

in which the turnout rate was less than 50 percent.

If 1968 is used as the triggering year, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana—three consistent offenders prior to the act and whose legislatures since the act have passed the majority of the voting laws objected to by the Attorney General under section 5—will not be covered as States. In addition, 22 counties and parishes cited by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its 1968 report on political participation will not be covered.

These counties and parishes are as follows:

Alabama: Barbour, Bullock, Choctaw, Dallas, Elmore, Greene, Lowndes, Montgomery, Tallapoosa.

Louisiana: Concordia, DeSota, East Carroll, Madison, Ouachita, Plaquemines.

Mississippi: Carroll, Grenada, Hinds, Holmes, Jefferson, Neshoba, Panola.

It is significant that these counties and parishes are for the most part located in that area where a violent history with respect to racial relations has been written. The types of abuses in these counties include murders, Klan violence in earlier days, a tragic roster of lynch victims, and other forms of repression, including denial of the right to vote against black citizens.

It is fair to ask why we should eliminate from the reach of the 1965 act such areas as Plaquemines Parish in Louisiana, Dallas County in Alabama—which made Selma a dateline known not just in this country but unhappily elsewhere in the world—Lowndes County, Ala., Neshoba County, Miss.—where three civil rights workers were murdered and the convictions were finally affirmed by the Supreme Court only last week—and Hinds County in Mississippi.

Most important, the record in these States and counties, since the passage of the Voting Rights Act—records of assaults to thwart Negro voting by subterfuge and other means, even where literacy tests were abandoned or suspended—shows without question the present danger of letting these areas now elude the safeguards of preclearance in section 5, the automatic power to send in examiners under section 6. There is nothing permanent about the 50 percent participation levels reached in these areas. Not only will further progress likely be stopped, but even the progress to date is in danger of being lost.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the Senator is speaking to the amendment that would

change the date under which the law would be changed from the 1964 elections to the 1968 elections. The Senator has cited examples from some States.

I wish to ask the Senator if in his research with regard to this amendment he has found any instances wherein the Legislature of the State of Virginia has passed a law contrary to the act or wherein there have been any reported instances in the Commonwealth of Virginia which would give cause to conclude that there has been an abuse or abuses under the statute.

Mr. HART. I think the answer is "No," in the sense that records available to me, indicate that Virginia, at least in the recent past, has not been the scene of threats or over intimidation to prevent a citizen from exercising his right to vote. But the Allen case decided last spring by the Supreme Court did involve a case in Virginia—as well as three companion cases from Mississippi. In Allen, Virginia had employed a practice which thwarted Negro voter efforts to support a candidate other than the winner of the party primary.

I said that the three States—Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana—were the States from which most of the changes in law which have occurred since the 1965 act were objected to by the Attorney General. Of the 11 objections filed by the Attorney General against changes in State voter qualification and procedures, seven were enacted by the legislatures in the three States, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana. The remainder were Georgia statutes or practices. But the Allen case, instituted by private parties, as I have noted, did arise in Virginia.

I think it bears repetition, for it is my impression that earlier in the day the able minority leader made reference to comments made by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee (Mr. CELLER), and the ranking minority member of that committee, Mr. McCULLOCH. I think, however, as we close today, it is worth repeating their reaction. And, of course, they are not alone in their expression of concern.

They state that to use the 1968 statistics, as the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina, and which now pends, would do, would gut the Voting Rights Act where it is needed most as effectively as if it had not been extended at all.

The argument which may be advanced—that Congress set a standard in 1965 of 50 percent registration and voting, which and that since the covered

States have now met this level, they should not be penalized further—this argument does have an appeal on the surface, but it does not withstand an examination, part of which I have undertaken.

I would hope very much that the approach taken by the Scott-Hart substitute—which is, in fact, the position of a majority of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, 10 of whom have subscribed to the memorandum which is on our desks—will be supported.

To adopt the amendment now pending would, to use again the phrase voiced by Chairman CELLER and echoed by Mr. McCULLOCH, get what has been described correctly as the most successful Civil Rights Act ever passed by the Congress of the United States. Those figures of improvement in voter participation are one measure of its success.

We have too few successes in our efforts by way of legislation to achieve more equal treatment among all Americans to be able to afford to abandon or cripple this one most successful one. I believe the amendment that is pending would have that effect.

For these reasons, I hope on tomorrow the amendment will not be agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HANSEN TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is the understanding of the leadership that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes immediately after the prayer tomorrow morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 6, 1970, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Nomination received by the Senate March 5, 1970:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Arthur K. Watson, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 5, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert S. Nagle, pastor, Emmanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, Holmes, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternally loving Father in Heaven, gratefully we accept Thy gift of this new, clean, and promising day; but if it is to be kept in that condition, we need

help—Thy help. We sometimes become so busy operating the big national business and even running our little personal interests that we are not always happy at what we consider Thy intervention and even interference. So, we pray that Thou wilt lead us to realize, that in all of life, but most specifically in our several capacities of elected responsibilities, we can only attain any degree of suc-

cess with Thy guidance. Blessed Lord, be forcefully in the thoughts, words, and deeds of this Chamber of legislation in general and each Representative in particular. In Jesus' name we pray. 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. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3396. An act to make certain technical changes in provisions of law relating to the postal service; and

S. 3397. An act to permit the acceptance of checks and nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services; authorize the Postmaster General to relieve postmasters and accountable officers for losses incurred by postal personnel when accepting checks or nonpostal money orders in full compliance with postal regulations; and to provide penalties for presenting bad checks and bad nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services.

**THE REVEREND ROBERT S. NAGLE,
PASTOR OF IMMANUEL EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH,
NORWOOD, PA.**

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, our guest chaplain this morning, Rev. Robert S. Nagle, Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church in Norwood, Pa., comes from the district in Pennsylvania which I am privileged to represent.

Rev. Robert Nagle has been a great inspiration in his ministry. He has been an inspiration to people of all faiths far, far beyond the reach of his own personal church in Norwood, Pa. Among his many other activities he is a chaplain for the Delaware County chapter of the Pennsylvania Fraternal Order of Police. Our policemen are constantly risking their lives in behalf of the safety of our people, and Rev. Robert Nagle has also been an inspiration to them spiritually and in every other way.

I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for Rev. Robert Nagle being our guest chaplain here this morning.

**DESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL
REVENUE TAXATION**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

MARCH 5, 1970.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.
DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Honorable JACKSON E. BETTS, of the Committee on Ways and Means, has been designated as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to fill the vacancy created by the death of the late Honorable James B. Utt.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 868) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 868

Resolved, That the following named members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Banking and Currency: CLARK MACGREGOR of Minnesota.

Committee on House Administration: JOHN WOLD of Wyoming.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**LEGISLATION TO PROTECT
NEWSPAPERS**

(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, I join with the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) in sponsoring the Newsman's Privilege Act.

Very briefly, what this would do would be to give reporters the same privilege that doctors and priests and accountants in New York now have. The law protects the confidentiality of their clients' conversations with them. Newsmen at this point are not so protected in so far as the confidentiality of their news sources is concerned. What we have seen recently is that the Attorney General and the Justice Department have sought to subpoena newsmen and obtain their sources of information. The chilling effect of the threat of subpoena is to dry up the news sources, and it is clearly intended to intimidate the news media.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is in the interest of all of us that the news media and reporters not be intimidated. And if their sources of information are dried up, then we too are the losers. The public will not know who is guilty of nonfeasance or malfeasance in office. The newsmen will not have the leads they need in order to give to us the reports we read in our daily press. Because of the public outcry, the Justice Department has backed down from its original position. But the threat posed by the Department's attitude continues to limit the news gathering ability of all newsmen.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge we address ourselves to this legislation and get it on the books as soon as possible.

INTIMIDATING NEWSPAPERMEN

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued and amused by the speech of the gentleman from New York when he talked about intimidating newspapermen. I just wondered if the gentleman had ever tried to intimidate one. They do not intimidate very easily.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE
ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE
TODAY**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee

on Public Health and Welfare of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. 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. 41]

Anderson, Tenn.	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Ashley	Fulton, Tenn.	Mosher
Baring	Gallagher	Moss
Belcher	Gettys	Murphy, N.Y.
Bell, Calif.	Goldwater	Ottinger
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Passman
Bow	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Bray	Hanna	Pike
Brock	Harvey	Powell
Broomfield	Hathaway	Preyer, N.C.
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Pryor, Ark.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hébert	Purcell
Byrne, Pa.	Hollifield	Quie
Cabell	Horton	Reid, Ill.
Cederberg	Jarman	Riegle
Celler	Kirwan	Robison
Chappell	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Kyros	Ruppe
Clark	Lennon	Sandman
Clausen, Don H.	Lowenstein	Saylor
Clay	Lukens	Scheuer
Cramer	McCarthy	Shibley
Davis, Ga.	McCloskey	Slack
Dawson	McDonald,	Steed
Diggs	Mich.	Taft
Dwyer	McEwen	Talcott
Eckhardt	McMillan	Teague, Calif.
Edmondson	Macdonald,	Tunney
Edwards, Ala.	Mass.	Van Deerlin
Edwards, La.	Mann	Vander Jagt
Fraser	Mathias	Watson
	Meeds	
	Mollohan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

**RIGHT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TEACHERS TO PETITION**

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out to my colleagues and particularly to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) that teachers are human beings and citizens. Even though they may live in the District of Columbia, they have a right to petition for redress of the many grievances that we know exist in the educational system. Their right to petition in this regard is the same as that afforded any other American citizen.

I think any delay on the part of the gentleman from Maryland or on the part of the District of Columbia Committee is particularly untimely in view of the fact that a number of teachers took this occasion today to participate in and ob-

serve the hearings that so profoundly affect them, and more importantly, their students in the District of Columbia. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will be permitted to engage in these deliberations to the fullest extent possible. As a matter of fact, we should be encouraging them and expressing our gratitude that we have such dedicated public servants. Their very presence speaks of their concern, and instead of discouraging them, it would seem more appropriate for conscientious legislators to encourage them.

TEACHERS SHOULD EXEMPLIFY RESPECT FOR LAW

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the observations made by my colleague from Michigan. I will say to him that there happens to be a prohibition in the Federal law and in District of Columbia law as well as in the contract which the teachers have with the school board in Washington making strikes illegal. In spite of these prohibitions, the local teachers union voted to strike.

When some of my colleagues and I forcefully called this aspect of their activities to their attention they said that only 5 percent would go out. This might conform to the letter of the law, but certainly does not conform to the spirit of the law.

Let me say this: I am the sponsor of what is perhaps the most liberal, most generous teacher pay raise bill of any we are considering before the District of Columbia Committee. I feel the teachers deserve a pay raise. This morning at a hearing of the District of Columbia Committee on pay raise legislation for the District teachers, policemen, and firemen, I offered a motion to pass over at this time consideration of the teacher pay bill as a demonstration that the Congress of the United States cannot be intimidated by the kind of tactics in which the teachers have been engaged over the last several days.

Mr. Speaker, this in no way diminishes my conviction that the teachers need an equitable pay raise, but at a time when disrespect for law and irresponsibility in regard to authority is so prevalent among our young people today, it is particularly distressing to me that teachers, who have these young people in their custody, would not give them the good example of positive respect for law and authority, but would take an opposite approach. That is why I took the action I did today. It is particularly disappointing to me because so many of these teachers are my constituents.

How can we expect our schoolchildren to obey and respect the laws of our country when they see their very own teachers violating the law in furtherance of their own selfish interests.

I would further like to state that I consider the action of these irresponsible teachers who walked out today to be not only reprehensible but also stupid. After District of Columbia Committee Chair-

man, JOHN McMILLAN, and subcommittee chairman, JOHN DOWDY, had already announced hearings would begin today on this pay bill, the teachers at the behest of the union still voted to strike.

I am fully sympathetic to the need for this pay raise for the teachers, but I will not be intimidated by this type of action and I cannot believe that any member of this committee will either be intimidated by or will sympathize with the just cause of the teachers as a result of this type of action.

My action today in having the teachers' pay bill passed over will in no way diminish my efforts to get a teacher pay raise which is vitally needed. Those dedicated teachers who do not condone the activities of the teachers' union and are in their classrooms today have my admiration and commendation.

TEACHERS HAVE RIGHT TO PETITION CONGRESS

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Michigan when he said that certainly the teachers here should have a right to come and petition Congress and present their position.

I, therefore, do not think we as the Congress need in order to protect the dignity of this House to threaten anybody that he cannot come here and petition the Congress by saying if he does we will not consider legislation affecting him. There was no violation of the law by these teachers.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order the gallery is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, not admonishing at this time, that those who are present in the gallery are the guests of the House, and under the rules of the House no manifestation of approval may be evidenced.

The Chair wants it understood at this time that the Chair is not admonishing, recognizing human nature, but the Chair does call attention that any such manifestations are a violation of the rules.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would say I am petitioned almost continuously by varying groups representing different interests throughout the United States including policemen, firemen, veterans, and many others. I accept this as a part of being a Congressman. I hope the other Members of the House, including the gentleman who has just spoken, will also do so.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me.

The concern he expresses here is the same kind of concern that he never fails to display as a member of the District of Columbia Committee.

I believe that for anyone to take the floor of this House and suggest that the teachers who have been here today have engaged in any illegal or unauthorized act, or have been in any way violent or disruptive, is to seriously misstate the purpose for which these educators have come upon the Hill. It seems to me it is about time we recognize that they have the right to peacefully petition. They are without representation. They do not have Congressmen. So it is patently unfair for any of us to attempt to denigrate or reflect critically upon their conduct or purpose for being with us today.

LEGAL PROHIBITION OF STRIKE BY SCHOOLTEACHERS

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. I thank my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, the point the gentleman from Washington made, that his constituents come and present grievances to him, I do not believe is particularly relevant to this discussion, because there happens to be a Federal statute and a District of Columbia statute which specifically prohibits striking by schoolteachers.

If the gentleman from Michigan was present at the hearing of the District of Columbia Committee, I do not see how he can indicate this was an orderly and peaceful presentation of grievances, because it was not.

I want to reiterate that I am the sponsor of what is perhaps the most generous pay raise these teachers are seeking, but I just wanted to demonstrate, by offering my motion—which was accepted unanimously in the subcommittee this morning—that we abhor these kinds of pressure tactics in an effort to intimidate the Congress in order to bring about legislation.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a concurrent resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Policy.

I am pleased to report that the following 17 of my colleagues are cosponsors of this resolution:

JOSEPH P. ADDABO of New York; GEORGE E. BROWN, JR. of California; PHILIP BURTON of California; DANIEL E. BUTTON of New York; JOHN CONYERS, JR. of Michigan; DON EDWARDS of California; LEONARD FARBSTEIN of New York; JACOB H. GILBERT of New York; SEYMOUR HALPERN of New York; WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY of Maine; HENRY HELSTOSKI of New Jersey; ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin; ROBERT L. LEGGETT of California; ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN of New York; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA of Hawaii;

BERTRAM L. PODELL of New York, and HOWARD W. POLLOCK of Alaska.

The purpose of the resolution is to permit the Congress to deal more effectively with foreign policy questions.

The U.S. intervention in Laos is occurring without consultation with the Congress. The President has refused to reveal the extent of U.S. military operations in Laos. If another undeclared war is to be averted, Congress must exercise control over such foreign policy decisions. The past mistakes in Vietnam and the recent events in Laos point out the great necessity for Congress again to exercise its constitutional role of oversight over our Nation's foreign policy.

The congressional role in foreign policy is vital. Congressional impotence in the past in overseeing foreign policy has resulted less from the exercise of Presidential prerogative than from congressional capitulation. For too many years, Congress has done too little, too late, too sporadically. Clearly the most egregious instance of congressional inaction is the failure of this House ever to undertake a searching examination of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

This is not to say that there are no signs of meaningful change. The intense congressional scrutiny of the military budget in the last session demonstrated a welcome, and necessary, assertion of authority in an area too long left to executive dictate. And, of course, this goes directly to the issue of foreign policy since, ultimately, the U.S. military posture is a function of the role it chooses to play in foreign affairs.

The concept of a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Policy is a simple one and is one amply supported by precedent. Today, there are in existence 10 such joint committees. Probably the most well known are the Joint Economic Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The committee I propose would bring together 10 Members from each House of the Congress to study U.S. foreign policy and to make recommendations. It will, as well, be able to propose legislation.

A committee of this nature is especially necessary for foreign policy because of the broad number of issues and wide range of legislation which may very vitally bear on our foreign affairs posture.

One example should suffice. The administration last year sought and obtained money to start deployment of an ABM system. And now, Defense Secretary Laird is seeking to expand this program. Apart from the very significant questions of effectiveness and cost, there is as well the vital question of how deployment of the ABM will affect efforts to achieve arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, the SALT talks, and our relationship with China. How will the Soviets react to what they may interpret as a hostile move, viewing the ABM system as actually offensive, rather than defensive?

Our foreign policy is articulated—by intention or otherwise—by a variety of means: treaties, military and economic assistance, trade restrictions, tariffs, buy-American requirements in federally

funded construction projects, limitations on the amounts American tourists may spend overseas, military expenditures, and others.

Needless to say, several committees, in both Houses, are concerned with one, or more, aspects of these subject areas. Thus, the House Armed Services Committee considers weapons systems; the House Foreign Affairs Committee deals with foreign economic assistance; the Ways and Means Committee considers tariffs and trade matters.

Apart from this diffuse approach, used to examine various bills which have the common, and very significant, ground that they affect foreign policy, there is the unacceptable fact that some issues and legislation which should undergo the most stringent scrutiny receive only perfunctory analysis. Again, one example—Vietnam—proves the case. The House has never, as a body or by committee, undertaken to examine stringently U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Over 40,000 American servicemen have died in combat in Vietnam, and yet the House has never really addressed the issue.

In order to obtain a coherent, penetrating approach to overseeing this Nation's foreign policy, a joint congressional committee—cognizant of the ramifications for our foreign policy that numerous, disparate actions may have—should be established, equipped to correlate these actions consistently, intelligently, and beneficially.

As the concurrent resolution provides, therefore, the 20-member joint committee serves four major purposes:

First, to insure that the congressional role in creating and passing upon foreign policy is firmly and clearly effected;

Second, to expand the congressional capacity to deal with foreign policy problems;

Third, to provide a clear focus on the difficult decisions to be made by the Congress and the executive branch affecting foreign policy; and

Fourth, to provide the other committees of the Congress with the necessary background to insure effective action on foreign policy problems and needs.

News reports of recent days—bringing to the public eye at least some knowledge of U.S. activities in Laos—are further demonstration to the need for this Joint Committee on Foreign Policy. We cannot allow this House to once again abdicate its proper function. Far more is at stake than Congress simply serving its proper institutional role. The President must not be permitted to involve the United States in another Vietnam tragedy with the further sacrifice of American lives and the devastation of the people and villages of another small country.

The words of President Nixon in his press conference on December 8 clearly further compel creation of this joint committee. The President stated, in response to a question concerning U.S. involvement in Laos and after reporting that our bombers are interdicting the Ho Chi Minh Trail as it runs through Laos:

Beyond that, I don't think the public interest would be served by any further discussion.

The public interest can only be served by full discussion and stringent oversight. That is what the joint committee would enable.

PROTECTION OF EXECUTIVE MANSION AND FOREIGN EMBASSIES

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14944) to authorize an adequate force for the protection of the Executive Mansion and foreign embassies, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "and" where it appears the second time.

Page 3, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, and insert:

"(5) by striking out the last two sentences of section 203(a);

"(6) by amending section 203(b) to read as follows:

"(b) Members of the Executive Protective Service shall be recruited under the civil service laws and regulations on a nationwide basis. Members of such Service may also be appointed from the members of the Metropolitan Police force and the United States Park Police force from lists furnished by the officers in charge of such forces. Whenever any vacancy is created in the Metropolitan Police force or the United States Park Police force as the result of an appointment to the Executive Protective Service, such vacancy shall be filled in the manner provided by law. In the period of time which follows the date of enactment of this sentence and precedes January 1, 1975, not more than thirty members of the Metropolitan Police force may be appointed annually to the Executive Protective Service."

"(7) by striking out section 205; and

"(8) by striking out in section 206 'Members appointed pursuant to section 205 of this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Members of the Executive Protective Service not appointed from the Metropolitan Police force or the United States Park Police force.'"

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are all the amendments germane to the bill?

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield.

Mr. GRAY. Yes. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. This amendment adopted by the other body only places a mandatory ceiling on the amount of policemen that can be drawn from the District of Columbia police force for the Executive Protective Service. It is a limitation of 30, for a total of 130, over a 5-year period. A maximum of 150 out of a total of 600 requested by the President.

I know that the gentleman raised that question along with others when the bill was under debate. It improves the bill, and the answer to the question asked by the gentleman is that it is germane.

Mr. GROSS. What was the number in the original bill, if the gentleman will refresh my memory?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the White House police force now has 250 men, which will be in-

creased under this legislation to 850 men or a net increase of 600. The President directs the chief of the Secret Service to protect all of the embassies in Washington. Out of the 600 additional police that can be hired, no more than 150 over the next 5 years can be drawn from the District of Columbia police force.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that the citizens of the District of Columbia will get equal protection with the foreigners who happen to be inhabitants of the District? In other words, will the citizens of this District be as well protected as are those who are here by sufferance?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentlemen will yield further, as always, the gentleman raises a very important question. The answer is emphatically yes, because we intend to relieve those policemen now protecting foreign embassies for duty in the District of Columbia. This is one of the purposes of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Will they be as elite, as those who are assigned to protect the embassies?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the policemen who are now protecting the embassies in Washington will continue to wear the same uniforms and the answer to the gentleman's question is no, they will not be elite; they will have no special uniforms.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2910, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 862 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 862

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2910) to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I

yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 862 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 2910 to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

The law was enacted in 1965 authorizing the construction of the third Library of Congress Building on the federally owned property adjacent to the Cannon House Office Building, which would contain a suitable memorial hall honoring the fourth President of the United States for his many and brilliant achievements. The appropriation of \$75 million was authorized for construction, including the preparation of necessary designs, plans, and specifications.

In the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, the House and Senate approved an appropriation of \$2.8 million for final plans and specifications contingent upon enactment of legislation adjusting the limit of cost of the project to reflect an accurate cost estimate plus any projected escalated construction costs required to complete the project. Thus, the purpose of this bill is to increase the authorization from \$75 to \$90 million.

It should be noted that: the exact estimate of costs and the escalation in the estimate for the facility is due to the continuing rise in construction costs; the facility is to be a library building and is not intended for other use; the Library of Congress is presently paying close to \$2 million annually for rental space scattered over the city and this cost would be eliminated when the Madison Memorial Library is completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 862 in order that S. 2910 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) has ably stated, House Resolution 862 makes in order for consideration of S. 2910 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of S. 2910 is to authorize additional appropriations for the new Library of Congress building to be known as the James Madison Memorial Building.

In 1965, Congress authorized construction adjacent to the Cannon House Office Building. It was urgently needed then, even more so now. Currently, the Library of Congress is paying about \$2,000,000 a year to rent space in buildings all over the Washington area.

In 1965, legislation was enacted authorizing appropriations of \$75,000,000 for design and construction costs. In 1968, appropriation requests totaling \$2,800,000 for design work was denied by the Appropriations Committee.

The 1970 appropriations request in the same amount has been enacted with an additional proviso requiring a reevaluation of the cost estimate for the entire project.

The bill does revise the cost estimate upward by \$15,000,000 to a final figure of \$90,000,000.

The report makes clear that this is to be only a Library of Congress building, nothing more. It also states that the delay of over 4 years, caused by the lack of appropriations, is the sole cause of the need to increase the authorization by \$15,000,000.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) has filed separate views, believing that any increase in the authorization should wait until the design work has been completed.

With inflation continuing to spiral, the construction of this building should be postponed. As a matter of fact, the proposed site should be held for the future and a contiguous location to the present Library of Congress building should be found.

It is inconceivable to me that this Congress would desire to continue authorizing large appropriations and at the same time express deep concern over the critical problem of inflation. We must discontinue reckless spending if we are to prevent this financial chaos.

I am proposing that the House kill the proposal for the present time in hopes it will be one step in the direction of controlling our monetary problems.

Just this week I heard a widely known economist predict that a mild recession is inevitable and that we must control spending if we are to conquer inflation.

For these reasons, I am strongly opposed to this rule and I am opposed to the bill and would urge that it be defeated.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman suggesting that the best way to handle this bill is to kill the rule and go on with whatever other business we may have today?

Mr. QUILLEN. That is one way of doing it, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, and I certainly would support that proposal.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I certainly will also. The position taken by the gentleman from Tennessee is exactly right; this is no time to proceed with this proposition.

Mr. QUILLEN. I think that it should be postponed, and whether or not we kill it by voting down the rule, or whether we kill it by voting down the measure, one way or the other the bill is dead.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentleman from Tennessee for the statement that he has made on the rule.

Also I would like to join with the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Iowa in voting down the rule because it seems inconceivable to me that we would increase an authorization to construct a building from \$75

million to \$90 million without plans and specifications having been drawn up.

I do not know whether this building is going to cost \$75 million or whether it is going to cost \$90 million, and I do not believe anyone who serves on the Committee on Public Works knows what it is going to cost. There is only one way to determine the cost, and that is to prepare plans and specifications and go out for bids. The plans and specifications for this building have not been completed, as the report well shows. It seems to me that we should take this up in timely order, and that is by finding out what it is going to cost before we come in and ask for more money.

The more money we authorize, the more it is going to cost, as the gentleman knows. So if we increase the authorization from \$75 million to \$90 million you can be assured that it will cost \$90 million, or if we were to increase it to \$100 million you can be sure that it would cost \$100 million. Whatever the authorization is, it is an open invitation to the designers and the planners and to the bidders to spend every cottonpicking penny they can get their hands on, and more, too.

So again I commend the gentleman for his statement, and for his indication that the rule should be voted down.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his timely contribution.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that we as Members of Congress should consider at this point that this measure represents an additional expenditure of \$90 million at a time when we have raging inflation, which should be of primary concern to us.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the committee report states that the expected construction time on this building is 54 months after the original contract is let for constructing the building. In other words, that is 4.5 years.

Here we have an increase from the original \$75 million request for authorization up to \$90 million, based on today's costs. If we have a continuation, as the report suggests, of increasing costs at the rate of 10 percent a year, over the 54 months it will take to construct this building, which is 4½ years, this would amount to approximately \$40 million in additional costs of construction added on to the \$90 million.

So I am not sure but what this building might end up costing somewhere in the neighborhood of \$130 million. I believe that this is a pig in the poke, and I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that it should be rejected on the floor of the House today.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield again to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the magic about this figure of \$90 million? That boondoggle called the sports arena, that the House wisely voted down the other day, last week I believe it was—carried a price tag of \$90 million. I am curious to know why these cost tags on propositions of this kind.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I would say that there is no magic, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, as to why or how these figures have been picked out. They just picked \$75 million and added 7 percent a year compounded to that figure. The truth of the matter is that they are going to spend and they are going to build whatever they can in accordance with whatever figure they can get out of the Congress.

It is inopportune for us to pick any figure until we can see—based upon some solid evidence, what it is going to cost. The figure is not magical—it is just one picked out of the wild blue yonder, as they so often do in a bureaucratic spending authorization.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know why there is this exception on page 2 of the bill that:

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 986), shall be construed to authorize the use of the third Library of Congress building authorized by such Act for general office building purposes.

What kind of subterfuge is this?

