal affairs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. COUGHLIN, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN to revise and extend his remarks during the consideration of the Interior Appropriations Conference report.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. FOREMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
 Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
 Mr. GUDE.
 Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
 Mr. ROBISON in two instances.
 Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.
 Mr. BUSH.
 Mr. SCHERLE.
 Mr. COWGER.
 Mr. ESHLEMAN.
 Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
 Mr. BEALL of Maryland.
 Mr. WOLD in two instances.
 Mr. BOB WILSON in six instances.
 Mr. LUJAN.
 Mr. BELL of California.
 Mr. BRAY in two instances.
 Mr. ZWACH in two instances.
 Mr. COUGHLIN.
 Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.
 Mr. WYDLER.
 Mr. FISH.
 Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)
 Mr. JONES of Tennessee.
 Mr. WALDIE.
 Mr. FEIGHAN in three instances.
 Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.
 Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
 Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas in two instances.
 Mr. TUNNEY in two instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
 Mr. BOGGS in two instances.
 Mrs. CHISHOLM.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.
 Mr. HOWARD.
 Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
 Mr. HANNA.
 Mr. YATES.
 Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. ADAMS.
 Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in six instances.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.
 Mr. BLATNIK.

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. 3192. An act to designate the navigation lock on the Sacramento deepwater ship channel in the State of California as the William G. Stone navigation lock; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3889. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for one year the authority of Federal Reserve Banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury; and

S. 3978. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 21, 1970 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 14452. An act to provide for the designation of special policemen at the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14453. An act to authorize the Public Printer to grant time off as compensation for overtime worked by certain employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 23, 1970, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2236. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ended June 30, 1970, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2237. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of celestite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2238. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to direct the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2239. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on improvements needed in Federal Aviation Administration procedures for determining excess spare parts, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13543. A bill to establish a program of research and promotion for U.S. wheat; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1322). 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. ADAMS:

H.R. 18577. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. HECKER of Massachusetts, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POLLOCK, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 18578. A bill to create a new National Service Agency to fill military manpower requirements, to create a voluntary civilian service as an alternative to military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18579. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 18580. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure that U.S. requirements for low cost energy will be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (for himself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 18581. A bill to amend chapter 3 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to U.S. contributions to international organizations and programs, to provide for a program to control illegal international traffic in narcotics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 18582. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 18583. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and other laws to provide increased research into, and prevention of, drug abuse and drug dependence; to provide for treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers and drug dependent persons; and to strengthen existing law enforcement authority in the field of drug abuse; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 18584. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 18585. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that no Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary facility shall be constructed, acquired, or altered unless such action is first approved by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 18586. A bill to provide for fulfilling the manpower needs of the armed services of the United States on a voluntary basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas (for himself and Mr. JARMAN):

H.R. 18587. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance financed in whole for low-income groups, through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits, and to provide a system of peer review of utilization, charges and quality of medical service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. PETTIS, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT):

H.R. 18588. A bill to authorize appropriations for the construction of economic growth center development highways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONOHUE (for himself, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. MANN, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 18589. A bill to facilitate representation of persons having claims against the United States by legal counsel of their own choosing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HAYS, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 18590. A bill to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for a recount (by the State or locality involved) of the population of any State or locality which believes that its population was understated in the 1970 decennial census, and for Federal payment of the cost of the recount if such understatement is confirmed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18591. A bill to amend section 905 of the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 18592. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the coastal waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself,

Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEDEI, Mr. REES, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 18593. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the coastal waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Messrs. BROWN of Ohio, CLANCY, DEVINE, FISH, MILLER of Ohio, SANDMAN, and STANTON):

H.R. 18594. A bill to regulate the importation, manufacture, distribution, storage, and possession of explosives, blasting agents and detonators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 18595. A bill to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 18596. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide that for purposes of unemployment compensation the States shall treat accrued leave of exservicemen as wages for past services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 18597. A bill to aid in the control of drug abuse by establishing a code for the identification of prescription drugs, to be printed on individual tablets or capsules; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 1321. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.J. Res. 1322. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.J. Res. 1323. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.J. Res. 1324. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 1325. Joint resolution to extend

the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to August 31, 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 1326. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 1156. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 1157. Resolution making it the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ROBERTS introduced a bill (H.R. 18598) for the relief of John Harwin Parrish, postmaster at Gladewater, Tex., and for Mary James Kates, owner of the Gladewater Daily Mirror, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

429. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to public use of beaches on Federal military installations in California, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

551. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the House of Representatives, Republic of the Philippines, relative to application of the principle of equal pay for equal work in U.S. bases and foreign private firms operating in the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

552. Also, petition of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, relative to the oil import quota system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

553. Also, petition of the Governor of the Territory of Guam, relative to his endorsement of the recommendations of the Constitutional Convention authorized by the Ninth Guam Legislature to review the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 22, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art from everlasting to everlasting, we thank Thee for this day, for this hallowed place of service, for work to do and strength with which to do it. Spare us from absorption with things as they are, but give us grace and wisdom to create a world as it ought to be.

Look upon this good land and in these testing times make us wise in every de-

cision and resolute in every action to the end that the righteousness which exalteth a nation may prevail in our ways. Turn us backward to appropriate the enduring values of our heritage and turn us forward to exploit the insights, skills, and wonders of this age—for the making of the unfinished world which is yet to be.

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., July 22, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate I appoint Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

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