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield again to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I would say to the gentleman, if I might, that my understanding on the day it was before the committee in executive session—I am not on the subcommittee—is that this was put in there to somewhat appease the gentleman from Iowa who has posed the question that he has been concerned about whether or not there would be another House office building in connection with this. I do not think I am telling you anything out of school, but that was the general thinking. They were concerned in the full committee. The gentleman from Iowa had raised the question on some bill, maybe the original bill here or on some other bill; that there might be some subterfuge going on; that there would be additional House office space in this building. So I would say that my understanding in that executive session was that this was put in there because of some of the diligent work that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) has done heretofore.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield again to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the light of what has transpired, does the right hand know what the left is doing in connection with this proposition?

Mr. SNYDER. I would say, if the gen-

tleman will yield further, that due to the diligent work that the gentleman from Iowa has put some caution into the deliberations of some of the committees around here, for which the gentleman from Iowa is to be commended.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that we should have an overall plan on the future of the Capitol area. This plan should be forthcoming before any building is built on the proposed location. I repeat again, I think the addition to the Library of Congress building, and I do not object to the name, should be adjoining the present building, rather than putting it down on the proposed site, as recommended by this measure.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Personally, I always believe in voting on the rule on the basis of whether or not it is a fair rule; one, which allows sufficient time for debate, consideration of amendments and other factors. Once we have adopted the rule we can then properly debate and vote for or against a measure on its merits.

I am concerned as to whether the plans for the Library provide adequate parking facilities for the Library employees. My constituents who work at the Library as well as employees from the District of Columbia and Virginia have a serious parking problem. It is very difficult to find a parking space. In addition inadequate parking contributes to the crime problem in that employees, both men and women, are often forced to walk a number of blocks between their cars and the Library often during hours of darkness.

I, personally believe it imperative that plans for this extension of the library provide ample safe parking for the employees in order that they have the security and peace of mind which they deserve.

I take the same position in voting for this rule on this as I did on the rule on the timber bill. Although I opposed the timber bill itself, I felt, as I always feel, there should be the opportunity for fair debate and possibly for amendments.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Again I want to say to the gentleman from Maryland that I thought we were discussing the merits, if any, and the demerits of the bill.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I have always believed that the object of debating and voting on a rule is to ascertain whether we have an adequate rule under which we can properly discuss the merits and shortcomings of a proposal.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. We are not discussing the merits of the Library. We are discussing the merits of a plan to put up, the Lord only knows how much money, to erect another structure down here and the nature of what that structure will be. We are not discussing the merits of the Library.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I thought we were also going to consider the fact that, when we talk about spending a lot of money, we are spending millions of dollars each year merely to rent space that is scattered around this city in 14 or 15 different locations, whereas we could consolidate those facilities and would not have to spend \$2 million a year for rental space for the Library.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on the rule, but since there has been so much darkness spread on the other side of the aisle here, I thought it was time to shed a little bit of light on what this bill would do.

First of all, my distinguished friend from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) who serves on the committee with distinction, made the best argument for this rule and for this bill when he said that we have to draw plans before we know how much a building is going to cost. That is all we are here for today.

The House Committee on Appropriations, with 52 very distinguished members, almost 1 year ago provided \$2.8 million for the architects to proceed with design drawings. But in that language they added a proviso that not one red cent could be spent until your House Committee on Public Works had come forth with an exact, precise estimate of the total cost of the proposed building. We know from the history of the Rayburn Building that when you have an open-end authorization, you can have overruns and increased costs by inflation and other factors, and the cost can go on and on and on. So \$525,000 was spent by a group of three very distinguished architectural and engineering firms to come up with exact, precise estimates, including an allowance of 7 percent per year for increased costs by way of inflation over the construction period. The \$90 million provided in this authorization is a maximum ceiling. The longer we wait to draw the architectural plans, which will take at least 1 year, the more we are costing the American taxpayer.

So I am a little surprised at my friends on this side of the aisle who would be talking about \$40 million more, the gentleman from Nebraska said, because it would take 4 years to construct. There would be \$40 million more cost.

Mr. Speaker, the lot on which this

building would be constructed was acquired back in 1958. That is 12 long hard years ago. We authorized this project in 1965. That is 5 long, hard years ago. And while we have been vacillating and talking about the need for a third library building, the costs of that building have already escalated by \$22.5 million, \$7.5 million more than the authorization we are asking for here today.

If Members want to talk about being penny wise and dollar foolish, I advise them to vote against this rule and vote against the bill, and when the buildings we are renting all over town begin to bulge at the seams, and we cannot get any service out of the Legislative Reference—which serves 435 Members in this House and 100 Members in the Senate—and our people in our districts write and say the Library of Congress does not answer their mail, then we will be coming back and we will be talking about \$150 million or \$200 million 10 years from now. That is really saving money for the taxpayers.

What are the facts about the need for a third Library of Congress building? Have a look. Here we have 4,000 employees working for the Library of Congress, serving your constituents and my constituents. They are housed, as the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia said, in 12 different locations around Washington. We have 159 working in the navy yard, 160 in the east navy yard; 200 in Suitland, Md.; many out in Crystal Mall, Va.; we have them in the Alexandria Federal Center; we have them at 2028 Duke Street, Alexandria; we have them at South Picket Street in Alexandria; we have them at Wright Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio; we have them at 415 Third Street NW.; we have them at 1291 Taylor Street; we have them at a Federal depot in Middle River, Md.; and we have them at 214 Massachusetts Avenue NW. At all these places we have people working and carrying on the work of the Library of Congress.

Since we authorized this building in 1965, your taxpayers and my taxpayers have already paid out \$10 million in rent for these locations, in addition to the 12 Government buildings we are utilizing, which is pre-empting space there and causing those other agencies to have to go out and spend millions of dollars for other rented space.

When we build this building next door to the Cannon Building, we will bring all these 12 various locations of work into the third Library of Congress building. Members here know that having people and doing business in 12 different locations causes duplication of management and duplication of waste. Talk about bus-ing for schools, how much do Members think it costs to carry all the documents—52 million of them housed in the Library of Congress—all over Washington in order to store them and bring them back when needed and when Members call for all kinds of research and they have to go out to the suburbs of Maryland or Virginia to bring back documents to be sent to Members of Congress and all over the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest econ-

omy bill we have ever brought before this Congress. A former distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Judge Smith, stood in the well of this House in 1965 and said this is a bill that needs to be passed. Not only will this give us a third Library of Congress building, but also we will be able to give a proper memorial to the great President of the United States, James Madison our fourth President. Judge Smith supported this bill. Do Members know of a more conservative Member of Congress than former Member Howard Smith of Virginia? He knew it was in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that Members of this Congress, who call on the Library every day for research work and for writing nice speeches and for this and that, can stand here and say: It is a great idea, but not now; it is a great idea, but should be done some time down the road; or it is a great idea, but we cannot afford it.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking only for a small \$2.8 million, that has already been appropriated almost a year, and this bill merely releases that money. It is not going to have any significance in relation to our inflationary pressures. It will take at least a year in order to design this building. All we are doing today is saying that whenever we go out for bids, whatever the cost, it cannot exceed \$90 million. That is all we are doing. We may build it for \$60 million or for \$70 million, but our estimate today is that it will cost \$90 million and not a dime more than that.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my very distinguished friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, who has heard witness after witness testify concerning this matter. He is the very distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. I will say to the gentleman that I support this rule and the bill.

As the gentleman stated, I do not think a more conservative Member ever sat in this House than our friend, Judge Smith of Virginia. He came before our committee and pleaded for construction money and for planning money. He was in favor of the addition to the Library. As the gentleman pointed out, there is a desperate need for this building. The Government is paying \$1.8 million a year for additional space needed for the Library.

The Library is growing. We want it to grow. It is one of the great assets of this Nation.

This building will provide for the needs of the Library for at least 50 years.

I thank the gentleman for the fine statement he has made.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my distinguished friend for his contribution.

I want to point out one other thing. I was here in 1958, along with most other Members. I recall the strong opposition against our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, when he wanted to acquire that area known as "ptomaine row"

immediately next to the Cannon Office Building. I heard the cries, "We do not need it." I heard the cries, "It is too much money."

Thank God for the wisdom and the foresight of the distinguished late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, the distinguished Speaker (Mr. McCORMACK) the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), and the others who served on the Building Commission. Because of their wisdom and foresight we acquired that entire two-block area of property here in the shadow of the Capitol for a little over \$5 million.

Do the Members know what it is worth today? At a conservative estimate it is worth \$20 to \$30 million.

If we vote down this rule, and vote down this bill, and say, "We do not need the Library, how can we do so, when we are growing at 5 million a year? Does anyone believe that we are going to close the schools? Does anyone believe there is going to be a lesser need for libraries or a lesser need for knowledge?"

It is a question of whether we want to vote for this bill today and make this \$2.8 million available and get on with the architectural work and later build this building for all Americans, or whether we want to talk about economy, as they did with Sam Rayburn, and then come back to spend three times as much later on.

I get no personal satisfaction out of asking the House to support a \$15 million authorization. Of course I do not.

I get no personal satisfaction out of voting an average of \$200 million or \$300 million a year for projects which come under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds that I have the honor of chairing, for Federal buildings all over the country. I know they are needed, so I vote for them.

I am here today to ask the Members to forget about whether we can afford it and to ask themselves, can we not afford to provide space for the Library of Congress? That is the issue. Let us vote this rule and let us vote this bill. It passed the other body unanimously.

I will guarantee, my friends, when we pass this and send it to the President, and give a go ahead to the architects and see that building functioning for the American people; yes, we will hold our heads high and say, "I am glad I struck a blow for education."

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I might have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois who was just in the well, I should like to set the record straight with the gentleman. I believe there is some confusion as to what my position is.

I have not said I was opposed to the construction of adequate facilities for the Library of Congress. I say that it is bad business practice to increase the authorization from \$75 to \$90 million without the plans and specifications having been completed.

I know the gentleman is going to say

that the appropriation bill provided they were not going to spend the money for plans and specifications until such time as the additional authorization was made.

If the gentleman wants to go out and build for himself a new house, he can build a \$50,000 house or \$75,000 house or a \$100,000 home. But I will say one thing. He is not going to authorize money to be committed until such time as he has plans and specifications and adequate material in front of him from which he can make a determination as to what he is going to get for his money.

To me, I do not find any argument with the fact that we can probably save some money by not going out and leasing space for these documents which they have all over town. But I say to the gentleman, I believe—this is just a belief, and it may be in error—we can adequately house them for \$75 million. That is just a guess, but it is just as good a guess as \$90 million.

I say that the only way it will be possible to find out what it will cost to build that building, whether over and above \$75 million or not, is to have plans and specifications drawn, to see if they meet with the approval of the gentleman's subcommittee. If it is what I expect, \$75 million; if not, \$90 million. Then they can come in and show Congress what they will spend the other \$15 million for.

I do not have any hesitation in saying to the gentleman that I am fairly well convinced at this juncture they need more space, but I do say it is a mighty poor business practice, and not a private enterprise company in the United States of America would exist very long building buildings on this kind of a proposition and premise. It just does not work.

I say to the gentleman further, if the Appropriations Committee has put any limitation in, then the thing to do is to deal to take it out, because that makes more conservative sense.

I would say further to the gentleman that if you do pass this bill, which you probably will today, you can give me no assurance that the Committee on Appropriations will not write in a similar limitation when the public works appropriation bill comes out this year and say, "We will not let you go ahead with the plans until you increase the authorization to \$150 million." If they want to hold our feet to the fire, it is a two-way street.

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

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman would not yield to me.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAY. I did not see the gentleman.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about our former colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Smith. I, too, have affection for Judge Smith, but after all he is not here today. You are here, and it is up to you—it is your responsibility as to whether you are going to spend \$90,000,000 of the

taxpayers' money for another marble edifice here at the Capitol. You are responsible to those who pay the bills, not our friend Judge Smith.

I would like to get something straight, and I regret that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS), is not here, because I want to quote his record back to him as of less than a year ago in the hearings before his appropriations subcommittee:

Mr. ANDREWS. Suppose that at some future time the House, after constructing the Madison library, decided that it needed a fourth office building. Could it, if it wished, convert this building to an office building?

This may be something way in the future, but as you know, there are those who think square 732 ought to be reserved for a fourth office building for the House.

Mr. CAMPIONI. Since this building has been designed as 100 percent flexible so that it can be used as either part office building, part library stack area, or either all stack area or all office building, this building could be converted to an office building in the future.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are the footings designed to take a building as high as the present surrounding buildings as a general office building?

Mr. CAMPIONI. Yes, sir.

Now, exactly what are you getting at in this deal? An addition to the Library of Congress or another House office building? Sure you have put language in this bill to the effect that the \$90,000,000 is not to be used—that nothing contained herein is to be construed to mean that it may be used to construct a fourth House office building, but in the light of the statements I have just read I seriously question what is actually proposed.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I am always glad to give public praise to the very distinguished gentleman from Iowa, because he raised that question on the floor when the appropriations were being considered.

Mr. GROSS. Just 1 minute. I am not looking for any kudos. I just want you to settle down here.

Mr. GRAY. I am not trying to do that.

Mr. GROSS. I would like you to settle down and tell me and I would like the gentleman from Alabama, who took this testimony less than a year ago, to tell me just what you are up to.

Mr. GRAY. I will be delighted if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. That colloquy took place on June 10, 1969.

Mr. GROSS. June 11.

Mr. GRAY. I beg your pardon, June 11. In late 1969, several months after that—to be exact, it was October 16, 1969—your House Committee on Public Works, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, read that colloquy and was disturbed with it. We have written into this act in section 2 where it says that nothing contained in the act shall be construed—

Mr. GROSS. I have read it. Please do not take my time to read it again.

Mr. GRAY. I want to assure the gentleman if this bill passes, I have been assured by the other body that they will accept the House amendment and the

President will sign it with a direct prohibition against it being used as a fourth House office building. So the gentleman has done a great public service.

Mr. GROSS. Suppose we kill this rule and stop this funny business now. The gentleman from Illinois, according to the newspapers, is already in financial trouble with the Visitors Center which he sponsored in Congress not so long ago.

Mr. GRAY. Oh, no.

Mr. GROSS. He does not have enough money and he will have to come back to the Congress to get some more money.

Mr. GRAY. Not I.

Mr. GROSS. And the other day the gentleman spoke in behalf of a sports arena here.

Mr. GRAY. I was not on the floor.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the gentleman let up on us and on the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. GRAY. I was not even on the floor when that bill was brought up. But if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman voted for it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding.

I would like to direct some questions, if I may, to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that considered this bill. It is referred to as the James Madison Memorial Building. Madison, of course, was born in the district that Judge Smith formerly represented and I am now representing.

In what way is this to be a memorial to former President Madison other than naming a building after him or a room after him? What will be done to honor him?

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

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I am glad that the gentleman from Virginia has asked that question because I did not cover it in my previous remarks.

The James Madison Memorial Commission is composed of Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, Senator HRUSKA, of Nebraska, Senator BENNETT; also the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), and, two public members. They got together with our committee and decided that we were going to build a functional building as an addition to the Library of Congress and that this would be a great way to memorialize the fourth President, James Madison. It will not take up an awful lot of space, but there will be a suitable memorial put in the front part of the building. In other words, as one enters the foyer, it will not be a great hall, but a hall with a lot of Madison's works. It will be a fitting memorial describing the great work he did in his tenure. It will

also contain his papers and other works to be placed there.

So, it will be a very suitable memorial.

That Commission asked that we use taxpayers' funds to go someplace and construct a building just for the sole purpose of memorializing the fourth President of the United States. We felt that a functional building to be used by the taxpayers for a needed library was the best way to do it. As the old saying goes, we feel that we have killed two birds with one stone.

Mr. SCOTT. Is there now a memorial in Washington at this time to the former President?

Mr. GRAY. There is not.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the members of the committee for their very untiring efforts and for doing the things in which they believe. However, at the same time, let me point out again that I sincerely feel that the construction of this building should be postponed.

First of all, I do not think the site is the proper location for such a building. We now have the Library of Congress, across the way over there, with a recognized front. The people coming to the Nation's Capital can recognize that building unquestionably. But, if you build another building—a separate building for the Library of Congress just because you have a vacant site available—does that mean that you are doing the right thing for the taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, I say again that there should be a master plan for the Capitol area. Let the planners decide where a new Library of Congress building should go, and I say that they will come up with an adjoining structure to the present landmark building, leaving the front of this building for all America to see and recognize as they have in the past.

Mr. Speaker, just because we have a vacant site, because someone in the Congress had the foresight to buy it at a bargain, it does not mean we have to build a Library of Congress building on that site. I say we should postpone permitting \$90 million to be thrown into the economy when construction of new Federal buildings throughout the land are being postponed in order to curb inflation. And, to have the distinguished subcommittee chairman take the well of this House and say he is surprised at some Members speaking out against this measure because we call the Library of Congress personnel for services; if that is a threat, I resent it.

The Library of Congress is not going to tell me that they are not going to give me service because I stand up here and say what I believe is in the best interests of the taxpayers of this country. And I think that the gentleman should reconsider what he said on the floor of this House. I am not ashamed to call over there, and I will call tomorrow, and if they resent my calling I will take the floor of this House.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have very much respect and very high regard for the gentleman, but I think that speech had better be made to the Bureau of the Budget, because we are only asking at the most today the release of \$2.8 million, and the President has asked for the 1971 fiscal year new buildings to cost \$183 million for buildings all over the country, including a project in the minority leader's hometown. I am all for it. I will vote for it. But I do not think the gentleman should chastise the Members for voting for this project to serve the entire Nation.

Mr. QUILLEN. What is the building in my hometown?

Mr. GRAY. I said in the minority leader's hometown.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the sincerity of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY), but I do not think that the Members of the Congress should be threatened by a lack of service from the Library of Congress. I do not think that any Member of this House should be threatened because a building is being built in his district. I think that I represent the finest taxpayers in this country, and I am in favor of saving money for the taxpayers of this Nation. For that reason the postponement of the construction of this building is not going to bring the present walls of the Library of Congress tumbling down. The gentleman brings a picture before the Members of this House showing the crowded conditions; did the gentleman ever take a picture in another agency to show the crowded conditions in that agency?

Yes, maybe the building is needed, but I believe that we should have a master plan of the Capital area before we take this vacant site and say this is where the building should be.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this rule should be defeated, and if not, the measure should be defeated.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am sincere when I say that I have brotherly love and respect for every Member of this House, and I would not seek to impugn the motives of the integrity of any Member.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman in the well of the House say that we should be ashamed to call on the Library of Congress for services if we are opposed to this measure. I am not ashamed, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Maybe the word "reluctant" would be better.

Mr. QUILLEN. I do not think that we ought to expect retaliation. Because I brought up some facts in opposition, it does not mean that I have to vote for this bill for fear of being denied service from the Library of Congress, and I am not going to vote for it. Let them cut off the services to my office if they will.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 289, nays 62, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—289

Abbott	Donohue	Kee
Abernethy	Dorn	Keith
Adair	Downing	Kleppe
Adams	Dulski	Kluczynski
Addabbo	Edwards, Ala.	Koch
Albert	Edwards, Calif.	Landrum
Alexander	Eilberg	Langen
Anderson,	Eriensborn	Leggett
Calif.	Esch	Lloyd
Anderson, Ill.	Evans, Colo.	Long, La.
Andrews, Ala.	Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Andrews,	Fallon	Lowenstein
N. Dak.	Farbstein	McCarthy
Annunzio	Fascell	McClary
Arends	Feighan	McCulloch
Ashbrook	Findley	McDade
Aspinall	Fish	McFall
Barrett	Fisher	McKneally
Beall, Md.	Flood	Macdonald,
Bevill	Flowers	Mass.
Blaggi	Flynt	MacGregor
Blester	Foley	Madden
Bingham	Ford, Gerald R.	Mahon
Blackburn	Fountain	Maillard
Blanton	Frelinghuysen	Marsh
Boggs	Friedel	Matsunaga
Boland	Fulton, Pa.	May
Bolling	Fuqua	Mayne
Brademas	Galifianakis	Michel
Brasco	Garmatz	Mikva
Brooks	Gaydos	Miller, Calif.
Broomfield	Gettys	Miller, Ohio
Brotzman	Gialmo	Mills
Brown, Mich.	Gibbons	Minish
Brown, Ohio	Gilbert	Mink
Broyhill, Va.	Gonzalez	Minshall
Buchanan	Gray	Mize
Burke, Mass.	Green, Oreg.	Mizell
Burleson, Tex.	Green, Pa.	Monagan
Burison, Mo.	Griffin	Montgomery
Burton, Calif.	Griffiths	Morgan
Burton, Utah	Grover	Morse
Bush	Gubser	Morton
Button	Gude	Mosher
Caffery	Halpern	Murphy, Ill.
Carey	Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.
Casey	Hammer-	Myers
Cederberg	schmidt	Nedzi
Celler	Hanley	Nichols
Chamberlain	Hansen, Idaho	Ober
Clark	Harrington	Olsen
Clay	Harsha	O'Neal, Ga.
Cleveland	Hays	O'Neill, Mass.
Cohelan	Hébert	Patman
Collier	Heckler, Mass.	Patten
Colmer	Helstoski	Pepper
Conte	Henderson	Perkins
Conyers	Hicks	Phillbin
Corbett	Hogan	Pirnie
Corman	Hosmer	Podell
Cowger	Howard	Poff
Cramer	Hull	Preyer, N.C.
Crane	Hungate	Price, Ill.
Culver	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Cunningham	Jarman	Pucinski
Daddario	Johnson, Calif.	Rallsback
Daniel, Va.	Johnson, Pa.	Randall
Daniels, N.J.	Jonas	Rees
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	Reid, N.Y.
Delaney	Jones, N.C.	Reifel
Dellenback	Jones, Tenn.	Reuss
Derwinski	Karth	Rhodes
Dickinson	Kastenmeier	Riegle
Dingell	Kazen	Rivers

Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Schwengel
Scott
Sebellius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz

Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggoner

Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Powell with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Baring.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Melcher.

NAYS—62

Bennett
Berry
Betts
Brinkley
Burke, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Carter
Clancy
Clawson, Del.
Collins
Conable
Coughlin
Davis, Wis.
Denney
Dennis
Devine
Dowdy
Duncan
Eshleman
Foreman

Frey
Goodling
Gross
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hastings
Hechler, W. Va.
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jacobs
King
Kyl
Landgrebe
Latta
Lujan
McClure
Martin
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix

O'Konski
Pelly
Pike
Poage
Pollock
Quillen
Rarick
Roth
Roudebush
Ruth
Schadeberg
Scherle
Snyder
Stratton
Thomson, Wis.
Weicker
Whitehurst
Wilson, Bob
Wold
Zwack

NOT VOTING—79

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Blatnik
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Chappell
Chisholm
Clausen, Don H.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Ford
William D.

Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Goldwater
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hollifield
Horton
Kirwan
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lennon
Lukens
McCloskey
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
Mann
Mathias
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moss

O'Hara
Ottinger
Passman
Pettis
Pickle
Powell
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Ruppe
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebell
Steiger, Ariz.
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Watson
Wilson,
Charles H.

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

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Gallagher with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Bow.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Schneebell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 16311 UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MARCH 11, 1970

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Wednesday, March 11, 1970, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 16311) entitled "The Family Assistance Act of 1970."

Of course, this request includes any supplemental or additional views.

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

There was no objection.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2910) to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2910, with Mr. CASEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GROVER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable KENNETH J. GRAY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works, for reporting to this body the legislation pending before us, S. 2910, which would increase the authorization for construction of the Madison Memorial Library from \$75 million to \$90 million. This is an increase of \$15 million over the original figure which the Congress authorized in the first session of the 89th Congress. When the original legislation authorizing the Madison Memorial was passed, the crying need for additional space for the operation and use of the Library of Congress and its facilities was made quite obvious to the Committee on Public Works.

This need has increased in the interval between the passage of that legislation and the bill now pending before this body today. S. 2910 would provide the additional funding that is needed to assure complete construction of the building so that the Library of Congress can continue its great work in proper surroundings.

Our Library of Congress is one of the great libraries of the world. It cannot be allowed to continue to operate in the manner it now does with its personnel and offices scattered throughout the Metropolitan Washington area. There is a definite need for this third Library of Congress building. I strongly support this legislation and I might point out to our colleagues that this legislation as reported by the Committee on Public Works makes it quite clear that this new building—with the exception of the portion set aside to honor James Madison—will be used for library purposes only, and nothing else.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we had a rather extensive debate on the rule, so to keep from being repetitious I will try to more or less summarize for the benefit of those who are here now who were not here during the debate on the rule.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Public Works is here today requesting an authorization of an additional \$15 million for a third Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. This legislation was required by action of the 52-member Committee on Appropriations. They allowed \$2.8 million the last fiscal year, fiscal 1970, that ends June 30 of this year, to begin architectural and engineering work on the third Library building that will be built on Square 732, which is the 2-square block area immediately east of the Cannon House Office Building, but they had a proviso in this appropriation bill that said that not 1 dime can be spent until we, the authorizing Committee on Public Works, fixes a final mandatory maximum ceiling on the cost of this project.

I think this was somewhat wise, because we know through history that the cost of the Rayburn Building escalated many times through change orders and

other escalated costs so that the bill before us today is a definite maximum ceiling that this project, regardless of how worthy it is, cannot exceed a cost of \$90 million when we finally go out for bids a year or two from now.

Now, in the very lively debate—and I think that that is healthy for the House—several arguments were advanced against voting for the rule and voting against the bill. So I should like in just a few moments to bring out some of the answers to those arguments that were advanced.

One argument was advanced by the very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), that it will take 4 years to construct this building, and that if costs escalate 7 percent a year this would be another \$30 or \$40 million cost in the Library, so that therefore it should be postponed.

What the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska does not realize is the fact that this land was acquired back in 1958—12 long years ago—that this project was authorized 5 years ago, in 1965, and that we have been vacillating; that we have been postponing, that we have been waiting, and as a result it has already cost the taxpayers just since 1965 a total of \$22.5 million in escalated costs, or \$7.5 million more than we are asking for in the authorization bill before us today.

Other arguments were advanced, that this project was not needed, that we ought to get along with the present Library of Congress, that was built back in 1840.

Let me again remind you in answer to that allegation that we are now renting space in 12 different locations around the city of Washington at a cost of \$2 million per year. So just since we authorized this in 1965, we have cost your taxpayers and we have cost my taxpayers a total of \$10 million in rented space.

I want to take the time, if I may, to read to you the locations of the various functions of the Library of Congress: 159 people working at the Navy Yard; 159 people working at the East Navy Yard; dozens of people working at Suitland, Md.; dozens of people working at Crystal Mall, Va.; dozens of people working at the Alexandria Federal Center; dozens of people working at 2028 Duke Street, Alexandria, Va.; dozens of people working at South Pickett Street, Alexandria, Va.; dozens of people working at the Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio; dozens of people working at 415 Third Street NW.; dozens of people working at 1291 Taylor Street NW.; dozens of people working at Federal Depot, Middle River, Md.; and people working at 214 Massachusetts Avenue NE.

In other words, there are 4,000 people spread all over Washington and the environs of Washington trying to carry on their business—not just the business of the Library of Congress and not just the business of storing documents, but answering the requests of schools all over this Nation and answering the requests of schoolchildren of all ages.

This is not a Library of Congress per se. This is a library—the only library serving all of the libraries of this great Nation. Yet, we have a large number of people voting “no” today, believing that there is no need for the construction of this library building.

I would like to call to your attention, if I may, to this photograph of the Legislative Reference Service. Listen to me now, my friends. This is the Legislative Reference Service that answers the requests of 535 Members of the House and Senate. They are housed out in the main room of the Central Library Building—with wooden partitions. How can they possibly concentrate on the valuable information that you are asking for—maybe speech material that you are going to deliver or a thesis that someone is working on for their doctorate? How can they possibly concentrate and get the best possible information and work under conditions like that?

There is one point that I did not bring out in my remarks on the rule, and this is a very important point. Do you realize that these documents that we are housing such as Lincoln's original Gettysburg Address and the Gutenberg Bible, which is the first printed document, and many of the works of our Founding Fathers are housed in many of these old buildings that are firetraps? What will we do if these 52 million documents that are the foundation—and, yes, the very precepts and concepts of our Nation, were destroyed by fire in one of these 12 buildings where they are housed?

We want to bring them all under one roof. We want to avoid the duplication in the management of these materials and the business of having to send buses all over the city to deliver documents and every time you want something, having to send a car to go and get it. We want to be able to bring these documents all under one roof and keep them there. This is an economy bill, I will say to you, my friends. You cannot go back and say that you voted to save the taxpayers money by voting “no” on this bill. To the contrary—because the clock is ticking on and on and we are paying \$2 million in rent for other space every year—plus the 12 Federal buildings where we are using the space for the Library which could be used by other agencies. So we are preempting space in these other buildings and other agencies are now renting space to use at a cost of several million a year.

So if you add that on, you will see that we will probably save \$4 or \$5 million a year in rent alone when we construct this building.

But forgetting about dollars and cents, let us talk about the energy for our knowledge. Anything—a human being or a machine—requires energy for propulsion. We cannot energize the thousands of libraries. We cannot energize the millions of students who come here to acquire knowledge and to be productive in this country without having the background information, the documents, the books, and all the historical documents needed by them to study, to learn, and to be productive in their lives.

As I said in the debate on the rule,

I get no real satisfaction in coming here and asking my dear friends in this House to vote for a \$15 million authorization. I get no satisfaction in approving projects all over this Nation, in chairing the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I know they are necessary and I know that every dime that is spent is, yes, based on a benefit-to-cost ratio, to see that the American taxpayers will get more benefit than the cost of the proposed projects.

In closing, let me tell you that really all you are voting for today is an authorization for \$2.8 million that the Appropriations Committee appropriated almost 9 months ago. It cannot be released, it cannot be spent until this bill passes. It will take at least a year to draw the plans, and then when we go out for bids, we may build this for much less than \$90 million. The economy could level off; the interest rates may go down. In any event, it cannot cost more than \$90 million.

I want to make the record clear here today that as long as I remain chairman of this subcommittee, I will not be back, as in the case of the Rayburn Building, saying, "\$90 million was not enough. We need more. They will either build it for \$90 million, or if they go out for bids and the bids are over that figure, they will come back and cut the plans to size and stay within the \$90 million. So go ahead and tell your constituents that you voted to free \$2.8 million today, and that you voted to place a maximum ceiling of \$90 million, no more, on this project. Then we can proceed with this project. Let us quit looking at the dollars-and-cents aspect.

Mr. Chairman, we had a very vigorous debate, which was healthy, but I am sorry to say that many of my friends whom I admire and respect over here on this side of the aisle are placing a dollar-and-cents value only on this library and for all libraries throughout this Nation. I would not impugn the integrity or the motives of anyone, but I would like to repeat a little story that I think is germane. It draws a very good analogy of what we are doing here today. This is the story about a man going into the sunset of his life. He was 90 years of age. All during his lifetime he went around looking for things of monetary value, picking up key chains, finding nickels, dimes, and quarters. When it was too late he said, in writing his diary, that in his entire lifetime he had found only about \$2,500 in things of monetary value. But all during those 90 years, he said, "I failed to look up when to do so I could have discovered thousands of new friends. I failed to look up to see beautiful sunsets and the changing of the seasons. I failed to look up to see the really important values of life."

I know we have to watch the purse strings. I know we are in a tight inflationary period. But I say to you today that there are many things that come before this House that are far more important than things of monetary value only. I say that preserving Lincoln's original Gettysburg Address, preserving the Gutenberg Bible, preserving all of the

historical documents that have helped to make us the greatest nation in the world, putting them under one roof, and at the same time getting the added benefit of memorializing our fourth President, James Madison, are steps that our Nation can afford to take.

Mr. Chairman, even Howard Smith, who was chairman of the Rules Committee for many years, spoke for this bill when it passed, at the time he was in Congress. Last year he came before the Appropriations Committee and asked for money for this project. He was the most conservative Member of this House when he served here with great distinction as chairman of the Rules Committee. He saw the values of life. He saw that this Library of Congress building was far more important than money.

Let us strike a blow, as I said, for the education of this Nation. Let us do something for the millions of schoolchildren who want to use these facilities. We have had that land, costing \$5 million, lying idle over there for 5 years. Let us vote unanimously, without even a rollcall vote, and send it to the White House. It passed the other body without one dissenting vote. Why can we not do that? Let us have a unanimous vote, and send this to the White House, and say to the schoolchildren of the Nation that we are going to preserve the historical documents that are ours to have by putting them all under one roof.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As far as I know, there is not too much question about the fact that these facilities are needed. At least, I do not question it. I would like to say that I do like the idea of the open space we have at the present time, but I am realistic enough to understand that probably cannot continue.

However, I would like to ask the gentleman about this aspect. There has been question raised about the design of the building and about the fact that it would fill this lot to a degree that it would be beyond that which is desirable, that it would crowd the area unnecessarily. Are we today committing ourselves to any design, or are we voting for plans which will later be before us for acceptance or rejection?

Mr. GRAY. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, raises a very important question. If the gentleman will recall, we had a very long colloquy in 1965, when this original legislation came before the House and was approved. Only \$525,000 has been appropriated for preliminary design plans. All we are doing today, if this passes and is signed into law, is freeing \$2.8 million for the architects to go into the design.

I remembered the gentleman's very great concern. I have told the architects—the three firms that will be designing this building—that we do not want a mass of concrete without some green, that we want it set back sufficiently on the lot so that there can be beautiful landscaping, and I assure the gentleman we will monitor the gentle-

man's concern and see that we get a functional building compatible with other buildings in the Capitol Hill area, but at the same time having some green around it.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wondered who established the benefit-to-cost ratio. Did the gentleman from Illinois establish it?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is a very great mathematician. We have had this lot for 12 years. We have spent a total of \$2 million a year over that 12-year period for rent, so we have already paid out \$24 million for rent, while we have been looking at a vacant lot. Simple mathematics would say that if we go for another 12 years without doing anything, it will be \$48 million for rent, and if we go twice that long, it will be \$96 million for rent. If we stop this rental cost, it will show in a very short period of time that we will have paid for the building. That is what I call a benefit-to-cost ratio.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the gentleman calls a benefit-to-cost ratio.

Mr. GRAY. We are building a flood control project in the gentleman's home area to control floods. That is the way the Army Engineers figure the cost-to-benefit ratio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, at the rate we are getting money for that flood control project out there, it will be 100 years from now before we get the floods stopped.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is right. Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman has \$90 million for this deal right now, has he not?

Mr. GRAY. No. We have had \$75 million here for 5 years and not a dime of it has been spent. We hope only to spend \$2.8 million in the next year.

Mr. GROSS. We have not spent anything so far?

Mr. GRAY. We have spent \$525,000 in 5 years, if the gentleman calls that a great deal of money.

Mr. GROSS. That is a great deal of money to me.

Mr. GRAY. I bet we have spent more than that on the Waterloo flood control project in the last 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. I bet a plugged nickel we have not.

Mr. GRAY. I am not being facetious, but I will be glad to appear with the gentleman before the Appropriations Committee and urge them to appropriate that money for the flood control project, because I know the gentleman has a problem.

Mr. GROSS. But with the holding which is going on and which the gentleman is apparently not acquainted with, I am afraid the gentleman and I would have difficulty getting by the barrier there.

Mr. GRAY. I am standing with the gentleman, not against him.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. If I correctly understand the situation here, we are being asked to authorize another \$15 million at this time because the Appropriations Committee says we cannot spend the \$2.8 million unless we do that. Is that correct?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes, as there may be further questions.

Let me elaborate just a moment and tell how this \$75 million figure came about.

This is a misconception to many Members. The Committee on Public Works tried to be honest when they came in here. Instead of saying, "We are going to authorize a third library," we gave a "guesstimate." I repeat, we gave a "guesstimate" of what the building might cost.

We have appropriated \$525,000 over the past 5 years.

We now have official estimates, exact estimates taking into account the escalation in cost. We are here today saying to you that instead of a \$75 million "guesstimate" in 1965 we are being honest with you and putting in a mandatory exact estimate, a ceiling of \$90 million on the project.

This does not mean the Members are voting \$15 million additional today. This has been the argument all day on this debate. This a maximum ceiling. When we go out for bids it may be we can build for \$70 million, or it may be \$80 million.

The Appropriations Committee, as my friend points out, put in a proviso that we cannot spend even \$2.8 million until we put a maximum exact 1971 estimate of the cost on.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. I am glad to yield further?

Mr. DENNIS. Is it not a rather unusual procedure to authorize \$15 million here because the Appropriations Committee says we cannot have any money until we do that? Did the gentleman consider going back to the committee and asking them if they would not spend a reasonable amount for plans without requiring us to authorize another \$15 million at this time, well ahead of any construction or even plans, as I understand it?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman makes a very important point. I want to confess my oversight.

What should have happened, when the appropriations bill came on the floor, was that we should have raised a point of order against the language. It was legislation on an appropriation bill. But, like all other Members, we are busy and we have constituents here, and it slipped by me. It got by the other body. They acquiesced. It was signed into law. It is a law now.

If we had gone out for bids \$75 million probably would have been adequate, but we are faced with the situation today of a law. If we wait for another year, for the Appropriations Committee to undo what needs to be done, with a 7-per-

cent escalation in cost, we are talking about another \$6 million out of the taxpayers' money while we sit here and argue about it. It is that simple.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. DENNIS. The gentleman would have to agree that even though we increase this authorization now there is exactly no assurance, and no possible way of being assured, that the actual construction will not cost more than this \$90 million at this point.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman can be assured of this one thing, that no agency, including the Capitol Architect who will be in charge of this construction, can spend one nickel more than is authorized.

Mr. DENNIS. I know that.

Mr. GRAY. If they go out for bids, and it is \$91 million, they will have to lop \$1 million off. If they come back and say, "Give us another \$1 million authorization," I am pledging to you that as long as I remain the chairman of this subcommittee there will not be any additional authorization bill brought in. They will live within this \$90 million ceiling.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time I have I first wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee, who have taken all the questions that have been raised here under advisement. The same concerns expressed by those outside the committee members here on the floor were the concerns expressed by myself and other members of the committee.

The chairman of the subcommittee that handled this bill in committee has been very diligent and thorough in his handling of this very important legislation. He has been and is imminently fair and proven once again that he is an outstanding Member of the Congress.

After his presentation of the basic facts little can be said to add to the argument for this bill.

After we weighed all of the facts and considered all the questions and considered all of the factors, we felt we must do this. So this bill has been brought before you here today with the support of both sides on the subcommittee.

In the prepared remarks I have, Mr. Chairman, I have first given a brief summary of the history of this legislation and then listed some pertinent facts that I think ought to be considered with it.

I believe in libraries, and I greatly respect this great body that many years ago provided for the Library of Congress. We now have an institution that we have given birth, to which we have given encouragement and supported the growth of through the years. It is the greatest library of its kind in the world. I join with all of those who want to make it more effective and efficient.

Mr. Chairman, the prepared remarks I have, which I will present here for the Record, are more complete than I will state them now, and I ask you to take the time to read them. They are not entirely authored by myself; they are authored with the help of those who certainly un-

derstand libraries and the importance of books better than I do. I do humbly invite you to read the entire document, however.

Now let me summarize this very briefly. Let me remind you that in the 20th century the Library assumed, that is, the Library of Congress, increasing importance as a national library and as a cultural, intellectual, and educational center for our Nation. It developed a subject classification scheme which is now used by most libraries in the United States. It permits other libraries to benefit from its own expert cataloging and distributing of printed catalog cards through a card distribution service which returned over \$7 million to the Treasury of the United States in 1968. That is only one part of the story, however. It is hard to estimate this, but there are untold millions to add to this in the way of amounts of money it has saved other libraries that otherwise would have had to provide their own catalogs. It would have been much more expensive for them to have performed it rather than to have the Library of Congress perform this service for them. This is an important factor for us to remember as we consider this bill.

The Library of Congress operates a program which provides free books for the blind. This is because of action we have taken here in Congress. It provides for the physically handicapped through 43 regional centers free service made possible by this body or this Congress. It offers through the National Referral Center an information service on the physical and social sciences to scientists throughout the country seeking sources of such information. It has taken the lead in investigating the possibility of automation in library processes and a machine readable cataloging service as well as a card distribution service with computer printed catalogs and other graphic controls. Throughout this period the Library has built unparalleled collections, gifts, purchases, exchanges, and deposits which combined to create in this one institution collections unequaled anywhere in the world today. Rare books of all kinds, with an emphasis on Americana. To each of its beneficiaries the Library shows a different face. There are many beneficiaries of the Library.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to say, first of all, that I am in favor of this bill and wholeheartedly support it. But I want to take this time to congratulate the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Iowa, for his splendid efforts in behalf of what we have to do and what has been done on Capitol Hill, about the capital of the world. This is the place. I think the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) has done a marvelous job. I am very proud to have been one of the original members of the U.S. Capital Historical Society with the gentleman from Iowa

serving as our leader, and I am happy he still serves in that capacity.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say again and again it is a wonderful thing that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) has taken this upon himself and has done a splendid job. I endorse all of the programs on which the gentleman has worked so ably and hard during the past years.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman very much.

Let me continue very briefly. To most Members of the House, to most of us in Congress, the Library of Congress means the Legislative Reference Service upon which we can depend for an unbiased survey of conflicting facts that legislators have to reconcile. I might add that there is no library in the world that serves its representative body in this manner as does our Library of Congress. There are ways and means to make the Library more effective and efficient in this regard, and I hope we will seek those ways and means and institute some programs so that we can take more and better advantage of the Library. Those of our constituents who come and visit, view the Library as a storehouse of treasured knowledge, containing the Gutenberg Bible, Jefferson's draft of the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address which has already been mentioned, and countless other valuable manuscripts; the Music Division, the Prints and Photographs Division, the Serial Division, as well as others. To the historians this is a repository of the private papers of American leaders, including those of our Presidents through Coolidge. To the geographer it is the Geography and Map Division, where he can consult over 3 million maps and cartographic records from all over the world. To the music lover it is the Coolidge Auditorium where throughout the winter months he can attend chamber music concerts made possible by the Coolidge and Whittall endowments. To the professional librarian it is the place to look for innovative solutions to the problems of coping with the "information explosion."

To all of these and many more the Library provides continuing service.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has built well. Following Thomas Jefferson's dictum, "There is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer," we have created a national library that stands as visible evidence of our belief in enduring intellectual values and of our search for truth.

My good friends, I hope you will heed the admonition of our leadership of the committee and pass this bill forthwith, for its passage would not only mean saving money but would represent one of the best investments we can make in this great country.

Mr. Chairman, let the public record show that Public Law 89-260, signed on October 19, 1965, authorized an appropriation of \$75 million for construction of a third Library of Congress building. Appropriately Congress has already decided to name it the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

Public Law 89-309, signed October 31,

1965, appropriated \$500,000 for preliminary plans and specifications for the building. A contract was entered into by the Architect of the Capitol, after approval of the congressional coordinating committee responsible for the overview of the construction, with the Associated Architects, DeWitt, Poor, & Shelton, in June 1966. On August 25, 1967, the preliminary plans and designs were unveiled in a Washington press conference by Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, of North Carolina, chairman of the congressional coordinating committee.

A supplemental request for \$2.8 million for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1968, was made by the Architect of the Capitol to permit the drawing of final plans and specifications. The House Committee on Appropriations disallowed this request, but the Senate reinstated it. The conference committee on the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1968, however, disallowed the request.

In his budget for fiscal 1969, the Architect of the Capitol again included a request for \$2.8 million for final plans and specifications for the Madison Building. The House Committee on Appropriations, in reporting the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal 1969, stated in its report—House Report No. 1576, 90th Congress, second session:

There seems to be no question about the Library needing a third building. The Library continues—inevitably—to grow. Annual space rental costs now approach \$1 million, and the Library keeps looking for more available and suitable space. The budget situation is worse than it was last December, leaving the committee little justifiable choice in the decision to defer the item.

The item—\$2.8 million—was "deferred without prejudice."

The Senate Committee on Appropriations also denied the item, stating in its report—Senate Report No. 1350, 90th Congress, second session:

The committee has denied the request for these funds at the present time in view of the budget situation.

A request of \$18,410,000 is included in the budget of the Architect of the Capitol for fiscal 1970. This request, if approved, would allow for final plans and specifications and would allow the Architect of the Capitol to enter into contracts for excavation and foundation work and for preordering the masonry for the exterior of the Madison Building. This request would permit construction in several phases without delays between contracts and therefore would effect reduction in temporary rental costs being incurred by the Library of Congress; would reduce the ultimate cost of the project by avoiding from 12 to 16 months additional escalation costs; and would permit occupancy earlier than the single-contract construction schedule.

Additional arguments in favor of appropriating this money during fiscal 1970 are the following:

Space problems at the Library of Congress, which become more severe as time passes, have forced the Library to disperse its activities to several outside locations thus hampering service to the Congress, Government agencies, libraries, the scholarly world, and so forth.

Lack of space presents serious preservation problems in that the Library's invaluable collections are scattered in several locations and, of necessity, must be improperly shelved.

Rental space, now costing nearly \$2 million annually, coupled with escalating construction costs—estimated at about 10 percent per year—will cost the Federal Government more and more money each year there is delay in appropriating funds for the continuation of the building program. Although it is necessary to appropriate the \$18,410,000 before the contracts for the work mentioned can be made, only a small portion of the amount requested would be expended during the coming fiscal year. It is therefore in the interest of real economy and efficiency to continue the program without delay.

I include at this point the following fact sheet:

FACT SHEET ON LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Authorized by Congress October 19, 1965 (Public Law 89-260).

Need for Building:

1. Severe shortage of space, which is hampering present services and will have critical impact on future services.

2. Some services and collections have already had to be dispersed to six outlying locations, ranging from the Baltimore to the Alexandria areas; this is resulting in operating inefficiencies and inconvenience to the public.

3. Rental cost to the Government for outside space (over 500,000 sq. ft.) already exceeds \$1.6 million per year and delay in constructing the Madison Building can only add to this cost, to say nothing of that for the Madison Building itself because of drastically escalating construction costs.

New building providing needed space is to be constructed on Square 732 (bounded by Independence and C Streets and First and Second Streets, S.E.)

Preliminary plans approved by Congressional Coordinating Committees in 1967.

Building would provide approximately 1.7 million sq. ft. of space for staff, users, and collections and have a total gross area of about 2 million sq. ft., six floors above grade from Independence Avenue and three floors below grade.

To contain the following services and operations:

	Square feet
James Madison Memorial and Exhibition Hall	15,200
Law Library	179,860
Legislative Reference Service	104,700
Processing Department	400,040
Copyright Office	150,790
Administrative Department	89,600
Office of the Librarian (including Information Systems Office)	25,800
Reference Department (Manuscript Division, Music Division, Prints and Photograph Division, Serial Division)	503,210

Architects: DeWitt, Poor & Shelton.

Estimated completion schedule if funds requested in the Architect of the Capitol's budget for fiscal 1970 as well as subsequent budget requests for construction are appropriated:

Completion of final plans and working drawings: 1970.

Occupancy of building: 1970.

APRIL 1969.

Mr. Chairman, on July 20 we witnessed a spectacular event, the arrival on the moon of men from the planet earth. How this was accomplished seems

to be beyond the comprehension of most of us. This "small step by man and giant step for mankind" is an achievement, however, that makes us think of the steps over the centuries that led to these moments—the first astronomers charting the movement of the heavenly bodies, the first scientists observing the phenomena of magnetism, pioneers of aviation exploring the earth's atmosphere, engineers forging metals able to withstand ever greater heat and stress were all small and giant steps. Each step in man's ascent to the moon and all other ascents were built on the experiments and discoveries that had been made before, are all recorded in books.

How much we owe our triumphant conquest of space to the makers and keepers of books is immeasurable. We owe much to those Egyptians who in 4000 B.C. made a writing material from papyrus, to that ancient king of Pergamus who prepared for writing the skins of sheep and calves and perpetuated the name of his kingdom in parchment to those 12-century builders of paper mills, to those 15th-century printers. And how much we owe to the countless millions who recorded knowledge and to those who preserved it and stored it for future generations will never be known. Said Edward Gibbon:

The use of letters is the principal circumstance that distinguishes a civilized people from a herd of savages incapable of knowledge and reflection. . . . (without) some species of writing no people has ever preserved the faithful annals of history, ever made any considerable progress in the abstract sciences or ever possessed, in any tolerable degree of perfection, the useful and agreeable arts of life.

The instinct to preserve important writings is as old as civilization itself; the earliest libraries were temples where sacred writings were preserved and the earliest librarians were priests. We know that a library of literary works inscribed on clay tablets existed at Nineveh in the seventh century B.C., and in Greece and Rome there were many libraries that were, while not public in our sense of the word, freely opened to scholars and learned men by their owners.

It was the rediscovery of the learning of the ancients, locked away in monastic libraries during the dark ages, that led to the Renaissance and at the height of the Renaissance the development of printing from movable type that made possible the dissemination of learning, the development of the arts and sciences, and the establishment of modern libraries.

On this continent the first library was that of Harvard College, which was formed in 1638 with the 400 books bequeathed by John Harvard; in 1700 libraries were established at Yale and at the College of William and Mary. The first "public" libraries in the colonies were usually the work of clergymen, interested in furthering religious instruction. Secular knowledge was collected from a desire of the people themselves for information.

Benjamin Franklin, for instance, started in 1727 a debating society for young tradesmen like himself who at first pooled their books and then formed

a subscription library. Now a branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Library Company received its first purchased books in 1732. Other subscription libraries were formed in Rhode Island, the Redwood Library and Athenaeum; in South Carolina, the Charleston Library Society; and in New York City, the Society Library. By 1776 there were 29 libraries open to the public in the 13 colonies, with 45,623 volumes; by 1800 there were 49 libraries with double the number of volumes.

The hunger for education was so great, and the interest in the promise of science and mechanical invention so widespread that more and more libraries were established in the first 4 decades of the 19th century by groups of artisans, clerks, and apprentices and by young men's associations. The trend stopped only with the growth of free tax supported libraries, a natural accompaniment to the growth of free schools. One of the first free municipal libraries to receive public support was in the town of Peterborough, N.H., in 1833, but the first public library to be established as a municipal institution supported by taxation was the Boston Public Library in 1848—that's only 122 years ago. There followed the development of a public library system unknown in any other country.

By 1964-65, 6,922 public libraries served a population of 181,000,000, circulating through the main libraries and 3,833 branches 842,000,000 books to 52,000,000 borrowers. One thousand eight hundred and seventy other libraries served over 7,000,000 faculty and students in universities and colleges and over 4,000 special libraries served the members of research institutions, learned societies, business firms, and industries.

The Government's commitment to library service began with the Library of Congress. For all Americans it was demonstrated in a number of pieces of legislation enacted in all States with special legislation for these States and in the 1950's and 1960's, the most important of which were the rural Library Services Act, later amended to be the Library Services and Construction Act, the Higher Education Act, the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under title II of ESEA alone, in 1964-65 the Library programs which involved the purchase and loan of some 20.6 million items—books, magazines, and audiovisual materials—reached some 27.5 million public and private school children, and about 3,378 new elementary and 259 new high school libraries were set up. Over 60,000 public school libraries expanded their collections.

The founders of the Republic were, of course, aware of the importance of books. Most of them had private libraries and all of them acknowledged the debt they owed to classical and European writers on political economy for the ideas that formed the U.S. Government. The Congress of the new Government itself created its own library when it included

in the act for the removal and accommodation of the Government of the United States, April 24, 1800, just 170 years ago, an authorization for the expenditure of \$5,000 for the purchase of such books as might be necessary for the use of Congress at Washington and for fitting up a suitable apartment in the Capitol for their safekeeping. On December 18, 1801, Uriah Tracy, Senator from Connecticut, and 3 days later John Randolph of Roanoke, of the House of Representatives, both members of the new Joint Committee on the Library, made an important report to their respective Houses on the subject of the needs of the Library of Congress. On January 26, 1802, an act concerning the Library for the use of both Houses of Congress provided that the books previously kept separately by each House be placed in the north wing of the Capitol and that the unexpected balance of the first appropriation of \$5,000 together with such sums as might be later appropriated be expended under the direction of the joint committee. The first collection of books, about 3,000, was made that same year.

This first congressional library was destroyed in 1814 when the British burned the Capitol, and to repair the loss Thomas Jefferson offered to sell his collection of 6,700 volumes to Congress. In spite of some objections in the House to the "infidel" character of some of his books and to the fact that the collection included "too many Bibles" the offer was accepted and Jefferson's library was placed in temporary quarters until the Capitol Building was restored. In 1824 when the Library was established in those rooms in the Capitol that were to be its home until 1897, Congress eased the expansion of its collections by remitting all duties upon books, maps, and charts imported by the Library.

In 1852, a year after a disastrous fire had destroyed over half of the 55,000 volumes then in the collection, Congress appropriated \$157,000 for the restoration of the Library hall and the purchase of books. In 1866 Congress transferred to the Library the 40,000 volumes in the library of the Smithsonian Institution, a great scientific collection with the largest number of journals and transactions of learned societies in the country. And in 1867 Congress appropriated \$100,000 for the purchase of the Peter Force collection of books, manuscripts, maps, and papers relating to American history, the most complete private collection then in existence.

In 1870 the growth of the Library was assured by a law regulating copyright that required that two copies of each book registered for copyright be sent to the Librarian. By 1873 its growth was such that a proposal was made to erect a separate building east of the Capitol and a Commission was appointed to study the subject. The Librarian of Congress, Ainsworth Rand Spofford, predicted at that time:

"Whatever may be the present rate of growth of American libraries, it cannot be doubted that their prospective increase, with the growing development and intellectual enterprise of the country, will be in an accelerated ratio as

compared with the past. The Library has twice doubled in 12 years. In 1860 there were 63,000 volumes in the Library, in 1866 there were 100,000 and in 1872 there were 246,000. Without calculating upon specially large accessions, it is reasonable to assume that, by the ordinary additions to its stores from copyrights and from all other sources, it will reach 700,000 by the year 1900, 1,250,000 by the year 1925, 1,750,000 by 1950, and 2,500,000 by 1975, or about a century hence."

Improbable though this prophecy may have seemed, its author was shown to be too conservative even before the end of Spofford's career, which spanned the incredible period from 1864 to 1908 at the Library. The new building was opened in November 1897, and into it were moved about a million books, manuscripts, maps, music, photographs, and pamphlets. By 1968 the Library held almost 59 million items and occupied two buildings on Capitol Hill, with some of its services and its collections already or about to be dispersed to rented quarters in Washington and elsewhere.

In the 20th century the Library has assumed increasing importance as a national library and as a cultural, intellectual, and educational center. It developed a subject classification scheme now used by most large libraries in the United States; it permits other libraries to benefit from its own expert cataloging by distributing printed catalog cards through the Card Distribution Service, which returned over \$7,000,000 to the U.S. Treasury in 1968. It operates a program which provides free books for the blind and physically handicapped through 43 regional centers. It offers through the National Referral Center an information service on the physical and social sciences to scientists throughout the country seeking the sources of such information. It has taken the lead in investigating the possibilities of the automation of library processes—MARC—machine-readable cataloging—card distribution, computer printed book catalogs, and other bibliographic controls. And throughout this period, the Library has built unparalleled collections. Gifts, purchases, exchange, and deposit have combined to create in this one institution collections unequalled anywhere in the world—rare books, Hispanica, Slavica, Orientalia, Semitica, and of course Americana.

To each of its beneficiaries the Library shows a different face. To most of us in Congress it means the Legislative Reference Service, on which we can depend for an unbiased survey of the conflicting facts that legislators have to reconcile. To our constituents who visit their Nation's Capital it is a storehouse of treasures—the Gutenberg Bible, Jefferson's rough draft of the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and countless other manuscripts, music scores, prints, and photographs on special exhibit. To the historian it is the repository of the private papers of American leaders, including those of our Presidents through Coolidge. To the geographer it is the geography and map division, where he can consult over 3 million maps and cartographic records

from all over the world. To the music lover it is the Coolidge Auditorium where throughout the winter months he can attend chamber music concerts made possible by the Coolidge and Whittall endowments. To the professional librarian it is the place to look for innovative solutions to the problems of coping with the "information explosion." To all of these and many more the Library provides continuing service.

Congress has built well. Following Thomas Jefferson's dictum, "There is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer," we have created a national library that stands as visible evidence of our belief in enduring intellectual values and of our search for truth.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) for the purpose of explaining a motion to recommit.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois after his commitment in the well of the House that so long as he remains the chairman of this subcommittee there will be no further authorizations requested, will give us a firm commitment to be pledged to his reelection if this bill is passed because I think we need that kind of assurance somewhere along the line. We have been down this road on so many of these projects before.

This time has been given to me to explain the motion to recommit which I intend to offer, if recognized.

It will be my intention to offer to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works with instructions that it not be reported back to the House until all necessary design, plans, and specifications have been completed. Now, this will, of course, automatically put us at odds with the limitations put on the money already appropriated for design as written into the appropriation bill. But I would say to the Members of the Committee that the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee has begun its hearings. As I understand it, the Committee on Appropriations is pretty much committed to giving us an appropriation bill per week, beginning after the Easter recess. So what we would be doing would be going back to the Committee on Appropriations and saying to the Committee on Appropriations we have got to take out this restriction which you have put in. We will be doing this in the next month or two, which will let the plans and specifications be completed with the \$2.8 million that has been appropriated. Then the Committee on Public Works and its subcommittee under the chairmanship of Mr. GRAY can take a look at those plans and can see positively whether or not we need a \$75 million building or we need a \$90 million building. This limitation is based upon good business practice.

If any member of this committee, or any Member of this body were going to have a house built or any structure built he would not authorize any money in any way until those plans and specifications had been drawn up and he saw what he was going to get for every buck

he was going to spend. We should treat the taxpayers' money with the same kind of discretion that we treat our own money and that would be the purpose of this motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, I will say again, as I said during the debate on the rule, that I believe that we do need additional space. I believe that we need a structure so that we are not leasing this space all over town and running people all over town for these documents. But we are not approaching it in a good, sound business fashion, the way we ought to conduct the taxpayers' business under the trust that has been given to us to spend their money wisely.

For the Committee on Appropriations to come back here and cut that limitation out, is not going to be catastrophic. We can proceed with this, if it seems prudent. We need to see what we are going to get for the taxpayer's money.

That, briefly, is the substance of the motion to recommit, and the purpose for which the instruction is put into it.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor the committee, but let me point out something that I think my distinguished friend, Mr. SNYDER, who serves with distinction on the Committee on Public Works has overlooked. The architects are three outstanding firms who are drawing a commission rate based on 5 percent of the project's price. Do you realize what the proposed motion to recommit offered by the gentleman would do? If we give these people a free hand to go out and design a building to fill up this two-square block they may come back with a \$130 million or \$140 million set of plans. The gentleman says that we ought to wait until the plans are finished, and then authorize the project. I say to do so would open up a Pandora's box. If the costs continue to escalate we may come back with a big, grandiose plan, costing \$120 million or \$130 million for a building bulging at the seams, and some Congress might authorize it. I do not want that. I want to tell the American people that it is not going to cost them more than \$90 million. Under this bill, if they draw the plans and the cost is going overboard, then let them go back and redraw them and stay within the \$90 million.

So if you want more money, vote for the motion to recommit, but if you want to know exactly what it is going to cost, then vote for this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the committee on which I am honored to be the ranking minority member, and to assure the gentleman that I too will stand side by side with him should anybody come to his committee, or any other committee, and ask for further funds in view of the pledge made by the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for interrupting the gentleman, but I do

want this committee to know of the tremendous work that the gentleman from New York has put in on not only this project, but on all projects good for this Nation. We have had wonderful cooperation from the minority side of the aisle in our committee, and I want to give public credit where credit is due.

Mr. GROVER. I thank the gentleman for his kind comment.

I would say that we on the committee generally do feel as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGL) feels and as many do in the Congress, that there is a critical need for this library extension.

One thing I think should be cited, and that is that every year in education funds we dispense throughout the country, and without the kind of control that we have from the House architect, we dispense money throughout the country to villages and to school districts and municipal districts to build libraries—millions of dollars—and we have no direct control over it whatsoever.

The very commonsense of what the gentleman from Illinois said—that we have spent over \$20 million for offsite storage around the District and outside of the District over a period of years, and we are spending \$2 million a year for that outside storage space—it seems to me it is penny wise and dollar foolish.

In fact, what we are asking for here is a \$2.8 million authorization so we can get the funds to go forward with plans and specifications which we must have in order to get the proper bid which will be, as we are committed, under the ceiling of \$90 million.

Again, I want to compliment the gentleman who made a most persuasive argument on the floor, even for the many of us fiscal conservatives in this very fiscally difficult time.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the Nation has created magnificent memorials to Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt here in Washington, D.C., with others in various planning or construction stages for Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy—but we are now told that somehow we have shamefully neglected many other of our past Presidents, and so we must erect a memorial for Madison. Whatever happened to the Adamses?

For a while, it seemed that to name a favored project in the name of a President gave it the magic touch to slide the project, no matter the cost, through the Budget Bureau, the committees of Congress, and the two Houses, for who would dare oppose a memorial to a President. Recently, however, this practice has come under question, and it is about time. I supported the motion to recommit the legislative appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970 when it included language appropriating \$2.8 million for planning for the James Madison Memorial Library building, and voted for the unsuccessful amendment to delete that appropriation from the bill. More recently, I opposed legislation to authorize planning for the Eisenhower Memorial Arena. Although I have supported appropriations needed to complete the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, I have done so not because I am impressed with the argument

that it memorializes the late President but because the Nation's Capital needs the facilities this building was proposed to offer and because failure to complete construction and enable operation of the Center would mean the millions of dollars already invested by our taxpayers would be absolutely wasted.

I am opposed to the resolution now before the House, for it would not only trigger allocation of \$2.8 million for planning for the James Madison Memorial Building but also it would in effect commit the Nation to eventual construction of a building now estimated to cost a total of \$90 million—and I doubt very much that anyone in this Chamber would be willing to bet his seat in Congress that final costs for this project would not eventually exceed even that tremendous total cost estimate. At a time when both the Congress and the President are attempting to shave appropriations even for high priority needs, when public works projects intended to reduce flooding or pollution must often be delayed in order to hold down expenditures, how can the Congress think of approving this legislation which primarily would serve the Congress and its employees?

It may be interesting to note that during neither of James Madison's two terms as President did total Federal expenditures for all purposes for all 4 years approach even a fourth of the amount requested for the planning and construction of the Madison Memorial Building. Surely the defeat of this proposal, and the initiation of other activity to further reduce Federal expenditures, would constitute a far better memorial to President James Madison than would this extravagant building.

I do not question that the Library of Congress needs considerably more room. It is doing a great job with its present space and staff limitations, despite the many demands made upon it. I do question whether the proposed building is, as planned at present by the Architect of the Capitol, really what the Library of Congress needs for future expansion and growth. Have the architects taken into account the best of modern library techniques, including storage of information in computer data banks and the use of information retrieval techniques? Perhaps if expenditures are to be made, it is time to be thinking of spending for such modern equipment and techniques rather than for obsolete dead storage space and offices.

When a school bond issue is defeated, the school board, the school administration, and the architects get together to knock out what is unessential and the frills or prestige items, and present to the voters a pared-down revision of its plans and cost estimates. Sometimes this process must be gone through several times before the bond issue is finally approved. All of my colleagues surely are acquainted with this process, yet we are now presented with the proposition that Congress must enlarge its original authorization for the James Madison Memorial Building by another \$15 million. I submit the Congress should instead insist upon the original \$75 million authorization limitation and require the

proponents of this building to prepare and present revisions of their original plans and specifications, paring away the unessential and the frills and expensive prestige items until they have a basic, no-nonsense building which would meet the real future needs of the Library of Congress and would not, despite projected construction cost increases, possibly exceed the authorized level by the time it has been finally constructed and ready for occupancy. The present resolution should be recommitted to the House Public Works Committee with instructions that this be done. Failing this, the resolution should be soundly defeated.

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the Clerk read.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes", approved October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 986), is amended by striking out "\$75,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$90,000,000".

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 2. Nothing contained in the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 986), shall be construed to authorize the use of the third Library of Congress building authorized by such Act for general office building purposes."

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the statements, particularly those made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY), both on the rule and subsequent to the adoption of the rule on this bill.

I have not heard any other member of the Committee on Public Works, or any other committee rise on the floor of the House and join the gentleman from Illinois in his assertion and promise that the cost of this building will be held to \$90 million. I appreciate the gentleman's assurance, but it does not amount to very much and this is said with no disrespect to the gentleman. In the first place, the gentleman is elected for only a 2-year period. He is just as subject to the whims and caprices of politics as any other Member of the House. He can be here today and gone tomorrow, just as the gentleman from Iowa.

So his assurance that this is only going to cost \$90 million is a fleeting thing at best. Mr. Chairman, I now invite any Member of the House on either side of the aisle, including the distinguished minority leader, to rise and tell us of any building project that he or she knows of that has been constructed around here in the last 15 or 20 years which has not

exceeded the cost at which it was sold to the Members of the House when the original authorizing legislation was enacted or the original appropriation was made. I invite the gentleman from Illinois to cite to me one project in the last 15 years or 20 years that has not substantially exceeded the original assured cost. Furthermore, we did not have the inflation during all that period of time that the gentleman talks about so profusely here today.

Incidentally, what is there that causes the gentleman from Illinois to think that there may not come a day soon when inflation will be stopped and perhaps the costs of construction reduced?

Is there any reason to assume that inflation will not end one of these days?

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

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

Mr. GRAY. In answer to your last question first, I certainly hope that it stops soon. But it will take 1 year to draw these plans. So if we do stop the inflation, or if it slows way down, we will be the better off for it, because the building will not go out for bids for at least 1 year.

Second, the gentleman made a very eloquent speech against the proposed motion to recommit. That is the very thing I am fearful of, that is, if we do not pass this bill and we allow the architects to proceed, we must remember that they get 5 percent of the total cost of the project, and why should they care if it costs \$150 million? The more it costs, the more their fee.

I want to put a ceiling on the project, and if we wait until they come back with their final detailed drawings and say, "We are sorry, but it will cost \$150 million," then someone—perhaps not me or the gentleman from Iowa—will have to get up in the House and say, "Folks, I'm sorry, it is \$150 million."

That is what happened in the case of the Rayburn Building, and we want to avoid a repetition. The gentleman from New York, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, has assured us also that, as far as we are concerned in the 91st Congress, we will not be back but we will have them cut the budget to size so that it will come within the \$90 million.

Mr. GROSS. Before the gentleman takes all of my time, I should like to ask a question or two. How long ago was it that the annex to the Library of Congress was built?

Mr. GRAY. Not since I have been here, and I have been here 16 years.

Mr. GROSS. It is of recent origin, is it not?

Mr. GRAY. Comparatively recent. I understand the original Library of Congress Building was built in 1840 and the annex building was built in the early 1950's.

Mr. GROSS. Did anyone go back and review the debate on the construction of the annex? Was it not stated then that additional space would not be required for the Library of Congress in the foreseeable future?

Mr. GRAY. I did not do so, because

the needs are so great today, I did not see much reason for going back 20 or 30 years.

Mr. GROSS. I will ask the gentleman this simple question: Where is it proposed to get the \$90 million, a minimum of \$90 million to spend on this project? Where do you propose to get it?

Mr. GRAY. First of all, I will say to my distinguished friend, we are talking about only \$2.8 million for the next 12 to 18 months. After that it will take 4 years—52 months, which will be 4 years and 4 months, to be exact—to construct the building, so that \$90 million would be spread over almost 5 years.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. GRAY. I will try to answer the gentleman's question by saying that the President has submitted to Congress in January of this year a request for \$183 million for buildings and, as I mentioned earlier today, that is a very, very modest amount, a very stringent amount to build Federal buildings all over the United States. In the next 6 years we will get this money the same place we will get that \$183 million this year to build buildings in Chicago and other places—not in my district. I live 300 miles from Chicago. I point that out.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, it will be borrowed money?

Mr. GRAY. Your President is submitting what he calls a balanced budget.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not believe that budget is going to be balanced unless some phony budget procedure is used, does he?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield, I will answer that question another way by saying that today our needs for public buildings total about \$4 billion a year, just to keep pace with the disrepair of our Federal property. The President's budget asks for only \$183 million, which is a small amount compared to the need.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, this proposed structure would be built with borrowed money, the same old credit card operation of the Federal Government. That is what we suffer from in this debt- and tax-ridden country today. We are living on borrowed time and borrowed money, insofar as our fiscal operations are concerned.

This bill authorizes \$90 million, does it not?

Mr. GRAY. As a maximum. We hope it will not be that much.

Mr. GROSS. Let us stop talking, then, about \$2.8 million, or whatever figure the gentleman has used. This bill authorizes \$90 million. It contains a commitment up to that amount.

Mr. GRAY. Let us set the record straight. This bill would authorize \$15 million; \$75 million has been on the books since 1965, 5 long, hard years ago. We are talking about a small \$15 million additional as a maximum. It may not be used, and it would only free \$2.8 million for the next 18 months.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

At this point I would like to say I think the gentleman from Illinois made a very pertinent point, sort of contradicting a point he made earlier. If the motion to recommit carries, that means the \$15 million is not authorized, and it means we are operating under a \$75 million total authorization and not some open-ended deal the architects can just take off into the wild blue yonder and run up to \$130 million as was suggested.

The truth is we are talking about a \$90 million limitation if the bill passes. If it is recommitted, then we go back to the prior limitation, which is a \$75 million limitation, which I happen to believe can house the facilities.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his comment and assure him that I will vote for his motion to recommit and then I have every intention of voting against the bill for the financial situation of the Federal Government is such that the construction of this building ought to be delayed at least until fiscal stability can be restored.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will take only a half minute. In my remarks before, I alluded to the fact that we in Congress authorized and appropriated money every year for libraries around the country, and we never seem to raise too much fuss about that. But we in the House of Representatives and in the Senate passed authorizations totalling \$344,175,000 for fiscal year 1969 and \$480,100,000 for fiscal year 1970 for construction grants to libraries around the country. We might say that is to be expected every year. The Madison Library is a one-shot thing and something which is critically important to the Congress of the United States and the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CASEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2910) to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, pursuant to House Resolution 862, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SNYDER

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SNYDER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER moves to recommit the bill S. 2910 to the Committee on Public Works with the instruction that it not be reported back to the House until all necessary designs, plans, and specifications have been completed.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The 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 149, nays 197, answered "present" 1, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—149

Adair	Frey	Pelly
Anderson, Ill.	Fuqua	Pettis
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goodling	Pickle
Arends	Gross	Pike
Beall, Md.	Gubser	Poage
Bennett	Gude	Pollock
Berry	Hagan	Price, Tex.
Betts	Haley	Quillen
Blaggi	Hall	Railsback
Blester	Hammer-	Randall
Blackburn	schmidt	Rarick
Blanton	Hansen, Idaho	Rhodes
Brinkley	Hastings	Riegle
Brotzman	Hechler, W. Va.	Robison
Brown, Mich.	Heckler, Mass.	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Hogan	Roth
Broyhill, N.C.	Hull	Roudebush
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Ruth
Bush	Hutchinson	Sandman
Button	Ichord	Sebelius
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Shriver
Camp	Jarman	Sikes
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Jonas	Smith, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Jones, Tenn.	Snyder
Clancy	Keith	Springer
Clawson, Del.	King	Stafford
Collier	Kleppe	Steiger, Ariz.
Collins	Kyl	Steiger, Wis.
Conable	Kyros	Stratton
Coughlin	Landgrebe	Stubblefield
Cowger	Latta	Taylor
Crane	Lloyd	Thomson, Wis.
Cunningham	Lujan	Vigorito
Davis, Wis.	McClure	Watts
Delaney	McKneally	Welcker
Dellenback	Martin	Whalen
Denney	May	Whalley
Dennis	Mayne	Whitten
Derwinski	Meskill	Williams
Devine	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Dickinson	Miller, Ohio	Winn
Duncan	Minshall	Wold
Edwards, Ala.	Mize	Wolf
Eshleman	Mizell	Wyatt
Fish	Montgomery	Wyllie
Flowers	Mosher	Wyman
Foley	Natcher	Zion
Foreman	Nelsen	Zwach
	O'Konski	
	Patman	

NAYS—197

Abbutt	Frelinghuysen	Nichols
Abernethy	Friedel	Nix
Adams	Fulton, Pa.	Obey
Addabbo	Gallfanakis	Olsen
Albert	Gallagher	O'Neal, Ga.
Anderson, Calif.	Garmatz	O'Neill, Mass.
Andrews, Ala.	Gaydos	Patten
Annunzio	Gettys	Pepper
Aspinall	Giaino	Perkins
Barrett	Gibbons	Philbin
Bevill	Gilbert	Pirnie
Bingham	Gonzalez	Podell
Blatnik	Gray	Poff
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Preyer, N.C.
Boland	Griffin	Price, Ill.
Bolling	Grover	Rees
Brademas	Hamilton	Reid, N.Y.
Brasco	Hanley	Reifel
Brooks	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Broyhill, Va.	Harrington	Rivers
Buchanan	Harsha	Roberts
Burke, Mass.	Hébert	Rodino
Burlison, Tex.	Helstoski	Roe
Burton, Calif.	Henderson	Rogers, Fla.
Burton, Utah	Hicks	Rooney, N.Y.
Caffery	Hosmer	Rooney, Pa.
Casey	Howard	Rosenthal
Casey	Hungate	Rostenkowski
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Cleland	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Cohelan	Jones, N.C.	St. Onge
Colmer	Karth	Satterfield
Conte	Kastenmeier	Scherle
Conyers	Kazen	Schwengel
Corbett	Kee	Scott
Corman	Kluczynski	Shipley
Cramer	Koch	Sisk
Curver	Landrum	Slack
Daddario	Langen	Smith, Iowa
Daniel, Va.	Leggett	Staggers
Daniels, N.J.	Long, Md.	Stanton
de la Garza	Lowenstein	Steed
Donohue	McCarthy	Stephens
Dorn	McClary	Stokes
Downing	McCulloch	Stuckey
Dulski	McDade	Sullivan
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	Thompson, Ga.
Ellberg	Macdonald, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Erlenborn	MacGregor	Tiernan
Esch	Mahon	Udall
Evans, Colo.	Mailliard	Ullman
Evins, Tenn.	Marsh	Vanik
Fallon	Matsunaga	Waggonner
Farbstein	Melcher	Waldie
Fascell	Mikva	Wampler
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Watkins
Findley	Mills	White
Fisher	Minish	Whitehurst
Flood	Mink	Widnall
Flynt	Monagan	Wiggins
Ford, Gerald R.	Morgan	Wright
Ford,	Morse	Wyder
William D.	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron
Fraser	Myers	Young
	Nedzi	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Morton

NOT VOTING—83

Alexander	Edmondson	Moorhead
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Moss
Ashley	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Hara
Ayres	Goldwater	Ottinger
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Passman
Belcher	Griffiths	Powell
Bell, Calif.	Halpern	Pryor, Ark.
Bow	Hanna	Pucinski
Bray	Harvey	Purcell
Brock	Hathaway	Quile
Broomfield	Hawkins	Reid, Ill.
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Ruppe
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	St Germain
Cabell	Horton	Saylor
Chappell	Kirwan	Schadeberg
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Scheuer
Clark	Lennon	Schneebell
Clausen, Don H.	Long, La.	Skubitz
Clay	Lukens	Symington
Davis, Ga.	McCloskey	Taft
Dawson	McDonald, Mich.	Talcott
Dent	McEwen	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Dingell	Madden	Tunney
Dowdy	Mann	Van Deerlin
Dwyer	Mathias	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Meeds	Watson
	Mollohan	Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Clark against.
 Mr. Schadeberg for, with Mr. Holifield against.
 Mr. Watson of South Carolina for, with Mr. Madden against.
 Mr. Goldwater for, with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania against.
 Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Dent against.
 Mr. Vander Jagt for, with Mr. St Germain against.
 Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.
 Mr. Skubitz for, with Mr. Lennon against.
 Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Edmondson against.
 Mr. Bell of California for, with Mr. Moorhead against.
 Mrs. Reid of Illinois for, with Mr. Pucinski against.
 Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Hays against.
 Mr. Quile for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Belcher.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Lukens.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Tunney with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Meeds with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Schneebell.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Teague of California.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Clay.
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Dingell.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Eckhardt.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Hathaway with Mrs. Griffiths.
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Purcell.
 Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Symington with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Scheuer.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Dawson.

Messrs. CLEVELAND, BERRY, and ROTH changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 209, nays 133, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—209

Abbutt	Aspinall	Buchanan
Abernethy	Bevill	Burke, Mass.
Adair	Bingham	Burlison, Tex.
Addabbo	Blanton	Burlison, Mo.
Albert	Blatnik	Burton, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs	Burton, Utah
Anderson, Ill.	Boland	Button
Andrews, Ala.	Bolling	Caffery
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brademas	Casey
Annunzio	Brasco	Celler
	Brooks	Chamberlain
	Broyhill, Va.	Cleland

Cohelan	Harsha	Podell
Colmer	Hébert	Poff
Conte	Helstoski	Preyer, N.C.
Corbett	Henderson	Price, Ill.
Cramer	Hosmer	Rees
Crane	Howard	Reid, N.Y.
Culver	Hungate	Reifel
Daddario	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Daniel, Va.	Johnson, Pa.	Rivers
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Delaney	Jones, N.C.	Rodino
Derwinski	Jones, Tenn.	Roe
Donohue	Karth	Rogers, Fla.
Dorn	Kastenmeier	Rooney, N.Y.
Downing	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
Dulski	Kee	Rosenthal
Edwards, Ala.	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
Ellberg	Koch	Roybal
Erlenborn	Landrum	Ryan
Esch	Langen	St. Onge
Evans, Colo.	Leggett	Satterfield
Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.	Schwengel
Fallon	Lowenstein	Scott
Farbstein	McClory	Shipley
Fascell	McClure	Sikes
Findley	McCulloch	Sisk
Fisher	McDade	Slack
Flood	McFall	Smith, Calif.
Flynt	Macdonald,	Smith, Iowa
Ford, Gerald R.	Mass.	Stafford
Ford,	MacGregor	Staggers
William D.	Madden	Steed
Fountain	Mahon	Stephens
Frellinghuysen	Maillard	Stokes
Friedel	Marsh	Stuckey
Fulton, Pa.	Matsunaga	Sullivan
Fuqua	Meicher	Symington
Galifianakis	Mikva	Thompson, Ga.
Gallagher	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Garmatz	Mills	Tiernan
Gaydos	Minish	Ullman
Gettys	Mink	Vanik
Gliamo	Minshall	Waggonner
Gibbons	Monagan	Waldie
Gilbert	Morgan	Wampler
Gonzalez	Morse	Watkins
Gray	Murphy, Ill.	Whalen
Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.	White
Green, Pa.	Myers	Whitehurst
Griffin	Nedzi	Whitten
Griffiths	Nix	Widnall
Grover	Obey	Wiggins
Halpern	Olsen	Wright
Hamilton	O'Neal, Ga.	Wylder
Hammer-	O'Neill, Mass.	Yates
schmidt	Patten	Yatron
Hanley	Pepper	Young
Hansen, Idaho	Perkins	Zablocki
Hansen, Wash.	Philbin	
Harrington	Pirnie	

NAYS—133

Adams	Gude	Pike
Arends	Hagan	Poage
Ashbrook	Haley	Price, Tex.
Bennett	Hall	Quillen
Berry	Hastings	Rallsback
Betts	Hechler, W. Va.	Randall
Biaggi	Heckler, Mass.	Rarick
Blester	Hicks	Rhodes
Blackburn	Hogan	Riegle
Brinkley	Hull	Robison
Brotzman	Hunt	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Roth
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Roudebush
Broyhill, N.C.	Jacobs	Ruth
Burke, Fla.	Jarman	Sandman
Bush	Jonas	Schadeberg
Byrnes, Wis.	Keith	Scherle
Camp	King	Sebellus
Carter	Kleppe	Shriver
Cederberg	Kyl	Skubitz
Clancy	Kyros	Smith, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Snyder
Collier	Latta	Springer
Collins	Lloyd	Stanton
Conable	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Conyers	McCarthy	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	McKneally	Stratton
Coughlin	Martin	Stubblefield
Cowger	May	Taylor
Cunningham	Mayne	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	Meskill	Vigorito
de la Garza	Michel	Watts
Dellenback	Miller, Ohio	Weicker
Dennis	Mize	Whalley
Devine	Mizell	Williams
Dickinson	Montgomery	Winn
Duncan	Mosher	Wold
Eshleman	Natcher	Wolf
Fish	Nelsen	Wyatt
Flowers	Nichols	Wyllie
Foley	O'Konski	Wyman
Foreman	Patman	Zion
Frey	Pelly	Zwack
Goodling	Pettis	
Gross	Pickle	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Morton
NOT VOTING—87

Alexander	Dwyer	Moorhead
Anderson,	Eckhardt	Moss
Tenn.	Edmondson	O'Hara
Ashley	Edwards, Calif.	Ottinger
Ayres	Edwards, La.	Passman
Baring	Feighan	Pollock
Barrett	Fraser	Powell
Beall, Md.	Fulton, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Belcher	Goldwater	Pucinski
Bell, Calif.	Gubser	Purcell
Bow	Hanna	Quie
Bray	Harvey	Reid, Ill.
Brock	Hathaway	Ruppe
Broomfield	Hawkins	St Germain
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Saylor
Byrne, Pa.	Hollifield	Scheuer
Cabell	Horton	Schneebell
Carey	Kirwan	Taft
Chappell	Kuykendall	Talcott
Chisholm	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Clark	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Clausen,	Lukens	Tunney
Don H.	McCloskey	Udall
Clay	McDonald,	Van Deerlin
Davis, Ga.	Mich.	Vander Jagt
Dawson	McEwen	Watson
Denney	McMillan	Wilson, Bob
Dent	Mann	Wilson,
Diggs	Mathias	Charles H.
Dingell	Meeds	
Dowdy	Mollohan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Clark with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Barrett with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Purcell with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Hathaway with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Chappell.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13000) entitled "An act to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 15694

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 15694, a bill to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13300, RAILROAD EMPLOYEES SUPPLEMENTAL ANNUITIES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13300) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 4, 1970.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House today involves the supplemental annuity program under the Railroad Retirement Act. It represents a compromise between the House and Senate bills.

In 1966, labor and management agreed on a program of supplemental annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act to be financed by a tax of 2 cents for each

man-hour of employment. The actuarial assumptions underlying this program were that this rate of taxation would be sufficient to pay supplemental annuities to retiring employees at levels between \$45 and \$70 a month, depending upon the employee's years of service.

It has turned out that those estimates were off very substantially, and the railroads now estimate that the supplemental annuity program will eventually cost them as much as 11½ cents for each man-hour of employment, as contrasted with the 2 cents per man-hour initially proposed. This program is financed entirely by the carriers, as contrasted with the regular railroad retirement program, which is financed through taxes paid in equal amounts by employers and employees.

The supplemental annuity fund was, and still is, substantially underfinanced, so that the supplemental annuity checks have been postponed in recent months because there was not enough money in the fund to pay them.

Negotiations were conducted between management and labor for revisions in the program to provide more adequate financing, but were unsuccessful until our committee began hearings on legislation. At that time unions representing between 75 and 80 percent of the employees reached agreement with management on a program under which the railroads would continue this program on a permanent basis, financing it entirely at the expense of the employers. In return for these large payments by the carriers, the unions agreed to a program of compulsory retirement of railroad employees ultimately at age 65.

Thirteen unions, representing a minority of employees, were opposed to this, and as a result of their opposition, the Senate amended the bill to eliminate mandatory retirement for employees, but provided for gradual forfeiture of supplemental annuities if employees fail to retire at age 65.

In conference, the House conferees refused to accept the Senate bill and the Senate conference refused to accept the House bill. It was, therefore, necessary to work out a compromise, and I think the compromise we have worked out will prove in the long run to encourage many employees to retire voluntarily at age 65.

As agreed to in conference, employees who are 68 years of age before the end of this year must retire on or before January 31, 1971; otherwise they will forfeit their entire supplemental annuity. This age is scaled down yearly until after December 31, 1973, when all employees must retire before the last day of the month after the month in which they attain age 65, or they forfeit their entire supplemental annuity.

If an employee has 23, but less than 25, years of service when he attains the age at which he must otherwise retire, the bill permits him to continue to work until he qualifies for the supplemental annuity, unless the employee is or becomes eligible for social security benefits.

There were a number of other differences between the two Houses; but they were relatively minor in nature, except with respect to a moratorium on use of

the Railway Labor Act procedures to obtain modification of supplemental annuities. The House bill provided a moratorium through 1975; the Senate proposed a moratorium until 1973, and the conference split the difference, providing that the moratorium shall run to July 1, 1947, with provision for section 6 notices to be served on or after April 1 of that year.

Mr. Speaker, although the conference agreement is not what the House Members wanted, we feel that it represents a good compromise, and the House and Senate conferees were unanimous in agreeing on the provisions of the conference substitute, and we urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) the ranking Republican member on our committee, such time as he may consume.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, for many years management and railroad labor discussed the possibility of an annuity schedule supplemental to that provided under the Railroad Retirement Act to be provided at the expense of the railroads and without financial participation by the employees. Negotiations finally resulted in such a plan on a trial basis of 5 years. It went into effect July 1, 1966, and provided for supplemental annuities for railroad employees thereafter retiring who had completed 25 or more years of service in the railroad industry. These benefits ranged from \$45 to \$70 per month depending upon length of service.

In order to finance this fund it was agreed that 2 cents per man-hour should be set aside. This determination was made by qualified people connected with the railroads and labor organizations and the Railroad Retirement Board. As it turned out, far more people accepted the opportunity to retire with the supplemental pension than anyone anticipated. This resulted in a depletion of the fund far sooner than expected.

When the financial situation of the fund became apparent, the parties negotiated a continuation of the supplemental annuity system which provided for a continuing plan rather than a short-term experimental one. It included, however, a provision for mandatory retirement of railroad employees. There were some railroad brotherhoods not in agreement with this one feature of the contract. The House, however, considered this as a completed contract and wrote into law the terms as submitted to us by the railroads and the other signatories to the agreement.

The Senate version of this bill was far different and did not provide for mandatory retirement.

Failure to compromise between these two versions would have resulted in a permanent discontinuance of supplemental pensions. These differences have already cost the beneficiaries great inconvenience and loss of payments during the last 2 months. These will be made up, however.

The compromise arrived at will probably work out although it is not at all what the House originally agreed to. The conference version does not provide mandatory retirement. Rather it proposes

an incentive to retirement. An employee reaching age 68 by the end of this year must retire or lose all entitlement to a supplemental pension. Thereafter each year this age limit drops by 1 year until it reaches age 65. After that all employees must retire at age 65 or forfeit any right to supplemental annuities. This actually means that the employee must make a decision whether or not to work for an additional 3 to 5 years. By doing so he can again build up his regular railroad retirement to the same level he would have received by retiring with the supplemental at the earlier age. If by any chance he is forced to retire in the meanwhile, he will lose.

There is one small additional safeguard for the employee who at age 65 can almost qualify for a supplemental pension but not quite. If he has social security entitlement, he will not be allowed to stay aboard merely to qualify. If he is within 2 years of qualification and has no social security entitlement, he will be allowed to stay aboard and make up that extra time and thereby receive a supplemental pension.

The conference report reflects the very best effort of your conferees to arrive at a solution which will bring about as nearly as possible the same results as the House bill. I think that this has been accomplished, and I recommend that the conference report be accepted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO CORRECT TITLE ON H.R. 13300

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 527) relating to the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 13300).

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 527

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 13300) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to strike out the title and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "An Act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities, and for other purposes".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no District bills.

Tuesday there will be consideration of H.R. 14169, expansion of agricultural exports, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 15945, to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, which is subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 15694, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction for the Coast Guard, which is subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 485, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with regard to wheat, which is also subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC., HAVING DIFFICULTIES

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, a great deal of consideration was given to legislation authorizing a 98-mile rapid transit system for the National Capital region. After numerous hearings and studies, the House on November 24 concluded its ac-

tivity on this matter and passed the legislation.

In our moment of successful culmination of so much effort to improve the transportation picture for the Nation's Capital and its environs—we were suddenly reminded that in another area of local transportation, we were facing a crisis. It has become increasingly apparent that the D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its union were having difficulties about their contract and with their welfare fund.

Earlier in 1969, hearings had been held by the House District Committee on a request for a subsidy by the D.C. Transit Co. During the course of these hearings, the precarious financial condition of the bus company became only too painfully apparent. At the same time, we in the House became aware of an intense effort to prepare emergency bus acquisition legislation in the other body. We breathed something of a sigh of relief when the crisis was ameliorated and the union and the bus company reached a temporary understanding. We have been watching the situation carefully since that time, and we have now reached the conclusion that it is necessary to take prudent action to be prepared in the event of a new bus crisis in the District of Columbia.

The Government agency, we believe, that is most qualified to assist us in the event of a crisis is the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority because, among other reasons, of the eventual necessity of coordinating bus routes with transit routes. There already exists on the staff of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority expertise in the bus field.

I want to make it very clear that our actions today are the actions of prudent men concerned with serious possibilities—not immediate necessities. I am, together with Messrs. BROYHILL of Virginia, GUDE, and HOGAN, introducing legislation to make possible the acquisition of D.C. Transit by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. Should that acquisition be, in the opinion of the Congress, necessary at some later time, this legislation which my associates and I am introducing—I wish to repeat—is not legislation which provides for immediate acquisition of D.C. Transit but rather clears up some ambiguities in the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority compact which would make it impossible for them to be available for assistance in an emergency. This legislation also clarifies the bus union's position in the event of an emergency takeover of D.C. Transit.

I wish to reemphasize that this is the action that prudence dictates. And I wish to further emphasize that it is necessary to take this action now so that in the event that a major transportation crisis should exist in the District of Columbia while Congress is not in session, the machinery will be available to meet the demands of the occasion.

The first five sections of the bill would establish labor standards governing operation of transit facilities owned or controlled by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. These standards

are derived from the basic Federal labor policy in this field reflecting a concern for maintaining fair and equitable conditions for workers who might otherwise be adversely affected by federally supported or approved adjustment in the transportation industries. They have been expressed in various ways in Federal legislation over a period of many years and, most recently, in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

The remainder of the bill provides congressional consent and adopts on behalf of the District of Columbia certain amendments to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority compact so that the Authority will be in a position to acquire and operate, either directly or by contract, the bus transit facilities of the area bus companies. Certain house-keeping amendments to the compact are also included.

CONFRONTATION ON KING STREET, BOSTON, MARCH 5, 1770

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are concerned about rising crime problems and the preservation of our American liberties and traditions, it might be well to consider a historic event that occurred two centuries ago today on March 5, 1770, about which an excellent book has been written. An excerpt follows:

MARCH 5, 1770: A FATEFUL CONFRONTATION ON KING STREET, BOSTON, THAT MOVED A COLONY TOWARD REVOLUTION

It is an old friend among the historical residue that we all carry; a familiar story that each of us has known since first we realized that our country's freedom grew from bloodshed. The picture has always been with us; the hated Redcoats tramping through the peaceful town of Boston; the honest citizens quietly going about their evening business; a few schoolboys harmlessly taunting the soldiers; the troops forming a battle line, loading with military precision, fixing bayonets, aiming carefully, and, on direct order deliberately given, firing a deadly volley at the helpless civilians. Death is everywhere; Crispus Attucks, the first American to die for liberty, lies an innocent martyr at the feet of his butchers; the soldiers grin through the musket smoke at the other victims sprawled in the gutter, shoulder their weapons, and march off. Five years before Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill, the Revolution has begun.

To this basic scenario, some of us learn a sequel. It might be called *The Birth of American Justice*, or (because every eighteenth-century play needs a subtitle) *Even the Guilty Deserve a Fair Trial*. This drama differs sharply from the Massacre itself. The characters (except for Crispus Attucks) lack definition or even names. Here the star is John Adams, whose future will include signing the Declaration of Independence and serving as our second president. We are not sure of the details, but we know that purely from a sense of duty, at great risk to his own popularity, lawyer Adams took the impossible case, and somehow convinced an implacably hostile jury to acquit his clients.

The Boston Massacre, in short, is a part, not only of our national history, but of our national mythology. It represents the first tragic culmination of that British policy which provoked independence; it represents

the physical sacrifice required to achieve independence; it represents the concept of Boston as Cradle of Liberty. And in its aftermath, it represents that nobility of soul and loftiness of purpose which we like to associate with the Founding Fathers. The Boston Massacre, or more accurately, what we think of when we refer to the Boston Massacre, thus fills a need in our national historic memory. Not the least of the Massacre's attractions as an object of historic contemplation is the speed with which the men of 1770 (on both sides of the Atlantic and both sides of the political fence) recognized the mythological value of what happened in King Street.

One would be unduly cynical to say that if the Massacre had not occurred, it would have been necessary to invent it. But no one leafing the pages of the Boston *Gazette* for 1770 or reading the bloody-shirt-waving tirades which until 1784 commemorated the anniversaries of the "Bloody Tragedy" can doubt that the patriot propagandist knew a good potboiler when they saw one.

Samuel Adams moved promptly to keep the memory of the killings red in America's eye. Catering to the Boston appetite for anniversary celebration, he arranged to have March 5 set aside as an annual day of mourning, complete with bell tolling, lighted-picture displays, and oratory. Every March 5 from 1771 through 1784, when, belatedly, July 4 assumed its proper place in the holiday hierarchy, selected orators delivered what Bernard Bailyn has accurately called "some of the most lurid and naive rhetoric heard in eighteenth-century America." The speakers touched only briefly on the actual facts of the King Street killings. Instead, they used the occasion to lambaste constituted authority and (after independence) the general English evils. . . . By Sam Adams's persistent efforts, "a great part of the people were induced to think the acquittals to be unjust and illegal. The action continued to be spoke of as a massacre, a bloody massacre, and the like." Men, Thomas Hutchinson noted, talked about the killings just "as if the jury had found those concerned in it guilty of murder."

On the night of March 5, 1770, John Adams later boasted, "the foundation of American independence was laid." But he felt similarly about Otis's speech against the writs of assistance. Does it matter which is more deserving the palm? The men in Boston and London, radicals and Tories alike, had long struggled blindly to control, for whatever purpose, a growing historical wind whose power and direction they could only feel. The deaths on King Street were but an eddy in that growing tempest.

For five years preceding the shootings, order had gradually disappeared from the streets, untrammelled law had slowly been barred from the courts. For five years, violence had become so common in Massachusetts and the attempts to restrict it so absurdly futile that killing must surely come, on one side or the other. Men believed it then, as we, looking backward, believe it even more firmly now. Courage and imagination on the loyalist part, restraint and moderation by the radicals might have delayed the bloodshed; but they could not have avoided it. True, less demagoguery by Sam Adams afterward might have kept the incident's fame proportional to its actual significance; but such accommodation would not have prevented the Revolution. Somehow it seems fitting that an event so historically inevitable and yet so basically insignificant should have taken place on a moonlit night, before scores of people, without leaving any two witnesses able to give the same account of what happened. (From the Boston Massacre (Norton, 372 pp., \$8.50), a definitive new history by Hiller B. Zobel '53.)

POT RESEARCH ESSENTIAL

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a news release today from the National Society for Medical Research entitled "Scientists Ask 2 to 7 Years for Pot Research" has been brought to my attention.

This society, headquartered in Washington, provides a public voice for over 200 of our top medical institutions, organizations, and industrial research firms.

They are concerned about two primary problems associated with the widespread use of marihuana. First, that regardless of the vast biomedical research facility this country has, Members of Congress and the public will have no responsible data upon which to rely in evaluating the use of marihuana for 2 to 7 years. Second, that the insidious problems of crime and violence connected with illicit drug traffic will wander aimlessly and uncontrolled unless more workable measures of law enforcement and social stability are created to control indiscriminate use of marihuana.

We are faced with a paradox, where we are forced to live with criminal side effects by sheer ignorance about a drug which is already in the marketplace, without any form of control, without scientific supportive data, without Federal agency approval, and, without even adequate supervision.

Because this subject is so vital and the source of this news so authoritative, I am placing the entire article in the RECORD:

SCIENTISTS ASK 2 TO 7 YEARS FOR POT RESEARCH

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It will be two to seven years before medical scientists are able to supply answers on the effects of marihuana, according to the National Society for Medical Research, Washington, D.C., representing some 200 medical institutions, professional societies and industrial research firms.

A detailed report of research progress on the topic published in *Science News* pointed out a problem of obtaining marihuana for study which is consistent in strength from plant to plant and, even more complicating, from country to country. Because of these factors, until recently, no two scientists have been sure they were working on the same chemical.

To solve the difficulty, two steps are being taken. At the University of Mississippi, marihuana is being grown and plants are being compared to define variations in chemical characteristics. They hope to standardize their crops for study. A second study, with Federal financial aid, is being conducted by The Arthur D. Little Company of Cambridge, Massachusetts, a private research firm, to isolate primary active ingredients. Researchers at the University of Chicago, the University of North Carolina, and Emory University in Atlanta are also reported to be studying biomedical effects of marihuana.

Regarding the two-plus years needed for biomedical research on the effects of marihuana, the National Society for Medical Research said it even may take longer. "One of the major elements in investigations of this type is finding ideal animal models, closely related physiologically to man, on which accurate and precise experiments can

be performed. The effects of marihuana upon chromosomes and other vital factors are unknown, but should receive no less attention than basic research on life saving drugs, which requires an average of about seven years of testing before FDA approval. Until scientifically proven results are obtained, it appears as foolhardy to smoke marihuana as it would be to take any other unknown drug or chemical agent just for kicks."

H.R. 12025—A POST MORTEM

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House rejected a resolution to bring up H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act, for debate and consideration. As a cosponsor of the bill and a member of the committee and subcommittee in which the legislation was drafted, I have exerted every effort to make this the most effective and most responsible bill possible, and one which would be acceptable to the Congress and to the American people.

I was deeply disappointed, therefore, that the House saw fit to preclude substantive discussion of this bill on its merits, for I believe that a point-by-point analysis of the legislation, in the give and take of debate on the floor of the House, would have convinced many of my colleagues who were concerned about the potential effects of this bill that their doubts and reservations were in fact groundless—that H.R. 12025 is sound legislation and eminently worthy of their support.

Since last Thursday I have spent quite a bit of time in reflection and review of the events leading up to the House action, and have tried to reach an honest and objective evaluation of the circumstances which resulted in the rejection of a piece of legislation before its case could even be presented.

For example, I studied the statements many of my colleagues presented on Thursday against adoption of the rule which would have brought the bill before us, and found that in most cases their objectives coincided almost exactly with mine and with those of the bill's supporters. We all apparently want to obtain basically the same things: better timber management in our national forests; achievement of our national housing goals; protection and support for multiple use values such as recreation, wildlife, forage, wilderness, and watersheds; in short, preservation of our vital national forest heritage while better utilizing its potential for contributing toward meeting our social needs.

Why, then, the profound differences of opinion on the legislative means necessary to achieve these ends?

I have the utmost respect for the opinions of my colleagues and I certainly respect their right to disagree. It has never been my intention to try to impose my views on any Member of this body even though I have strong feelings about the value and need of H.R. 12025. The fact is, however, that most of the arguments

raised against bringing up this bill were based not on what the legislation would actually do, but rather on what some thought it would do.

And, this is precisely why I feel that if this legislation has been given a chance on the floor of the House to stand or fall on its own merits, a majority of my colleagues would have concluded with me that H.R. 12025 is, indeed, good legislation.

The basic problem was not with the legislation itself, but with the climate in which it was surrounded as it moved to the threshold of House consideration. A climate of mistrust, misapprehension, and misunderstanding. And, it is unfortunate, to say the least, that the development of this adverse climate has had such a serious and detrimental effect on responsible legislative decisionmaking.

And now, as we in effect go back to the drawing board, it behooves us all—proponents and opponents—to ask why this climate, this atmosphere of mistrust built up to the extent it did. What particular combination of events and circumstances fostered and nourished it and allowed it to grow?

Of course, this is not the first time this has happened on controversial legislation. We have all seen this kind of destructive force at work on other bills in the past—an emotional upheaval that thwarts efforts to approach an issue on a logical, rational basis.

Perhaps one of the basic problems here has been the fundamentally emotional nature of the subject itself. A tree is not just a tree to most people—certainly not to me. A tree is an idea, representing many of the values in life that make man more than a two-legged animal. There is almost a religious aura that envelops the concept of a tree, and relates not only to the quality of our lives, but has an even deeper symbolic relationship to purpose and ultimate meaning in our existence.

Given these philosophic and religious implications, should anyone be surprised at the depth of emotion that is stirred within many of us when the subject of cutting our trees—our national forest trees—is brought up for public discussion?

A part of the problem is, of course, that as our society becomes more and more urbanized and we no longer need to provide for our basic needs by personally physically transforming raw materials into usable products as our ancestors did, we tend to forget that in order for us to enjoy our steak a fine animal in the prime of life had to be destroyed, and in order for us to have a roof over our heads several fine trees must be cut. We develop a resistance to recognizing these necessities and are often able to simply put them out of our minds unless the awareness is forced upon us.

But most of us also recognize that in order to exist on this earth, we must come to grips with our environment in a practical, realistic way, and try to find some middle ground, try to achieve some balance among our conflicting physical, social and spiritual needs. We need trees for houses, but we also need them for wildlife protection, for watersheds, for

recreation and to put it very simply, for our souls.

And, in the process of trying to find this balance, it is both natural and understandable that we become more than just a little bit emotional on occasion. And whenever we lose control of this emotion and allow ourselves to be ruled rather than guided by it, we tend to lose sight of the logic behind the pros and cons of an issue.

I do not think there is any question that this is one of the factors which influenced the fate of H.R. 12025 and has been a contributing element in the climate of mistrust which developed around it.

Perhaps another important factor has been the zeal with which some opponents of this legislation have attempted to justify their case. Now, we all recognize the differences of opinion which may shade the facts on any issue, and we also understand very well that personal or group interests often result in the interpretation of facts in such a way that a particular point of view is presented in the most persuasive and compelling manner possible. This is natural and is perhaps one of the most fundamental elements in our system of Government. The difficulties arise, however, when it is carried to extremes, and at such times it becomes a negative and destructive force, impeding rather than facilitating responsible legislative decisions.

I was disturbed not at the opposition to this bill—for truly good legislation is nearly always pounded out between the hammer of opposition and the anvil of support—but at the vociferousness and intemperance of the attacks and charges that were launched against the legislation and its supporters. I have been surprised to find myself and many of my colleagues referred to—indirectly, of course, as cosponsors and proponents of the bill—as unwitting or willing tools of the “timber barons,” “despoilers of our environment” who would condone the ravaging of our national forest lands, and Agriculture Committee members who are paying only lipservice to conservation while supporting a carefully disguised despoliation bill concocted by the “cut-and-run” timber industry.

My concern is not so much that these loose and intemperate statements are patently baseless and untrue, but that this kind of impassioned rhetoric creates a smokescreen behind which the facts, the relevancy and logic of the legislation itself becomes obscured, and reasonable, sensible debate of the basic issue on its own merits becomes practically impossible.

There were charges also that this bill constituted a “sneak” attack on conservation, that its real purposes were disguised and misrepresented, and that the intent was to slip it through the Congress.

This, too, is not only patently false, but ridiculous on its face. Trying to “slip” H.R. 12025 through Congress would be a little like trying to sneak an elephant through a public library.

The intent has been just the opposite. From the very first, the bill's supporters have been giving it as much exposure as

humanly possible, inviting ideas and debate, encouraging careful analysis of all its provisions, asking—rather, pleading—for help from all quarters in making it strong, sound legislation.

And yet, the confusion, misunderstanding and misapprehensions grew. Those of us who spent months working on the bill in our committee were deeply distressed that Members of the House continued to receive—up to the very time the rule was debated—letters and telegrams and phone calls of opposition based on a bill which no longer existed and which had itself even been seriously misinterpreted and misconstrued in the beginning. The bill which was to have been considered last Thursday was the product of substantial revision and amendment by our committee, and would have been opened to further amendment on the floor of the House. For instance, proponents of the legislation were to have offered an amendment to earmark a portion of timber sale receipts for multiple uses other than timber, such as wildlife habitat management, watersheds, and recreation.

Another point that was disturbing to me were the blanket indictments of Forest Service management of our national forests under the Multiple Use Act. In response to that criticism, I would say only this—no agency of the Federal Government or its employees in carrying out Federal policy have achieved a state of perfection—at least to my knowledge. And I do not think we can expect perfection in the foreseeable future. The point is that while some of us may disagree on the quality of Forest Service administration in specific cases or areas, it seems to me this is one agency of the Government that, where given the tools, the funds and the go-ahead, has done an excellent overall job. Considering the facts that they cannot please everyone, and that their policy directives from Congress are often contradictory and pointing in different directions, I think the Forest Service is to be commended for an outstanding dedicated performance.

I am not, at this point, going any further into the pros and cons of the legislation itself. Since the House has, in effect, decided that the bill should not be considered in its present form, it would appear to be a waste of time to discuss it on the point-by-point approach which would have been appropriate last Thursday had the House elected to debate the legislation.

I will say only that it was designed to better utilize the existing potential of our national forests to supply timber for our national housing needs—potential that remains untapped. And the fact is, of course, that this potential can be utilized without in any way threatening our wilderness, watershed, wildlife, recreation, and other conservation values which are so vitally important to all of us. It can be utilized without “stripping” our public lands of timber and leaving only vast areas of bare and denuded land as some seem to fear.

On the contrary, H.R. 12025 was designed to enhance and complement these values rather than to threaten them. This

legislation is completely consonant and in harmony with the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, and as one of the authors of that act and a firm believer in the benefits and value of our multiple use management system, I have made every effort to insure this. I could not lend my support to a bill that would do otherwise.

This is not, as some have charged, a timber cutting bill. It is a reforestation bill—a timber management bill, providing for the application of sound timber management techniques and practices such as harvesting downed trees before they rot, reducing waste in timber harvest, fertilizing and thinning properly, so that a greater yield of harvestable timber can be obtained from a specific forest area.

But the question now is not what the bill in its present form might or might not have done. The question is where do we go from here?

As I mentioned earlier, reviewing the statements of my colleagues in the House who opposed the rule last Thursday, it appears to me that a substantial number of us do have the same ultimate objective: preservation of our national forest heritage, while at the same time better utilizing its potential to contribute toward meeting our pressing social needs.

I believe this common objective could provide a solid foundation upon which to rebuild national timber management legislation. I hope so.

I, for one, do not intend to stop trying. The dual needs of improved timber management and housing will not go away if we only close our eyes. We have both an obligation and a responsibility to meet these needs, and they can be met without damaging or adversely affecting any other important values.

Efforts to obtain any kind of meeting of minds will require a great deal of work, I know. But we must start again, and I want to invite and encourage all my colleagues here in the House to join in these efforts in a spirit of open-minded cooperation. I am going to do my best.

Is this, then, a post mortem for H.R. 12025?

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is a post mortem for the controversy, not the idea.

IN HONOR OF SFC. MATTHEW LEONARD

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great untold stories of the conflict in Vietnam is that of the courage and heroism of black Americans there. Last Saturday in the city of Birmingham, Ala., which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, one of these stories of courage was underlined as the city declared February 28 "Matt Leonard Day."

Sfc. Matthew Leonard was an Alabama native and spent most of his life in Birmingham. On February 27, 1967, in the jungles of Vietnam, Sergeant Leonard gave his life for his country in an act of heroism above and beyond the call of duty.

On December 18, 1968, Sergeant Leonard became the first Alabamian to be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously. His citation reads as follows:

Sergeant Leonard was serving as platoon sergeant with Company B, First Battalion, 16th Infantry, First Infantry Division, when his platoon was suddenly attacked by a large enemy force. His platoon leader and several other key leaders were wounded almost immediately and Sergeant Leonard rallied the platoon to throw back the enemy assault.

After organizing a defensive perimeter, he noticed a wounded companion outside the perimeter. While dragging the man to safety, he was hit by a sniper's bullet, which shattered his hand.

Refusing medical attention, he continued to move throughout the perimeter, encouraging his men and directing their fire against the well camouflaged enemy.

The enemy moved a machine gun into a position where it could sweep the entire perimeter. At that time the platoon machine gun in that area malfunctioned. Sergeant Leonard crawled to the gun to help the crew when they were wounded by the enemy machine gun.

Sergeant Leonard rose to his feet and charged the enemy gun and destroyed it despite being hit several times by enemy fire. He propped himself up against a tree and continued to engage the enemy until he died of his many wounds.

Sergeant Matthew Leonard's conspicuous gallantry and extraordinary heroism at the cost of his own life were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit on himself, his unit and the United States Army.

Sergeant Leonard left behind a courageous wife and five children.

During a "Matt Leonard Day" luncheon in Birmingham Saturday, which was attended by hundreds of persons, U.S. Army Chief of Staff Gen. William C. Westmoreland spoke of the gallantry of the Medal of Honor winners saying:

In the course of human events some few risk their lives to help others. Still fewer give their lives to help others. But all stand in awe and reverence before the man who sacrifices his life in the performance that is clearly "above and beyond the call of duty."

Army Sgt. Maj. Henry L. Cobb attested directly to the courage of Matt Leonard, for he was one of those men for whom Sergeant Leonard gave his life.

Birmingham Mayor George Seibels called the day honoring Matt Leonard an event which "typifies the spirit of our people in their response to the honoring of a very brave man who gave his life for his country in destroying the enemy and to protect his comrades."

I would like to join Mayor Seibels and extend my deep appreciation to Roscoe Whatley and Mrs. Bessie Estell for their work in chairing and cochairing "Matt Leonard Day." Mrs. Estell was a former teacher of Matt Leonard and described his outstanding character even as a school boy.

The 1st Infantry Division, which the city of Birmingham has adopted and of which Sergeant Leonard was a member, presented a portrait of this heroic man to the city, painted by combat artist CWO Chester Jezierski. This portrait will hang in City Hall in tribute to Matthew Leonard.

It is fitting and proper that any city

set aside a day in tribute to the memory of this man. The courage and dedication shown by soldiers like Matt Leonard have made it possible for the rest of us to continue to know the blessings of liberty.

Whatever hope there is for a just peace on earth and a resolution of the conflicts within our own society, it is vested in men like Matthew Leonard of Birmingham, Ala.

ONLY THE PEOPLE CAN CURE CRIME

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an editorial by the eminent journalist, David Lawrence, from the March 9, 1970, edition of U.S. News & World Report. Mr. Lawrence has made, I believe, some pertinent and valuable comments on crime in America today, and on the need for something more than legislative action if it is to be curbed. His point is that crime cannot be halted, or even significantly reduced, as long as there exists in this Nation the sort of widespread disrespect for law evidenced by the more extreme campus radicals and other violent dissenters, particularly among the young. I believe this to be a column well worth the consideration of every Member of this body. The editorial follows:

ONLY THE PEOPLE AS A WHOLE CAN CURE CRIME

(By David Lawrence)

We have too long assumed that merely increasing the number of policemen or detectives will diminish the number of crimes in America. It's time to face up to the facts: Many of the burglaries as well as murders are committed in private homes.

We are witnessing a crime wave of unprecedented proportions. There is widespread disrespect for law and order by citizens. Too many individuals in the younger generation have no regard for property rights or for life itself. Stealing is regarded as a proper means of obtaining funds. There is a feeling that punishment for crime will be light. Morality is brushed aside.

A virtual revolution has taken place which has manifested itself in the form of "demonstrations." Buildings have been taken over on college campuses, churches have been invaded, municipal officers have been picketed and their entrances blocked. The spirit of revolt is extensive. Some segments of the press have sympathized with this uprising and given it recognition as merely the exercise of the constitutional right of "freedom of speech" or "freedom of assembly." The fact that it might incite to riot or lead to damage of property or to injury or death has been largely ignored.

When will the American people come to realize that negligence on the part of a large number of their own law-abiding citizens has been responsible for the passive attitude toward crime and violence that has brought America to its tragic status of unmorality?

Even some of the clergy have failed in their duty. A few days ago, William C. Sullivan, Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a speech in Chicago declared that prominent churchmen have been expressing sympathy for the Black Panthers, raising bail money for them, and even in some cases taking residence in Black Panther headquarters to discourage police raids on them. He also noted that some church leaders have been accusing police of murder-

ing Black Panther members in wholesale lots.

"Just what do these clergymen," asked Mr. Sullivan, "really know about the Black Panthers? Have any of them taken the trouble to get the facts about this organization?"

Mr. Sullivan pointed out that there are "about 900 hard-core guerrilla-type" members and perhaps "another 900 intermittent members" active in chapters in approximately 40 cities in the United States, and that the group is committed to the goal of "destroying the government and institutions" of this country. He said that the Panthers have embarked on a deliberate policy of waging guerrilla warfare against the police, and have stockpiled large supplies of weapons. He added:

"Although it has been claimed that as many as 28 Panthers have been killed by police, the truth is that 10 Panthers have died as a result of incidents involving police. And Panthers violence has killed 5 police officers and wounded 42 others. . . .

"Clergymen quite rightly should be very active in establishing social justice, eliminating poverty, and abolishing discrimination. Does this mean, however, that they have to fall under the spell of some strange compulsion to identify themselves with and give support to an organization containing a band of criminals?"

Unless the people of America cooperate with the Government in securing respect for law and order, new statutes will not have a maximum effect.

The Organized Crime Control Act, which passed the Senate on January 23 by a vote of 73 to 1—and now is pending in the House—was sponsored by Senator John L. McClellan of Arkansas after a year-long effort by the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, of which he is Chairman.

Basically, the measure would give broad power to the Federal Government to crack down on racketeers, who are the main influences behind organized crime. This and other laws providing more police and better methods of detection and gathering evidence will help in the arrest and prosecution of wrongdoers. Perhaps the meting out of punishment may discourage other criminals.

But the root of the whole problem will not be reached by legislation or by law-enforcement mechanisms. The main responsibility rests with the American people, particularly the educated class. They must come to recognize that things have gone too far in America when we find ourselves witnessing "demonstrations" in behalf of those convicted defendants in Chicago who provoked disorder in the courtroom and day after day hurled insults at the judge presiding at their trial.

The words "law and order" should mean respect for law and the maintenance of order by everybody—without exception. Neither the courts nor the law-making bodies should hereafter permit quasi-revolutions to be conducted across the land by rebellious individuals. Until youth is taught the meaning of respect for law, we cannot expect crime to be cured in America.

IT IS TIME FOR THE FACTS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Secretary of Agriculture Hardin to exercise some control over the propaganda that is emanating from the Department of Agriculture, and to tell the Nation frankly what are the facts, and what are not facts, coming out of his office.

It is time for him to stop the dissemination of inaccurate and misleading statements intended to prove that low prices and greater volume of sales will be the salvation of farmers, and that price support programs represent "welfare payments" or "handouts" to our agricultural producers.

In one statement, an Assistant Secretary has given inaccurate figures intended to prove Hardin's hard line that lower prices and larger volume is the panacea for agriculture, when the figures are contradicted by one of the Department's own statistical releases.

In another, made orally, one of the Secretary's administrators has reportedly made a statement which smears farm price supports as "welfare" or "handouts," to discredit them.

On March 2 the Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, issued a release in which Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Clarence Palmby declared that soybean raisers had received 13.2 percent more gross income from their product, with a 10 cent per bushel decline in price per bushel, than they had the year before.

In the same release, he asserted that corn had experienced the same encouraging results as a result of his sales policy.

I include the USDA's three-page press release in the RECORD at this point:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLARENCE D. PALMBY

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Clarence D. Palmby said today that Government price and sales policies for corn and soybeans had aided the current rise in use of these major Midwest commodities. He spoke to the Quad-State Grain and Feed Dealers Association meeting in the Sioux City, Iowa.

Mr. Palmby said total disappearance of soybeans in the current marketing year would be up 18 percent over last year and that dollar returns to U.S. growers would be at a record level. Total disappearance of corn will be up about 150 million bushels.

He said:

"Although prices received by farmers for the 1969 crop of soybeans may be down about 10 cents per bushel national average, soybean producers will receive around \$2.6 billion for the crop—up about 13 percent from \$2.3 billion the preceding year. This results from the high level of soybean use.

"We expect disappearance to be right at 100 percent of the record 1969 crop this marketing year. This compares with a disappearance of 87 percent of the 1968 crop last year. This increase came about through market expansion at home and abroad.

"Exports of soybeans will be up by 55 to 70 million bushels this marketing year—a record annual increase. Soybean meal exports seem to be increasing at the rate of about 15 percent this year. Domestic crushing is, of course, moving at an all-time high.

"The downward adjustment in the 1969 CCC loan level for soybeans—a lowering of 12.3 percent—contributed directly to the rise in soybean use. It made our beans more competitive here and abroad. It enabled U.S. growers to hold on to their markets and share fully in the expanded use of oils and meals around the world."

Mr. Palmby said the rise in corn use, while not as great as in soybeans, "is an encouraging development, particularly in view of the decline last year."

He said:

"Total domestic use of corn this marketing year will approach 4 billion bushels. Exports should be in the 575 million bushel range, which would be a growth over 1968—

69. We expect, therefore, that total disappearance will be around 4.6 billion bushels.

"We feel that early announcement of the sales policy on corn stored by the Commodity Credit Corporation is helping in the management and movement of grain both in private and Government hands. The simultaneous announcement that farm storage loans would not be extended on corn from the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops is also helping by making storage available for newer corn."

The Department of Agriculture announced on December 29 that resale loans on 1964, 1965, and 1966 corn crops would not be extended. The maturity date on this corn is July 31, 1970. "This was a move dictated by good management, and has not had a detrimental effect on the market," Mr. Palmby said.

"The corn for which resale was not extended amounted to 147 million bushels—the stocks remaining from the three crops involved. Corn under loan from the 1969 crop alone is more than double that amount—330 million bushels at the beginning of this year. Moreover, an additional 251 million bushels continue under loan from the 1967 and 1968 crops.

"This action is simply good management—a matter of moving old stocks to make room for new. With the expenditure ceilings that we face all the time in CCC, any dollar spent for storage costs is a dollar that cannot be used in direct producer income programs. It just makes good sense to move these older stocks into market channels, particularly when farmers have some equity in these stocks.

"In calendar year 1969, the cost to the Government of resale loan storage was \$142.5 million. For the same year, the CCC spent \$120.9 million in storage and handling costs for commodities it owned. So the cost of storing commodities is a major item of CCC expense, and these are funds that cannot therefore be used in programs of direct benefit to current farm income."

In a "report to industry" on CCC stocks and investments, Assistant Secretary Palmby said:

"At the end of 1969, the CCC had \$5.4 billion invested in loans and inventories, compared with \$4.7 billion a year earlier. As of mid-February, the total value of uncommitted CCC inventories was \$1.6 billion, and one-half of this investment was in grains.

"CCC owns 293 million bushels of corn. Soybeans in the CCC inventory amount to 167 million bushels, and there are 162 million bushels of wheat."

Mr. Palmby's statements did not ring quite true to me. My own information was that soybean returns were down, but lest I be challenged as an authority on the subject I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to check Mr. Palmby's statements and give me the facts.

The reply from the Legislative Reference Service states:

Assistant Secretary Palmby was misinformed when he said in his press release of March 2 that although prices received by farmers for the 1969 crop of soybeans may be down about 10 cents a bushel, producers will receive 13 percent more than for the 1968 crop.

He is also misinformed in singling out the lowering of the CCC soybean loan rate in his press release as a key factor in increased soybean utilization this season.

Preliminary USDA estimates indicate soybean producers will receive 4 percent lower gross returns for their 1969 crop than for their 1968 crop—not 13 percent more. The relevant information appears in table 3 of the January 1970 Fats and Oils Situation published by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The Legislative Reference Service report goes into some further details on soybeans, and then advises me that demand for feed grains for livestock feeding increased—not as a consequence of lower price, but “associated with higher prices to producers of feed grains.”

Mr. Speaker, I include the Legislative Reference Service report to me, and also table 3 from the January Fats and Oils Situation, to which reference has been made:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1970.

To: HON. JOHN MELCHER.

From: Senior Specialist Division.

Subject: Effect of lower soybean prices on producers net returns.

This is in reply to your request of March 2. Assistant Secretary Palmby was misinformed when he said in his press release of March 2, 1970, that although prices received by

farmers for the 1969 crop of soybeans may be down about 10 cents a bushel producers will receive 13 percent more than for the 1968 crop.

He also was misinformed in singling out the lowering of the CCC soybean loan rate in his press release as a key factor in increased soybean utilization this season.

Preliminary official U.S.D.A. estimates indicate soybean producers will receive 4 percent lower gross returns for their 1969 crop than for their 1968 crop—not 13 percent more. The relevant information appears in table 3 of the January 1970 Fats and Oils Situation published by the Economic Research Service.

The major beneficiaries of the lower CCC soybean loan rate in 1970 are the soybean processors not soybean producers. Although lower prices usually result in increased utilization, the lower prices paid producers for their 1969 crop of soybeans are not being passed on to the buyers of soybean meal and oil either here or abroad.

United States soybean processors are get-

ting over 25 percent higher prices for soybean oil than a year earlier and moderately higher prices for soybean meal. European processors also are getting higher prices for their soybean oil and meal than a year earlier even though they are paying U.S. exporters lower prices for their beans.

Because of the increased demand for soybean oil and meal and the lower prices paid producers for soybeans, U.S. processors now have the widest processing margins in years—about a 50 cent spread between the spot prices of soybeans and soybean oil and meal. The usual spread is 10 to 15 cents.

Increased domestic and export demand for feed grains for livestock feeding also is resulting in increased utilization of feed grains this year associated with higher prices to producers of feed grains.

Increased demand at home and abroad are the major factors explaining the increased utilization of both soybeans and feed grains this year.

WALTER W. WILCOX,
Senior Specialist in Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—SOYBEANS: ACREAGE, PRODUCTION AND PRICE, AND VALUE BY STATES AND AREAS, CROP YEARS 1967-69

State and area	Acreage harvested (in thousands)			Yield per acre harvested (bushels)			Production (million bushels)			Price per bushel received by farmers (season average)			Value of production (in millions)		
	1967	1968	1969 ¹	1967	1968	1969 ¹	1967	1968	1969 ¹	1967	1968	1969 ¹	1967	1968	1969 ¹
North Carolina.....	1,117	972	933	24.5	17.5	26.0	27	17	24	\$2.47	\$2.44	\$2.35	\$68	\$42	\$57
South Carolina.....	1,046	932	959	22.5	12.5	22.5	24	12	22	2.49	2.47	2.35	59	29	51
Georgia.....	542	472	467	24.0	15.0	24.0	12	7	11	2.45	2.45	2.40	32	37	27
Alabama.....	48	557	641	27.0	22.0	23.0	13	12	15	2.50	2.42	2.30	33	30	34
Total, Southeast.....	3,189	2,932	3,000	24.1	16.8	23.9	77	48	72	2.48	2.44	2.35	192	118	169
Kentucky.....	388	466	485	28.0	26.5	28.0	11	12	14	2.45	2.39	2.30	27	30	31
Tennessee.....	1,115	1,193	1,193	25.0	21.0	24.0	28	25	29	2.44	2.39	2.30	68	60	66
Mississippi.....	2,120	2,120	2,290	23.5	27.0	22.0	50	57	50	2.52	2.45	2.40	126	140	121
Arkansas.....	3,989	3,989	4,228	23.0	22.0	20.5	92	88	87	2.48	2.45	2.40	228	215	208
Louisiana.....	1,306	1,436	1,608	23.0	27.0	19.0	30	39	31	2.50	2.44	2.35	75	95	72
Total, South Central.....	8,918	9,204	9,804	23.7	24.7	22.7	211	221	211	2.48	2.42	2.35	524	540	498
Ohio.....	2,231	2,276	2,344	22.5	30.5	29.0	50	69	68	2.53	2.40	2.30	126	167	156
Indiana.....	2,898	3,246	3,278	24.5	32.0	32.0	71	104	105	2.50	2.40	2.30	176	249	241
Illinois.....	6,009	6,663	6,596	31.0	31.5	33.5	186	210	221	2.52	2.48	2.35	471	521	519
Iowa.....	5,246	5,561	5,283	27.5	32.0	33.0	144	178	174	2.51	2.44	2.25	361	434	392
Missouri.....	3,423	3,663	3,150	22.0	28.0	26.0	75	103	82	2.47	2.40	2.30	186	246	188
Minnesota.....	3,591	3,232	3,167	19.5	22.0	24.0	70	71	76	2.51	2.42	2.25	174	172	171
Total, Eastern Corn Belt.....	23,398	24,641	23,818	25.5	29.3	29.6	596	735	726	2.51	2.42	2.31	1,494	1,789	1,667
North Dakota.....	290	215	185	13.0	15.5	16.5	4	3	3	2.40	2.33	2.20	9	8	7
South Dakota.....	370	300	258	16.5	17.5	24.5	6	5	6	2.45	2.37	2.20	15	12	14
Nebraska.....	782	782	813	22.5	23.5	33.0	18	18	27	2.44	2.38	2.20	43	44	59
Kansas.....	825	957	852	22.5	25.0	23.0	19	24	20	2.43	2.30	2.20	45	55	43
Total, Western Corn Belt.....	2,267	2,254	2,108	20.7	20.4	24.2	47	50	56	2.43	2.34	2.20	112	119	123
All other ²	1,995	2,073	2,127	22.6	23.0	25.5	45	48	53	2.44	2.36	2.28	111	115	122
United States.....	39,767	41,104	40,857	24.5	26.8	27.3	976	1,103	1,117	2.49	2.43	2.31	2,433	2,679	2,580

¹ Preliminary.

² New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Florida, Oklahoma, and Texas.

The American farmers, and the American public, Mr. Speaker, are entitled to have the facts of the farm situation, and farm program performance, and not to have outrageously contradictory statements being issued, from the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture itself.

I have one more item, Mr. Speaker.

On February 26, the United Press International carried the following story:

WASHINGTON.—A Nixon Administration farm official declared recently he was “damn tired” of farmers who come to Washington for government handouts. A spokesman for rural bankers said today.

The official, Kenneth E. Frick, said his remarks had been taken out of context and was not meant as a criticism of farmers or “sound” farm programs.

Don F. Krichner, Riverside, Iowa, described Frick’s remark today during testimony about farm legislation in the Senate Agriculture Committee. According to Krichner, Frick said during a February 4 conference that: “I don’t like welfare programs. I am get-

ting damn tired of farmers crawling into Washington on their hands and knees, and asking for handouts.”

Frick, a California cotton grower, is Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in the Agriculture Department.

He told a reporter later he had meant to indicate, in the conference with Krichner, that he believed in the need for a farm program but regretted that farmers had to spend so much time in Washington trying to help shape a program.

I had previously been advised that Assistant Secretary Kenneth Frick had made such a comment about “welfare” and “handouts” for farmers, although, as a former California cotton grower, he represents, in Secretary Hardin’s team, a class of agricultural producers who have had their share of large cotton payments.

Payments to adjust agricultural production are not welfare, and they are not handouts, in my opinion, but if it is the

position of the present administration at the Department of Agriculture that they are—that the Department so regards them—then we ought to have that stated honestly and forthrightly so the farmers of this Nation know the attitude which present U.S. Department of Agriculture administrators take toward them.

There should be no “whispering campaign” about the propriety of payments.

Let us have some facts from the Department of Agriculture.

It is time that the head man tells us whether the lower price crusader, Mr. Palmby, was right about the soybean experience, or the much more objective Statistical Research Service.

Secretary Hardin has testified that about 400,000 of our farmers should be put on the President’s new family welfare program. But we ought to know if he regards all other agricultural payments as welfare handouts, too.

I have previously objected to Secre-

tary Hardin's statement about the 400,000; if he regards most other families as already on welfare handouts, we ought to know it.

THE "GOOD NAME" PROTECTION BILL

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I am today introducing a bill (H.R. 16340) to provide meaningful protection to the public against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious information compiled by consumer reporting firms and used against the individual when applying for credit, insurance or employment. Hearings on this legislation and on numerous related bills will begin on St. Patrick's Day, March 17.

By the end of 1969, consumer debt in this country had risen to the staggering sum of \$122.5 billion, including \$98 billion of installment debt, and nearly \$24.5 billion of noninstallment debt. It is absolutely essential that the industry supplying the information on which intelligent credit decisions are made operates efficiently and equitably. The bill I am introducing today attempts to strike a balance between the legitimate need for information by those supplying credit, insurance and employment and the individual's right to assurance that information about himself be collected and disseminated in the most careful manner.

It is only a matter of time before information on every American will be in a computer data bank. Currently, the Associated Credit Bureaus of America, having over 2,200 members serving 40,000 creditors in 36,000 communities, maintain files on more than 110 million Americans. Another firm, Retail Credit Co., has files on 45 million individuals. An industry spokesman recently estimated that it would be a mere 5 years before everyone who has applied for credit would be included in their computerized file.

When a false, or incomplete, or malicious piece of information goes into a consumer's file in a credit reporting agency, it can do irreparable harm to that individual and his family, usually without his knowing why he has been denied necessary credit or insurance, or why he seems to be unable to find employment. The abuses which have occurred in this field have been extensive and intolerable.

The initial legislative proposal to enable consumers to learn about adverse information in their credit files and correct or explain data which had been relied upon to place an individual unfairly in a "bad risk" category was in the form of an amendment offered by Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin to the consumer credit protection bill during floor debate in the House early in 1968. This proposal was expanded and introduced by Congressman ZABLOCKI as

a bill, H.R. 6071, at the beginning of the 91st Congress, with numerous cosponsors. A companion bill, S. 823, introduced by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER of Wisconsin, was passed by the Senate in amended form on November 6, 1969.

My bill today, H.R. 16340, takes the basic concept of the Zablocki bill and revises it to cover all of the points and situations which should be considered in the hearings for the purpose of assuring the widest possible review of the abuses the legislation is intended to correct. It is, I believe, a careful drafting job designed to pose the issues squarely, hence, it is undoubtedly more controversial in many of its provisions than the compromise bill which passed the Senate by unanimous voice vote.

In that connection, the subcommittee will be much in the same situation as it was 3 years ago after the Senate passed 92 to 0 a compromise Truth in Lending Act and we considered instead a more far-reaching bill know as the consumer credit protection bill containing a great many provisions not included in the Senate-passed bill. Many of these added provisions were adopted without change, others were amended—modified or expanded, and some were deleted, based on the information we received and developed in the hearings. If there are sections of this bill which are unworkable, or which would make it easier for people who are not good credit risks to get credit they should not receive, I am sure the testimony in the hearings will pinpoint any such deficiencies. On the other hand, if we have left out important consumer protections which should be included in legislation of this kind, then we will want to know that, too. That is the purpose of holding hearings.

Entitled the "Fair Credit Reporting Act," the bill could just as well be called the "Good Name Protection Act," for it is intended to insure that consumer reports contain only information that is accurate and relevant, while preserving the confidentiality of such information. The bill is not intended to curtail the growth of consumer reporting agencies, but only to regulate their activities so they perform their stated function in an equitable manner.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF H.R. 16340

Mr. Speaker, I attach a section-by-section summary of the highlights and provisions of the bill, H.R. 16340, along with a press release issued by the Committee on Banking and Currency announcing the hearings. The section-by-section analysis as printed herewith differs technically in section 24 from the information contained in the copies which were distributed to the press. As the bill now stands, a consumer damaged by failure of a consumer reporting agency or user of consumer information to exercise reasonable care in complying with the act will have the right to sue for actual damages, as this summary states. The earlier version of the summary did not spell this out.

In addition, as a result of a change in the final draft of the bill prior to introduction, there is a new section 61 in the summary, which means that sections 61 and 62 of the original summary are now

sections 62 and 63 of the summary which follows:

SECTION BY SECTION SUMMARY, H.R. 16340, FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 1. Short Title—Act may be cited as the "Fair Credit Reporting Act."

Sec. 2. Findings and Purpose—Indicates the need for fair and impartial procedures by consumer reporting agencies. The purpose of the act is to enable individuals to protect themselves against the dissemination of inaccurate or misleading information bearing on their credit worthiness, insurability, or employability.

Sec. 3. Definitions and Rules of Construction—A "consumer report" is defined as a report on an individual which is to be used as a factor in establishing eligibility for (1) credit or insurance for personal, family, or household purposes or (2) employment. Excludes reports made by a person who has a direct transaction with the subject of the report. An "investigative consumer report" is one which includes personal information obtained through interviews. A "consumer reporting agency" is any person who regularly engages in the furnishing of consumer reports.

Sec. 4. Effective Date—Act takes effect 6 months after enactment.

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 21. Regulations—The Federal Reserve Board shall issue regulations to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

Sec. 22. Administrative Enforcement—Compliance would be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission for those consumer reporting agencies and users of reports not regulated by another Federal agency enumerated in subsection (a). These agencies may use their existing enforcement authorities to bring about compliance.

Sec. 23. Advisory Committee—The Federal Reserve Board shall establish a broadly based advisory committee for advice and consultation.

Sec. 24. Civil Liability for Negligence. When a reporting agency or user negligently fails to comply with any requirement under the Act, any individual injured thereby can sue for actual damages. In addition, if there was negligence in the design of procedures or supervision of employees to assure compliance, the individual can recover his attorney's fees.

Sec. 25. Civil Liability for Willful Non-compliance:

- (1) Individual can sue for actual damages; and
- (2) Punitive damages; and
- (3) Attorney's fees.

Sec. 26. Civil Liability for Obtaining Information under False Pretenses:

- (1) Individual can sue for actual damages; and
- (2) Punitive damages; and
- (3) Attorney's fees.

Sec. 27. Jurisdiction of Courts; Limitation of Actions—Civil actions may be brought in any U.S. district court without regard to the amount of controversy or in other jurisdictional courts within 5 years of the violations.

Sec. 28. Criminal Penalties—Any person who obtains a consumer report under false pretenses can be fined up to \$5,000 or imprisoned up to one year, or both.

CHAPTER 3—ACCESS TO AND USE OF INFORMATION

Sec. 31. Access by Individuals to their Credit Files—Any individual upon furnishing full identification, may examine the information in his file during normal business hours upon reasonable notice. He may be accompanied by one person of his choosing and may take notes. The information shall include the names and addresses of prior recipients of his report for the last five years.

No charge shall be incurred if the consumer report resulted in denied credit, insurance or employment. A grant of legal immunity may not be made a condition to obtaining access to his file.

Sec. 32. Disclosure of Sources—The sources of information acquired in preparing an investigative consumer report need not be disclosed unless the individual finds it impossible to refute certain allegations without disclosure of such sources.

Sec. 33. A consumer reporting agency should maintain procedures designed to insure the confidentiality of its files.

Sec. 34. Uses of Information—A consumer reporting agency must maintain procedures to insure that consumer reports are furnished only to those with a legitimate economic need. Examples of what is and what is not a legitimate economic need are enumerated.

Sec. 35. Access by Government Agencies—Consumer reporting agencies can only divulge identifying information to governmental agencies unless legal process is obtained.

CHAPTER 4—OPPORTUNITY TO CORRECT ERRORS

Sec. 41. Disclosure of Adverse Action—Whenever a person denies credit, insurance or employment because of information contained in a consumer report, he must notify the individual of this fact in writing and give the name and address of the consumer reporting agency furnishing the report.

Sec. 42. Correction of Inaccurate Information—If a consumer reporting agency finds a disputed item to be in error, or is not verifiable, the agency shall (1) expunge the item from the file; (2) refrain from reporting the item on future reports; and (3) notify prior recipients of the error, without charge to the individual.

Sec. 43. Disputed Items—If an item remains in dispute after a reasonable effort is made to ascertain the facts, the agency shall, unless it finds the allegations made by the individual are so lacking in evidence as to be clearly frivolous, (1) mark the item as disputed in all future reports; (2) allow the individual to file his statement of the dispute; and (3) send a copy of this statement to prior recipients if requested by the individual.

Sec. 44. Items Claimed Incomplete or Misleading—If an individual contends an item is misleading because of the omission of relevant facts, the consumer reporting agency shall follow the procedures of Sec. 43.

Sec. 45. Disclosure of Nature of Information—When information comes from a person other than a consumer reporting agency which accuses a denial of credit, such information shall be disclosed to the individual concerned.

CHAPTER 5—DUTY TO KEEP INFORMATION CURRENT, ACCURATE AND RELEVANT

Sec. 51. Keeping Information Current—Creditors shall promptly report the disposition of any account which has become past due, the fact of which had been reported to the consumer reporting agency.

Sec. 52. Discarding Obsolete Information—Prohibits the reporting of adverse information older than three years, except for bankruptcies (14 years), suits, arrests, and judgments (7 years). Any item of derogatory information shall be deleted whenever it is learned that the source of the information can no longer verify this item.

Sec. 53. Public Record Information—A consumer reporting agency which compiles public record information must maintain strict procedures designed to keep the information up to date and notify the individual when adverse public record information is reported to a client.

Sec. 54. Relevance of Information—A consumer reporting agency may only report information which is reasonably relevant to

the purpose for which it is sought. The Federal Reserve Board has authority to approve, upon request, standardized forms for compliance with this section.

CHAPTER 6—INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS

Sec. 61. Exclusion of Certain Preemployment Reports—This chapter's requirements do not apply when the investigative report is used solely for evaluating an individual for a position for which he has not specifically applied.

Sec. 62. Disclosure by Users of Investigative Reports—An individual's consent must be obtained, after disclosure of nature and scope of the investigation in question, before an investigative report can be prepared.

Sec. 63. Restrictions on Investigative Reports—Subsequent investigative reports may not use information obtained for a prior report unless reverified.

PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Speaker, following is the press release issued today by the Committee on Banking and Currency on the hearings scheduled to begin on March 17:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 5.—Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee announced today that hearings will open Tuesday, March 17, on legislation to regulate credit reporting firms.

The hearings will be before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in Room 2128 Rayburn House Office Building. Mrs. Leonor K. Sullivan (D., Mo.) is chairman of the Subcommittee.

Legislation to control credit reporting activities was introduced in the House today by Mrs. Sullivan. The bill is designed "to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous and malicious credit information." (A summary is attached.)

Congresswoman Sullivan, principal sponsor of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, said the witness list for the credit reporting hearings is now being prepared primarily from among groups and firms "which have broad experience in, or knowledge of, this field so as to give the information we want and need in order to be able to write appropriate legislation. Additional groups or individuals wishing to present testimony should write to the Subcommittee outlining the kind of information they wish to present, so that we can decide if the hearings should be expanded.

"In any event, all statements of views submitted in writing by individuals, firms or associations bearing on this issue will be reviewed by the Subcommittee for possible inclusion in the printed hearing record."

Mr. Sullivan added: "I believe the first legislative proposal for Federal regulation of credit reporting firms was in the form of a proposed amendment offered on the House Floor on February 1, 1968, by Congressman Clement J. Zablocki (D., Wisc.), during debate on the Consumer Credit Protection Act. The amendment was rejected, but Congressman Zablocki refined and perfected it and introduced it as a separate bill, the Fair Credit Reporting Act, with multiple sponsorship at the opening of the 91st Congress in 1969. A companion bill, S. 823, introduced in the Senate by Senator William Proxmire (D., Wisc.) has passed the Senate in amended form and is among many bills on this subject now pending before the House Committee.

"There is vast public interest in this subject because of the tremendous influence of credit reporting firms on the availability of consumer credit, and on applications for insurance or employment, particularly for those persons whose credit files contain erroneous, misleading or incomplete data. Responsible leaders of the credit industry have

recognized the sometimes tragic consequences of such erroneous information and have adopted a Code of Ethics to assure an opportunity to the individual to learn the nature of adverse information in his file when it has led to a denial of credit.

"However, a great many credit reporting firms do not subscribe to this code of ethics. Furthermore, the proliferation of computerized personal data on individuals can easily create a never-ending nightmare for people applying for mortgages or other credit, or for insurance or employment, who are the innocent victims of mistaken or deliberately false information in their files. When we complete our hearings, we expect to have a documented story of the nature and extent of such abuses, and of appropriate legislative solutions for them."

TEXTILE IMPORT AGREEMENT URGENT

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the textile import situation daily grows more serious. We constantly hear reports of curtailment, unemployment, and the closing down of plants in our domestic textile industry. In my hometown, we have lost 300 jobs since February 1 due to the growing recession in the textile industry caused by unfair, low-wage imports. I fervently hope that our Japanese friends will see the urgency of this deteriorating situation and immediately advance a positive proposal to relieve our textile industry before legislation in Congress becomes absolutely necessary.

Secretary Maurice Stans has our full support in his Herculean efforts to negotiate a voluntary agreement with Japan to limit textile imports to the United States. Secretary Stans has manifested great patience, tact, courage, and determination to negotiate such a voluntary agreement with Japan. Only a moment ago I received the following letter from Secretary Stans, which was simultaneously delivered to the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, chairman of our informal House textile committee, and the Honorable CHARLES R. JONAS, vice chairman of our group:

DEAR MR. DORN: Thank you for your letter of February 25 signed jointly with Congressman Landrum and Jonas expressing your serious concern over the development of our negotiations with Japan regarding the textile import problem. I am responding separately to them.

In accordance with President Nixon's directions, the Administration has been engaged in extensive negotiations with Japan and other supplying countries to bring about a reasonable international solution of the textile import problem. We have been seeking to negotiate effective comprehensive international agreements to limit U.S. imports of these products. These negotiations have been conducted in the United States, in the Far East, and in Europe, and we have worked extensively on this problem through diplomatic channels.

I regret that I am not able to advise you at this time that we have an agreement which will solve this import problem. I can say, however, that our negotiations with Japan have reached the final stage and that after extensive presentation of our case for such an agreement, and after having put forward serious and concrete proposals to

the Japanese for an agreement, we are now awaiting a response from them which will indicate whether an agreement is negotiable at this time. I appreciate your concern that we cannot accept selective limitations under any circumstances and can assure you that we have made this point eminently clear to the countries concerned on a number of occasions. The proposals we have put forward have involved restraints on a specific list of products coupled with an efficient mechanism under which additional restraints would be effective automatically to prevent the spread of disruption in the market to other products. Our position is well known to Japan.

We have rejected in clear terms the idea put forward by Japan that the condition of the U.S. industry be determined for this purpose by an international body. We have pointed out to the Japanese that such a proposal would be more restrictive than the current provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and indicated that all countries must make their own judgments as to conditions in their own domestic industry. We expect to be responsible for making such judgments and cannot delegate that responsibility to other countries.

I believe that before the Administration determines whether it should propose legislation to achieve a limitation of our textile imports, we should give the Japanese Government the opportunity to respond with a concrete proposal. I shall report to you within about two weeks on my judgment, based on the latest information available to me at that time, as to whether we can negotiate a viable international agreement with Japan on wool and man-made fiber textile products. We appreciate very much your support of our negotiating efforts over this past year and your patience in what has been a very difficult situation for all concerned.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Secretary of Commerce.

COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would provide for the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Marihuana.

During the past few years, we have seen the use of marihuana spread from use by a restricted few to its present large-scale distribution among college students and certain groups of people who classify themselves as "intellectuals." Although most of the users of marihuana claim that it will not have any damaging physical or psychological effects, upon detailed examination of the facts available, one finds that there is no conclusive medical evidence to prove this idea either true or false. Thus, at this point, it is worthwhile to examine the preliminary studies which have been conducted by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and physicians across the country.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in a recent publication stated that marihuana acts upon the brain and the nervous system effecting the user's emotion and senses in widely varying degrees. Furthermore, the paper goes on to state that when large doses are used, vivid hallucinations occur which may cause panic or an inordinate fear of death with periods of paranoia. Persons

using marihuana find it difficult to make decisions requiring clear thinking and a user is more apt to follow another's suggestion.

A study by Dr. Edward R. Bloomquist for the California Medical Association states that continual use of marihuana can cause an individual to become psychologically dependent upon this drug. The article points out that most of the students are introduced to marihuana under social circumstances and tend to use it because they want to go along with the crowd. Dr. Bloomquist points out that when young people from lower economic groups come in contact with marihuana a significant number of them are easily enticed into experiments with stronger drugs. He has shown through his studies that many of these young people go on to become heroin addicts. He feels, moreover, that the threat of use by the better educated classes is even greater since this group uses the mind-expanding drugs out of curiosity or desire to solve personal problems. Many of these people find marihuana too mild an hallucinatory drug, and therefore experiment with LSD or similar drugs.

In this day and age, when many of our young people are experimenting with untested and dangerous drugs, I feel that it is the duty of elected officials to investigate these drugs and determine the physical and psychological harm which our young people could inflict upon themselves. This bill authorizes the President to appoint a commission of nine members who shall investigate the problem of marihuana, and 1 year after the enactment of this legislation the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a comprehensive report on its study and recommendations for proposed legislation. The Commission would investigate the following areas:

First, the extent of use of marihuana in the United States to include number of users, number of arrests, number of convictions, amount of marihuana seized, type of user, nature of use;

Second, an evaluation of the efficacy of existing marihuana laws;

Third, a study of the pharmacology of marihuana and its immediate and long-term effects both physiological and psychological;

Fourth, the relationship of marihuana use to aggressive behavior and crime; and

Fifth, the relationship between marihuana and the use of other drugs.

Mr. William F. Buckley wrote a column for the Washington Star in which he quoted from a study conducted by Dr. Keith Yonge. For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of Dr. Yonge's comments on the danger of marihuana:

The use of these drugs does indeed induce lasting changes in personality functioning, changes which are pathological in so much as they impair the "mental and social well-being. . ."

The harmful effects are of the same order as the pathology of serious mental illness (psychosis), namely in distorting the perceptual and thinking processes and in diverting awareness from reality, impairing to the individual's capacity to deal with the realities of life.

The argument that marijuana is no more harmful than alcohol is specious. Although

alcohol does constitute a serious health hazard in our society because of its readiness to intoxication, its action on the mental processes cannot be simply equated with that of marijuana. The primary action of alcohol is that of a relaxant. Impairment of mental functioning occurs when intoxicating quantities are taken. Marijuana, as with all the psychotropic drugs, on the other hand, acts solely as an intoxicant, its effects being primarily the distortion of perception and reasoning.

In psycho-social development man grows from the prevalence of self gratification and dependency, with little regard for reality, to the prevalence of self-determination and self-abnegatory involvement in his society. Against this progression, the trend toward "instant" self-gratification and artificial self-exploration (by the use of psychotropic drugs) is distinctly regressive—a reversion to the immature, the primitive. The regression is further evidenced in the other trends in group behavior with which the non-medical use of drugs tends to be associated—reversion to the crude or primitive in speech, in sexual expression, and in taste for music forms—however much these may be rationalized as emancipation from socio-cultural oppression.

Throughout our history there has been a constant discussion of whether this Nation would decay from within or be conquered by external forces. Now many eminent sociologists contend that the United States is entering upon a drug culture. They feel that apparently our citizens do not wish to face the realities of life. Therefore they use drugs such as marihuana to escape.

This bill is identical to a bill which was introduced by the Honorable EDWARD I. KOCH and several other Members of Congress.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CROSSING OF THE RHINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 25th anniversary of one of the truly great events in American military history which turned the tide of the war in Europe and which saved 5,000 to 10,000 lives and no doubt shortened the war by many, many months. I refer to the 25th anniversary of the crossing of the Rhine River and the capture of the bridge at Remagen, Germany.

The Rhine River, Germany's proudest defensive barrier, had not been crossed by an invading army since Napoleon's time.

In the early months of 1945 the German commanders were faced with two conflicting orders from Hitler: No. 1, stand and fight at positions just west of the Rhine; and, No. 2, blow up the Rhine River bridges to prevent Americans from crossing.

Remagen, located between Bonn and Koblenz, had a railroad bridge, known as the Ludendorff Bridge, built by the

Germans in World War I and planked over to permit vehicular traffic crossing.

The terrain was steep on both sides of the river, so it was not the place anybody would plan to make a crossing, and certainly nobody expected that the bridge at Remagen would still be standing.

On the drizzly afternoon of March 7, 1945, A Company, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion, 9th Armored Division, accompanied by A Company, 14th Tank Battalion, 9th Armored Division and armored engineers and supporting troops, were moving toward the Rhine River. They had planned to capture Remagen, then prepare to turn south to meet General Patton's 3d Army which planned to close a trap on the German troops west of the Rhine.

The infantry company—led by 1st Lt. Karl Timmermann of West Point, Nebr., now deceased—came out of the woods on a high hill overlooking the Rhine and spotted the amazing sight of the Ludendorff Bridge still standing. The infantry, supported by tanks, attacked and captured Remagen. As they were coming up to the bridge, the Germans blew a 30-foot crater at the western approach, making it impossible to get tanks across the gap to the bridge. The American forces then observed the Germans preparing to blow the bridge.

When the charge went off, the bridge seemed to lift up from its foundations, then settled back, miraculously standing. The first American troops then rushed across and secured a slim foothold east of the Rhine. Although no casualties were suffered on the actual crossing of the bridge, heavy casualties followed in scaling a precipitous hill on the east side of the Rhine, and during the next few days when the Germans threw in many counterattacks, artillery, jet planes—used for the first time in the war—underwater swimmers armed with explosives trying to destroy the bridge, von Braun's V-2's fired at the bridge, and what was apparently radio-directed artillery aided by residents of Remagen.

Into this hottest of hot spots, on the blackest night of the year, the first tanks moved in and crossed the bridge during the first night, and General—then colonel—Westmoreland, Chief of Staff of the 9th Infantry Division, moved his troops, along with the 78th Infantry Division to reinforce the shaky bridgehead.

SIGNIFICANT

Capture of the Remagen Bridge probably saved 5,000 to 10,000 American lives and shortened the war in Europe by months—V-E Day came 2 months later on May 8. Hitler regarded it, next to the Normandy invasion, as Germany's greatest defeat, and he sent out a court-martial which immediately executed four officers for their alleged cowardice—although the facts prove the Germans fought bravely to try and blow the bridge and repulse all American attacks.

The Remagen Bridge was also significant in showing the initiative and courage of American troops, trained to work together. At the 10th anniversary of the capture of the Remagen Bridge, on March 7, 1955, President Eisenhower called together the surviving winners of

the Distinguished Service Cross for a special ceremony at the White House, and said at the time:

Now, of course that was not the biggest battle that ever was, but for me it always typified one thing: the dash, the ingenuity, the readiness of the first opportunity that characterizes the American soldier.

From the infantry privates to the generals in command, Remagen represented a sudden opportunity unplanned, unexpected, which was exploited with split-second timing and initiative. Maj. Gen. John W. Leonard, who commanded 9th Armored Division, had this to say at the time of the capture of Remagen Bridge:

To me, one of the grandest tributes to the American Army methods of training, organization and discipline came all unconsciously and with no fanfare from Sergeant Alex Drabik, the first man across Remagen Bridge. When asked how he felt when he found himself over the bridge and on the German side of the Rhine, Sergeant Drabik said quietly and in all simplicity:

"Well, I looked around and 7 of the 9 men in my squad had been together in the outfit for a long time, and I just knew they would stick."

What a tribute to the esprit de corps of your unit! He had confidence because he knew that his buddies had been with him in the company for a long time.

THE REMAGEN HEROES

The Army conducted a very thorough assessment of who did what at Remagen, on the spot and at the time, and awarded 13 Distinguished Service Crosses. Eleven of the winners of the DSC—the Army's second highest combat award—are still alive. All of them were at the White House when President Eisenhower assembled the Remagen winners on March 7, 1955, followed by a special Pentagon luncheon cohosted by Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, and Secretary of the Army Robert Stevens.

The following summary data describes the DSC winners and their roles:

DECEASED

1. *1st Lt. Karl H. Timmermann* of West Point, Nebraska. First officer across the bridge. Company commander of Co. A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion, having assumed command late in afternoon of March 6—less than 24 hours before capture of the bridge. After returning home, he re-enlisted in the Army, helped lead a spearhead in the Inchon invasion in Korea, September, 1950. Contracted cancer and died in 1951.

2. *Sgt. John A. Reynolds* of Lincolnton, N.C. Along with Lt. Hugh Mott and Sgt. Eugene Dorland (all of Co. B, 9th Armored Engineer Battalion, 9th Armored Division), cleared the German explosives from underneath the bridge. The main charge had failed to go off, and the Germans exploded a reserve charge ignited by hand. The explosives from the main charge were still attached to the bridge and constituted a grave threat to the Americans. Sgt. Reynolds was killed by a sniper bullet in the closing days of the war several weeks after he won a DSC for his role at Remagen.

LIVING

1. *Michael Chinchar*, 31 MacArthur Drive, Saddle Brook Township, Rochelle Park, N.J. Age: 52. Currently employed in production control at Inmont Corp., Lodi, N.J. Chinchar was platoon leader of the 1st platoon, Co. A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion, 9th Armored Division. He had been platoon sergeant of the platoon commanded by Lt. Tim-

mermann, and when Timmermann moved up to be company commander of Co. A late on March 6, Chinchar although then only a sergeant was put in charge of the platoon. He was one of the first men to arrive at the western approach to the bridge, and had already led his platoon onto the bridge when opposition came from one of the towers on the bridge, and he and Sgt. Anthony Samele helped clean out the tower, and Sgt. Chinchar was among the first to cross the bridge.

2. *Sgt. Joseph A. DeLisio*, Co. C, Infantry Training Center (Special Troops), Fort Lewis Washington. Age: 48. Currently stationed at Ft. Lewis, Washington, and due to go to Vietnam March 25. Home address of father: 220 Victoria Road, Hartford, Conn. With the shortage of officers in the armored infantry company, DeLisio as a sergeant was also a platoon leader, commanding the 3rd platoon of Co. A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion, 9th Armored Division. He brought up his platoon when the first infantrymen were pinned down on the bridge, and operated on the theory that if you advanced fast enough, you had less of a chance of getting hit. He uncorked the stalled attack on the bridge. He rushed out beyond the defended towers, then back-tracked to clean out the right tower, and while he was subduing the Germans in the tower, *Sgt. Alex Drabik* dashed across to be the first man to set foot east of the Rhine.

3. *Eugene Dorland*, 2921 Ashley, Houston, Texas. Age: 51. Current occupation: Foreman at Spaw-Glass Construction Co. in Houston; born and brought up in Manhattan, Kansas. As a sergeant in Co. B, 9th Armored Engineer Battalion, 9th Armored Division, Dorland was picked along with Sgt. John A. Reynolds by his platoon leader, Lt. Hugh Mott, to help neutralize and throw into the Rhine the many German explosives placed underneath the bridge. This was an extremely hazardous task, with the knowledge that the explosives might blow them all up at any moment.

4. *Alex Drabik*, 8765 Dorr, Toledo, Ohio. Age: 59. Has been employed as a repairman and laborer at Medusa Cement Co., Sylvania, O., but was laid off in mid-January. First man to cross the bridge at Remagen. Served as sergeant and squad leader of 3rd platoon, Company A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion, 9th Armored Division.

5. *William J. Goodson*, 311 Jefferson St., Pendleton, Indiana. Age: 55. Makes starter brushes at the Delco-Remy Plant in Anderson, Indiana. Sergeant and tank commander, Co. A, 14th Tank Battalion, 9th Armored Division. Commander of first tank which crossed the bridge at Remagen under cover of darkness, night of March 7, 1945.

6. *Judge John Grimbail*, 4000 Bloomwood Rd., Columbia, S.C. Age: 55. Served in South Carolina state legislature and is now Judge of Court of Common Pleas, Columbia, S.C. As 1st Lt., was platoon leader in Company A, 14th Tank Battalion, 9th Armored Division. Head of first tank platoon to reach the bridge. When his battalion commander told him over the radio: "Get to the bridge," his stirring response came back over the radio: "Sir, I am at the Bridge!"

7. *C. Windsor Miller*, 3802 Jeffry, Wheaton, Md. Age: 56. Vice President of Robert W. Bridge Realty Co., Rockville, Md. As 1st Lt., was platoon leader of the first platoon of tanks to cross the Remagen Bridge during night of March 7, 1945, Co. A, 14th Tank Battalion, 9th Armored Division.

8. *Hugh B. Mott*, 2701 Eastland Ave., Nashville, Tenn. Age: 49. Presently Adjutant General of the State of Tennessee and a Major General in Army Reserve, member of the Governor's cabinet. As 1st Lt. and Platoon leader in Co. B, 9th Armored Engineer Battalion, 9th Armored Division, commanded three-man team which ripped out the wires

to German explosives underneath the bridge and neutralized the explosives on the bridge.

9. *Joseph Petrencsik*, 12514 Firsby St., Cleveland, Ohio. Age: 58. Had a heart attack 3½ months ago, and just went back to work at Welded Ring Products Co., Cleveland, as an oiler and sweeper. As a sergeant and assistant squad leader in the 3rd platoon of Co. A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion, 9th Armored Division, Petrencsik was one of the first infantrymen to fight his way across the bridge.

10. *Anthony Samele*, 583 E. 189th St., Bronx, N.Y. Age: 49. Currently working in the maintenance department of the Transit Authority in New York. As a sergeant and squad leader in the 1st platoon, Co. A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion, 9th Armored Division, Samele was the third man to cross the bridge.

11. *George P. Soumas*, 1803 Warford St., Perry, Iowa. Age: 55. Currently practicing attorney, and recently resigned as Police Judge in Perry, Iowa. Company Commander of Co. A, 14th Tank Battalion, 9th Armored Division, the first tank company to cross the bridge on the night of March 7, 1945.

I might mention for the benefit of my colleagues that this group which will be coming into Washington tomorrow will be honored on Saturday at the 25th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to renew my invitation to all of my colleagues and members of the staff to attend the showing of the United Artists film of "The Bridge at Remagen" at 3 p.m. Friday in the Senate Office Building auditorium.

I would like for the benefit of my colleagues to say that no official American military equipment was utilized in the making of this film. It was all leased from the Austrian Army, from equipment that the Austrians had purchased as surplus from the Americans following World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I was very interested, following the end of World War II, to hear the observation of some of the German officers like Hermann Goering, Jode, Keitel, and others who were captured and later tried at Nuremberg. Before their trial I had the opportunity to interview them. They said:

A development such as has occurred at Remagen could have occurred in no other army than the American Army.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the gentleman from West Virginia and my other distinguished colleagues to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the historic capture of the famed bridge at Remagen, Germany, and to pay tribute to those brave American fighting men who took part in this operation.

One of those who participated in that event was Maj. Gen. Hugh B. Mott, of Nashville, Tenn., who is presently still serving his Nation, State, and community as adjutant general of the State of Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege over many years to know and respect Hugh Mott. He has worked actively and effectively in our community in civic and governmental affairs. Prior to assuming the duties of the office of State adjutant general, he served our community as metropolitan treasurer for Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn. General Mott also served the people of Ten-

nessee in the late 1940's as a member of the Tennessee General Assembly.

For his part in the capture of the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen, General Mott, then a first lieutenant, was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. He led a team of engineers in a very dangerous assignment onto the bridge to cut demolition wires and destroy boxes of TNT which had been placed by the defending German troops.

Mr. Speaker, we are today, as in March of 1945, very proud of Hugh B. Mott and his comrades in arms who, by their daring and courage, captured the bridge at Remagen, an action which measurably shortened the war in Europe and saved countless numbers of lives.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleague from West Virginia in calling attention to the 25th anniversary of one of the greatest turning points of World War II in the capture of the bridge at Remagen.

One of my constituents, Eugene Dorland, 2921 Ashley, in Houston, was a winner of the Distinguished Service Cross for his heroism at Remagen. As a sergeant in Company B of the 9th Armored Engineer Battalion of the 9th Armored Division, Dorland showed great courage in helping to remove dangerous explosives which the German defenders had placed underneath the bridge. By his actions in the face of a possible explosion of these charges, he paved the way for the first American troops to make a successful crossing of the Rhine River over the Remagen Bridge.

I am pleased and proud to note that Eugene Dorland has been invited, along with the other winners of the Distinguished Service Cross, to a 25th anniversary luncheon, hosted by the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. William Westmoreland.

C. WINDSOR MILLER—REMGAN HERO

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, March 7, marks the 25th anniversary of the crossing of the Rhine at Remagen during World War II. This was the first time an advancing army had crossed the Rhine into Germany since Napoleon's campaign, and it was a major turning point in the war.

One of my constituents, Mr. C. Windsor Miller of Wheaton, Md., was among the American forces at Remagen, and he received the Distinguished Service Cross for valor. He is one of 11 who earned this high honor at Remagen to be invited by General Westmoreland to a special ceremony at the Pentagon, to be held on Saturday, to mark the anniversary. I want to take this opportunity to add my own commendation of Mr. Windsor and those who served with him on that historic day. By honoring the heroes of past wars, we demonstrate to all young men now serving their country in the armed forces that America will not forget the courage and sacrifice of the men who defend her.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) in paying tribute to the remarkable World War II military feat of the crossing of the bridge at Remagen 25 years ago this Saturday.

A constituent of mine, George P. Soumas, now an attorney in Perry, Iowa, was a captain and commander of the Company A, 14th Tank Battalion, the first tank company to cross the Remagen Bridge. For his valiant military service during that campaign, Captain Soumas was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1872, at the waking hour of 7 a.m. the first woman in American history cast a vote in a presidential election. History does not record the candidate thus favored, but we do know who this distinguished and courageous lady was.

She was, of course, Susan B. Anthony. Miss Anthony's historic gesture landed her in jail. But the vote she cast was counted and the act became the symbol of a fight that resulted in the so-called Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution ending discrimination in voting rights on the basis of sex.

The famous 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution became the law of the land on August 26, 1920. This was some 14 years after the death of Susan B. Anthony.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of that great event in our history. I can think of no more appropriate time to commemorate this occasion than on August 26, 1970.

For this reason, I am introducing today a joint resolution that will authorize the President to proclaim August 26, 1970, as "Susan B. Anthony Day." This would be a fitting tribute to her courage and to her great victory, the 19th amendment.

I am deeply pleased to announce that I am being joined in this effort by Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. DWYER, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mrs. HANSEN, Mrs. MAY, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. REID, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. HECKLER.

The resolution follows:

Joint Resolution—Authorizing the President to proclaim August 26 of 1970 as "Susan B. Anthony Day"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating August 26 of 1970, the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, as "Susan B. Anthony Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

TEXAS' ALL AMERICA CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Look magazine, three Texas cities were named by the National Municipal League as competition winners of the All America Cities of 1969. Borger, Cuero, and El Paso are among 11 cities awarded top honors for significant achievements in local affairs.

As a Texas Congressman, I congratulate the three Texas cities which were singled out for honors in the National Municipal League and Look magazine salute to All America cities. The citizens of Borger, Cuero, and El Paso have demonstrated once again what can be accomplished by determined effort initiated on the local level. All Texans should take pride in their accomplishments and find example in their deeds.

A National Municipal League study indicates most previous winners of the contest were selected on the basis of significant achievements in passing local bond issues, reorganization of city government, and in growth of industry and business.

The following is the text of the Look magazine story on Texas' three All America Cities of 1969:

TEXAS' ALL AMERICA CITIES
EL PASO, TEX.

The largest 1969 winner (pop. 350,000) has so far accomplished least in brick-and-mortar terms. A new special-care hospital, supported by \$650,000 in citizen donations, is being built. The first low-cost housing in 16 years and a Labor Department manpower training center are on the way. But El Paso's true All America claim is staked upon its spiritual awakening, led by Mayor Peter de Wetter, a peppery businessman, from a half-century of indifference toward its Mexican-American poor. Locked in feudal poverty on the city's south side, they provide de Wetter with enough negative housing, health and employment statistics to fill a target-area textbook. While he digs for Federal help ("In Washington, they think the Mexican-American is a cross between a Colombian and an Eskimo"), de Wetter faces ominous Brown Power militancy among angry chicano youth. The Mayor has started a youth program (El Paso's median age is 22.7) and is making the Anglo establishment aware of conditions on the south side. Says college student Ed Carrera: "People are beginning to see the Mexican-American as he really is—not some guy sleeping in the sun under a sombrero."

BORGER, TEX.

Oil and gas created a boomtown in the Texas panhandle in 1926. Forty years later, after bankruptcy in 1940 and another boom during World War II, Borger faced automation at its refineries, gas works and carbon-black plants. Population slowly declined from 20,000, schools had to be closed, old buildings were left to rot and small businesses began failing. Borger decided not to die. Over 900 citizens helped revamp the school system. Businessmen began clearing away unsightly shacks and hustled three new industries into town. A new shopping mall and senior citizens' center were built. Borger's two leading industrial firms outdid other Texas corporations in complying with the state's 1967 clean-air law, spending millions of dollars on filtering equipment that rid Borger's skies of carbon pollution by 1969.

CUERO, TEX.

Far away to the south, another Lone Star hamlet, 60 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, got tired of a city council and town manager who were as unresponsive to complaints from Anglo citizens as they were to those of Mexican-Americans and blacks. At the same time, Cuero's agricultural economy leveled off. As younger citizens left town to look for jobs, the prospect that Cuero's hospitals wouldn't satisfy Medicare requirements ruffled older conservatives. They surprised the new town manager by voting a \$750,000 bond issue for a new hospital and donating \$170,000 more in a fund drive. Their success united Cuero. Inspired by matching Federal dollars for the hospital and a new recreation project, the town is spending as it never did before to improve schools, streets and housing. A new furniture factory will provide 130 jobs, and Cuero is hunting for similar light industries.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY NOT OBJECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Washington-experienced people understand that there is no official tabulation of how Members of Congress vote on any given set of positions which the President of the United States may hold, personally.

They understand that, in any given session of Congress, in which hundreds of issues are considered, debated, and voted upon, a President probably assumes a personal position on no more than a handful of issues of personal importance to him.

As Members of this body know, such personal positions by a President are set forth by the President to the Congress through the leadership, and/or by Presidential messages.

Knowledgeable people in both the executive and legislative branches of Government, therefore, place no particular value on, and do not take seriously, pretensions by such private, profitmaking, publications as Congressional Quarterly that they are competent to rate Members of Congress on their degree of support for a President's personal legislative views and desires.

For such a publication as Congressional Quarterly to presume to rate Congressmen with respect to the President's personal position on any given set of issues may make headlines and may sell papers, but it does not reflect authenticity.

It is most unfortunate, therefore, that the President and his congressional supporters have to be subjected to this sort of tommyrot.

I am aware of the fact that, for many years, many persons in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government have found cause to suspect that, frequently, Congressional Quarterly was more subjective than objective.

This publication's pretense of rating Members of the House of Representatives on "an overall support score" based on the "percentage of 47 Nixon-issue rollcalls in 1969" on which they voted "in agreement with the President's position," is an excellent example of why Washington-experienced people find

cause to doubt either Congressional Quarterly's objectivity or ability.

At the White House, and in this body, I am known as a strong supporter of the President. Yet, Congressional Quarterly permits me a rating of voting "53 percent of the time" on these "47 Nixon-issue rollcalls in 1969—with the President's position" and has the gall to give only a 63 percent rating to the distinguished Republican whip of the House (Mr. ARENDS) and to the distinguished chairman of the Republican conference (Mr. ANDERSON).

Others of our colleagues in the Republican delegation, well established as staunch supporters of their party, their President, his platform and his programs, are afforded support ratings of as low as 38 percent.

Nor is it insignificant to note that Congressional Quarterly's peculiar selection of supposedly important issues includes simple recommittal motions and such purely procedural matters as a vote on the previous question while ignoring votes on such truly key issues as tax reform.

I cannot help but wonder whether Congressional Quarterly may be more interested in trying to sell someone on the fallacious slant that Republicans in the Congress are so poor in their support of President Nixon that some Democratic members of the Congress actually give the President more support than the Republicans do. Consider the intriguing fact that CQ gives the distinguished House Democratic whip (Mr. BOGGS) a 72-percent rating in that department—10 percent higher than that awarded Mr. ARENDS as whip of the President's own party.

It is quite understandable that, the other day, when I called this to LES ARENDS' attention, he looked surprised and commented, "I am sure I was supporting him all of the time."

Nor can I help but wonder whether Congressional Quarterly may be trying to sell someone on the slant that President Nixon suffers a lower first-year percentage of total congressional support than any President since before Mr. Eisenhower. In its January 16, 1970, issue, Congressional Quarterly credits President Eisenhower with enjoying 89 percent congressional support in his first year in office, President Kennedy enjoying 81 percent in his first year, President Johnson enjoying 93 percent in his own first year in office, and President Nixon suffering a 74-percent congressional support during his first year in office.

When I called this latest Congressional Quarterly problem to the attention of the Republican congressional committee's research staff, I was told that, of these 47 issues on which Congressional Quarterly claimed President Nixon had taken a personal position, the staff reported he had taken no position on 12 of them. Further, I know that Congressional Quarterly was wrong in interpreting at least 12 others, and I personally disagree with Congressional Quarterly's interpretation of several other of these 47 votes.

When I called this to the attention of Mr. Marlyn Aycock, associate editor of

Congressional Quarterly, he told me that he, personally, did not know what those 47 issues were—that he would have to check with the staff research man who handled the computer. Shortly after, however, Mr. Aycock managed to supply me with the numbers of the 47 roll-calls on which these votes were taken, but he impressed me with the fact that I would have to refer to previous copies of Congressional Quarterly, to which I do not subscribe, if I wished to ascertain the facts.

When Mr. Aycock was advised that the burden of proof of published statement rested with his organization, Mr. Aycock agreed to give me the information I sought if I was willing to pay a fee for the so-called research.

At first, he was unable to tell me how much the fee would be and whether the research would take hours, days, or weeks. After becoming impressed with my serious concern in this matter, Mr. Aycock informed me that, for only \$5, I could have the information if I sent a member of my staff to his office in a couple of hours. This was done.

Yet, to my surprise, all I got for my money was something far short of the research result that I understood I was purchasing, and for which I would have paid more. All I received was a tally which, presumably, Congressional Quarterly had previously published, of "House Votes 1969." Encircled in red were the 47 so-called Nixon-issue votes in question. In each of these 47 cases there was a brief one-paragraph Congressional Quarterly summation of the vote as Congressional Quarterly found it—followed by a parenthetical reference to pages of old copies of Congressional Quarterly.

In seven cases, quite revealingly, I discovered that someone at Congressional Quarterly had penned through such printed sentences as, "the President did not take a position" and/or had otherwise altered the previously published record with such penned notations as, "A 'yea' was a vote supporting the President's position."

Perhaps the most revealing indication of the Congressional Quarterly modus operandi is found, however, in CQ's "Ground Rules for CQ Presidential Support-Opposition":

Presidential Issues—CQ analyzes all messages, press conference remarks and other public statements of the President to determine what he personally, as distinct from other Administration spokesmen, does or does not want in the way of legislative action.

This would suggest that Congressional Quarterly presumes to have the ability to analyze and interpret what a President, personally, "does or does not want in the way of legislative action," the presence or lack of official Presidential statements notwithstanding.

That, additionally, certain of Congressional Quarterly's analytical results, published as reportorial fact, may have been determined after the fact of a House vote is strongly suggested by the altering of its own previous copy to which I have just called attention.

This, then, should completely clarify the fact that Congressional Quarterly

must have had something other than objectivity in mind when it published its version of the amount of support that President Nixon enjoys from members of his own party in the Congress.

COMPREHENSIVE DAIRY IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today on behalf of my colleagues, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. THOMSON, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. SCHADEBERG, and Mr. BURTON of Utah, and myself the Comprehensive Dairy Improvement Act.

This legislation combines all the major domestic dairy legislation into one bill to present a comprehensive approach to Federal domestic programs affecting our dairy industry and the supply of fresh milk and dairy products available to the Nation.

In the other body Senator DOLE is the chief sponsor of this legislation and I am pleased to join with him in this effort by Members of both parties in both Houses.

A member of the Wisconsin State Grange recently wrote to me that—

In no other segment of our Nation's economy is it necessary for a whole family to work 7 days a week, 10 to 12 hours a day.

The number of milk producers and milk cows have been declining consistently over the past several years. Many agricultural economists feel we have reached a good basic level of producing units. We must give these producers the guidance and dependability necessary so that they will continue to supply the Nation with one of the most nutritious foods available.

It has been estimated that some 66 percent of the 51 million schoolchildren have benefited from the special milk program. Only 44 percent will benefit from the school lunch, special assistance, and breakfast programs after they are expanded. Approximately 94,500 schools and institutions have participated in the milk program. Under the proposed expanded nutrition programs only 82,000 schools will be included.

I find, using information for the budget that the claims that an expanded school lunch and breakfast program will not result in any reduction in the amount of milk actually consumed because each new lunch provided for in the budget will include milk are not accurate. The elimination of the milk program coupled with the increase in the lunch and breakfast programs will actually reduce the amount of milk consumed by approximately 2 billion half-pints annually.

I support the expansion and upgrading of the school lunch program, but until such time as we can insure that all of the Nation's schoolchildren, and particularly those living in poverty, will receive nutritionally adequate meals, no effort should be made to eliminate al-

ready proven programs designed to provide badly needed dietary supplements.

Section 8 of the proposed bill incorporates the class I base plan amendments approved by the House Agriculture Committee and supported by the major dairy organizations. The amendments would make the class I base plan concept permanent, but also would allow new producers after delivering milk to a market for 90 days to share equally on the basis of his historic production in the class I prices—the same as producers who were delivering milk at the time of institution of the class I base plan in the order. The complicated and expensive appeal procedure, which particularly affects the small farmer adversely, is not included.

Section 4 of the bill terminates the butterfat support program.

Section 5 requires that dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price-support operations, insofar as they can be used in non-profit school lunch and other non-profit child feeding programs, in the assistance of needy persons, and in charitable institutions, including hospitals, to the extent that needy persons are served, be donated for any such use prior to any other use or disposition.

Section 6 permanently extends the military and veterans hospital dairy programs which expire on December 31, 1970.

Section 7 permanently extends the dairy indemnity payment program.

There is one significant new proposal included in the bill. Section 3 would require that the price of milk be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity for the 1970-71 marketing year. Bill Eckles of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative in Fond du Lac, Wis., put the need for an increase in parity well in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin. He wrote:

Current manufacturing milk prices are now at 90 per cent of parity equivalent but milk production continues below a year ago. If dairy farmers are to continue the confining and long hours of dairying, they want some assurance of respectable levels of income in the future. Assurance of the maintenance of current price levels can be improved without increasing present levels by raising government support levels to the full, permissible 90 per cent of parity, or about the current price levels being paid.

I would also urge my colleagues to review a comprehensive report on this subject prepared by the Associated Dairymen, Inc., which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26.

Section 2 of the bill provides for a permanent extension of the school milk program. My colleagues will recall that similar legislation, H.R. 5554 was approved by the House last year by a vote of 384 to 2. The other body has not yet taken action on the bill, however. The program is due to expire on June 30, 1970, and is seriously endangered by the proposed cut in the fiscal year 1971 budget.

Many proposals in this bill are now being considered by the Congress. It is our hope to bring all of the facets of these worthwhile provisions into a cohesive unit. It will assure the dairy farmer that the Federal Government

realizes the importance of his work to the welfare of the Nation and establish a permanent working base to encourage him to continue to provide this most nutritious food for all our citizens.

PROTECTING WITNESSES IN ORGANIZED CRIME CASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 3, 1970, page 1, column 1, an article authored by Craig R. Whitney appeared in the New York Times. The article concerned the rising death rate, by violent means, of informants in Federal narcotics cases in New York and other areas. The author reported that in New York alone there is a strong possibility that as many as 100 informers have been executed over the last 15 years. As is often the case with problems in law enforcement, this increasing death rate has a close relation to the actions of some of our courts. In this instance, the rulings leading to the increase in the death rate are those requiring the prosecution to disclose the identity of informants to the defendant. The problem resulting from informing a criminal of the identity of a key witness whose testimony could result in 5 years in prison on each count of the indictment is obvious, and that problem is only accentuated when the indicted individual belongs to an organization which has a niche in its table of organization for an enforcer or executioner. We are all aware that organized criminals are ruthless in the extreme. They will not hesitate to murder informants. What our judiciary has apparently so far been unable to appreciate is that there is more than one type of defendant coming before the courts. Too often they have ordered disclosure without giving due consideration to the possible consequences of their decision. Death has been the result.

Fortunately, however, a proposal is now pending before the House Judiciary Committee which will aid in solving this problem. In title V of S. 30, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969, the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to provide for the security of Government witnesses and their families including acquisition of facilities in which they would be protected. Since it may be undesirable to either the witnesses or the Government for the witnesses to remain in these facilities during the entire time pending trial, title VI—depositions—also allows the taking of pretrial depositions for use at trial, in the event that the witness is unavailable, to remove the incentive for narcotics dealers and other organized criminals to murder informers. When a deposition can constitutionally substitute for a murdered informant, there is less incentive to kill the informant.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the provisions of S. 30 are designed primarily to deal with the special evidentiary and trial problems involved in combating organized crime. Titles V and VI are but two examples of the imaginative solu-

tions that this bill proposes to deal with the problem of bringing criminal sanction to bear on organized crime, a problem that is broader than it is often realized. S. 30 is a vital step, for instance, in our attempt to control the narcotics traffic in the United States. For if we fail to focus on the problems of trial and gathering the evidence necessary for trial in organized crime cases, we will have failed in our other criminal law efforts. Congress can pass laws from now throughout eternity dealing with narcotics, but if we are unable to prosecute successfully those who deal in narcotics, then we will not have taken one step along the road to elimination of these leeches who prey upon our citizens in all walks of life. We can focus on the problems that cause crime and perhaps relieve a number of them. There is no way, however, that we can legislatively finally cure the evils of human greed and weakness. Narcotics traffic is prevalent in all sectors of our society, including those sectors which demonstrably have no need of redeeming social legislation. If we are to cure illicit narcotics traffic, it must be—at least in major part—through procedural devices which enable us to enforce the substantive laws that are now on the books.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1970]

MURDER OF NARCOTICS INFORMERS ON RISE, LAW AUTHORITIES REPORT

(By Craig R. Whitney)

The number of informants in Federal narcotics cases here who have been murdered has reached "substantial" proportions in recent years, according to reliable law enforcement sources.

Federal prosecutors would not divulge the exact number, but other sources reported that it might be as high as 100 over the last 15 years.

Authorities say there are two main reasons for the mounting toll: increasing requirements by courts to disclose the identity of informants, and increasingly high stakes for narcotics criminals, who usually face minimum penalties of five years' imprisonment on each count of a charge and will resort to murder to avoid conviction.

One recent murder of an informant in Brooklyn started an investigation that resulted in the indictment of two former agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics on charges of extortion last week.

And, according to sources in the office of United States Attorney Whitney North Seymour Jr., there have been many other, more important informants killed over the last decade.

The problem is one that has caused grave concern in Mr. Seymour's office and in the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, which develops many of the hundreds of narcotics cases the United States Attorney's office prosecutes.

All these Federal authorities, aware of the dangers their informants face, refused to add to them by commenting, but acknowledged the existence of what one called "a substantial problem."

The authorities say that many informants die simply because of their associations with criminals who do not hesitate to mete out the death penalty to double-crossers because they face heavy penalties themselves for dealing in heroin, cocaine and other illegal drugs.

"The major defenses a trafficker has are fugitivity and murder," an assistant United States Attorney said last week.

Nearly every one of the narcotics cases

under the jurisdiction of Federal prosecutors, headed by William M. Tandy, is built on informants.

"WORKING OFF TIME"

The usual pattern of such cases, as explained in a recent Court of Appeals decision, is this: "Federal Bureau of Narcotics agent meets informant; informant arranges meeting with narcotics salesman; agent negotiates buys; narcotics salesman are arrested."

The informant is usually someone who has been arrested but is "working off" a case instead of going to trial. "It's called 'working off your time in the streets,'" another assistant said last week.

The formula is so simple that even if the informant's name is not publicly divulged, the criminal can often figure out who he is. "So a lot of them have been killed, no question about that," said a narcotics official.

But often, for legal reasons, the prosecutors must name their informants in indictments or when a case goes to trial. The informant in the Brooklyn case, for instance, was named in the indictment against three narcotics smuggling suspects who now face reduced charges because he is dead.

A recent narcotics case that came before the Federal Court of Appeals here illustrates some of the problems that can be created for informants by court rulings. Their effect, according to a judge on the court, is to require the Government to disclose an informant's name and address if he is put on the witness stand or to reveal who he is if the defense asks for the information.

In the recent case, two men appealed for a reversal of a conviction on charges of selling \$3,500 worth of heroin to an undercover narcotics agent who had been introduced to them by an informant in his hotel room.

"As soon as the agent used the word 'informant,' [the defense] counsel objected to any further testimony unless the informant's identity was disclosed," the Appeals Court said in summary.

The lower court did not require the disclosure, but a day later the defense had found the informant's name and address from the records of the Americana hotel, where the heroin sale took place.

The Court of Appeals asked the Government attorneys why they had withheld the information in the lower court, and they said they had no idea the informant had registered under his correct name.

COURT DECISION CITED

According to Judge Henry J. Friendly, who wrote the higher court's opinion, "But for this representation, we would have been tempted to reverse these convictions; a prosecutor should not place needless and pointless roadblocks in the path of the defense."

Other Supreme Court decisions have ruled—although not conclusively—that an informant's identity should not remain secret if disclosure would be "relevant and helpful" to the defense.

Bureau of Narcotics officials say that because of such court rulings since 1957, informants have had to be identified and placed on the stand more frequently than in the past. But the officials do not feel that is the only reason for the informers' deaths.

Mr. Tandy is said to keep a file of such murders in his office, although he would not acknowledge this, disclose its contents, or discuss the problem generally.

One of the men said to be named in the file is Albert G. Agueci, an Ottawa mobster whose charred body was found in a field near Rochester in 1961, before a trial involving him and other gangsters in a heroin smuggling case was to begin.

Prosecutors say that Agueci, feeling desperate before the trial, went to Stefano Magaddin, head of a Mafia family in Buffalo, and threatened to become an informer to escape

conviction. He was found dead a few days later.

"There are a lot of people who have sat in that chair you're sitting in now," an assistant United States Attorney said last week, "who aren't around any more because they were informing."

FOR PROPER OBSERVANCE OF OUR COUNTRY'S BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, we the people of the United States, and we the members of its Federal Government have once again let pass without remembrance March the 4th—although we, as a people and as a government, were officially born on that day. On the fourth of March, 1789—181 years ago yesterday—our Federal Constitution began—to quote Lord Acton—"the career it has so grandly run" to achieve "an astonishing and unexampled success."

On that day, too, the "grand alliance" of the 13 States under the Articles of Confederation was buried, without a tear. Under those Articles there were also the familiar words, "the United States" and "Congress"—but there was no such terms as "we the people of the United States." Re-read the original Declaration of Independence, and you may be surprised to find that the "United States" appears there as the "united States"—with a little "u" and a capital "S." The accent was on the sovereignty and independence of each of the 13 States, not on their Unity—and there was no mention of the American people. Nor was there in the subsequent Articles of Confederation.

Those Articles begin: "To all whom these Presents shall come, we the undersigned Delegates of the States," each of which States it then names. Its article II states that "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence." and article III adds: "The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defence, the securities of their Liberties." No, I am not quoting the North Atlantic Treaty of alliance of 1949 but the Articles of Confederation of our 13 sovereign States.

The Congress of the United States was far from the Congress of the United States we know now—because of the Federal Constitution. It was much more like the Council of NATO. Each State had one vote, regardless of how many people it had. Like that Council, the Congress had but one House. Again like the NATO Council, it elected each year a figurehead it called "President." Did you know that there were 14 who were "President of the United States" before George Washington became our "first" President—thanks to the Federal Constitution? Do you remember—can you name a single one of those 14 earlier Presidents of the United States of the "grand alliance"—except John Hancock? John Adams, who knew that earlier "Congress," called it, contemptuously, a "diplomatic assembly." True, it had powers NATO lacks. For example, it could issue currency, as could each State in the alliance. Its dollar is

the one still remembered as "not worth a Continental"—even less than the trifling value which the dollars of many of the 13 States then had.

And then, after conditions got so bad that the people were rising in armed revolt—as in Shay's Rebellion in the sovereign State of Massachusetts—there began, on March 4, 1789, on this forgotten birthday of the present Constitution, there began perhaps the greatest of revolutions, because it was not merely profound, but without violence, without bloodshed.

To quote the astute Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, who visited us 45 years later and wrote his classic, "Democracy in America," then began "a new thing in history." Our Federal Constitution, he went on, rests "on a theory that is entirely new, and which stands as a great discovery in modern political science." Under it, he explained, "the Union governs not State but simple citizens," and he should have added—and did later—those "simple citizens" are its true sovereigns, not the States, for the citizens elect the Union Government.

To me, there is a majesty in the opening words of the Federal Constitution, "We the people of the United States," not "We the people" as in the United Nations Charter. "The People of the United States," a new concept, was created out of 13 petty peoples by the Federal Constitution which began its life on the 4th of March 1789. No wonder the British Prime Minister, William Gladstone, called it almost a century later, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." The wonder is that this "new birth of freedom," as Lincoln rightly described it, after having been long marked by the fact that each President was inaugurated on the 4th of March, has been so shamefully forgotten since 1933 when the inauguration day was advanced to January 20.

We still celebrate the Fourth of July—and it is a revolutionary date in human history that deserves even more celebration than we now give it. The principles of free government had never been set forth so clearly as on July 4, 1776—and never before had any State government been founded on such statement of the sovereignty of the citizens. But the achievement of March 4, 1789, was, I submit, even more revolutionary; indeed, to the Founding Fathers it was a "miracle." Never before had the sovereign citizens of democratic States created on anywhere on earth an interstate government where the citizens and not the State governments were the sovereigns—and this was done, unlike the creation of government elsewhere—by peaceful agreement, not force; by the power not of going into the streets with violence, not of armed revolt as in Shays' Rebellion, but by the life-giving and life-preserving, and life-advancing power of reason, common-sense.

We now hear much ignorant talk of the "Second American Revolution"—but we have already had the Second American Revolution—and the fact that the changeover to citizen sovereignty from State sovereignty in the United States

was achieved without war, without violence, without bloodshed—all this makes it the more remarkable and the more to be remembered, not the less—as it is now, alas.

As the 4th of July is Freedom's day of the year to be celebrated, the 4th of March is Union's Day—or Liberty-and-Union's Day to be remembered.

On George Washington's birthday every year, his Farewell Address is read in both Houses of Congress. How many have noted the passage in it that warns that alliance will not work, even among our free States? How many remember that George Washington was "First in the hearts of his countrymen"—not merely his fellow Virginians—because he led in the peaceful revolution that transformed the President of the United States from a forgotten figurehead into an Executive, and the Congress from a contemptible "diplomatic assembly" into the foremost lawmaking body of the world that is free?

Why, then, should we not honor the birthday of our Federal Union as we do that of Washington—who—when his was the name of a man, not a capital—lost no occasion to insist that Freedom without Union is anarchy?

Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest that we mark each 4th of March in future, by having the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate read, in alternate years, respectively in the House and the other body, one of the truly great papers on Union that helped save the people of the United States—and could help save the people of all free countries—from freedom's fatal tendency to perish in disunion?

The papers I suggest for alternate reading:

First. Franklin's moving plea on June 28, 1787—when the Federal Convention was on the point of breaking up in disaster—for prayer to save the union of the free.

Second. Hamilton's magisterial Federalist Paper No. 15, demonstrating why alliances always are doomed to failure and only the federal system can work between free peoples.

Third. Madison's persuasive Federalist Paper No. 45—sovereignty lies in the citizen.

Fourth. Lincoln's second inaugural, March 4, 1865, where to save the Union, the Commander in Chief of an army at war, rose to the peak where he blamed his own side as much as the other—and proved that by so high an appeal to human mobility the most dreadful of wars can be won, and the most enduring kind of peace can be established.

DISABLED VETERANS SUFFERING FROM CUTBACKS MUST END

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. PHILBIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the current plight of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in Massachusetts.

We have to rely on these hospitals to

take care of disabled veterans, who, in our minds, have highest priority claim on the finest and best kind of hospitalization, medical care, and treatment that this Nation can provide.

Some few years ago, over the protests of veterans' groups, political leaders and an overwhelming number of people in Massachusetts and New England, the Veterans' Administration hospital at Rutland, Mass., which for years served many veterans of Massachusetts and the New England region, was closed.

At that time, I, and others, made determined efforts to save that hospital, which we knew and declared was an essential part of the VA hospital system in our State and area.

We filed legislation to retain this needed facility and the bill was reported to the House by our Veterans' Affairs Committee.

We besieged the Veterans' Administration and the President in urging that the hospital be kept open.

We mobilized all the assistance we could get to persuade the officials of the Government that unless the hospital was kept open serious consequences would result.

We pointed to the limited number of beds in Massachusetts and New England that were available to disabled veterans, and the fact that the elimination of this hospital with its large number of beds would in time create a crisis regarding the hospital care and treatment of our disabled veterans in our State and region where 700,000 veterans reside in the area.

I am sorry to say that this time has now come, according to no less authority than our esteemed friend, the very able, distinguished gentleman from Texas, Chairman TEAGUE, of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, who recently declared that he was seriously concerned about recent reports indicating "that many Veterans' Administration hospitals were being caught in an impossible squeeze between higher medical and drug costs and rising workloads without receiving proportionately higher funding and staffing allocations."

"If this is true," Chairman TEAGUE said, "such policies, if allowed to stand, will wreck the VA hospital system and undermine the veterans medical program to the point of dangerous dilution in quality."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must not allow that to happen. We must respond, as we have always done, to the call of the needs of our disabled veterans and their dependents and families. In this instance, we must take immediate action to make sure that disabled veterans are being given, and shall be given, admission to VA hospitals—first-class medical care and treatment in hospitals manned by adequate, qualified staffs and experts to care for our beloved, disabled veterans to whom we owe so much.

Chairman TEAGUE has pointed to the fact that VA hospitals currently have an average staff ratio of 2.72 employees for every patient in general medical community hospitals, and State and local government hospitals, and the ratio in university hospitals operated in connec-

tion with medical schools is three employees to every patient.

I thank Congressman TEAGUE for writing to President Nixon advising him that he expects to seek a minimum staff ratio for VA hospitals of at least two employees for every patient and a 1-for-1 ratio in psychiatric hospitals.

Most unfortunately, his study of Massachusetts Veterans' Administration hospitals revealed funding deficiencies in fiscal year 1970 of over \$1.7 million to operate about 4,000 hospital beds serving approximately 300,000 Massachusetts veterans.

In the House, February 4, 1965, when the Veterans' Administration was moving to close Rutland, Mass., hospital, I spoke as follows, and I quote some of my remarks at that time:

The Veterans Administration knows, and I know, and my colleagues in the House know who will be the innocent victims of the unsound economy which is being claimed as justifying the closing of Rutland Heights Hospital. It will be those gallant men and women to whom a grateful nation made solemn pledges of aid and assistance when they came home from the wars.

Not only will our veterans suffer, but their families and dependents will have to endure lengthy waiting periods until hospital care can be provided for the veterans in need.

This is truly shocking ingratitude from the richest nation in the world. It is an intolerable situation which the American people will never condone.

But no attention was paid at that time to my strong appeals, and those of other members of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress.

Now we are faced with the results we predicted then. The hourglass has run out. The timetable has changed its course, and now the disabled veterans of Massachusetts and New England must suffer for gross bureaucratic, yes, and congressional miscalculations, which closed Rutland Hospital.

This action has reduced the already inadequate staffing, even more. I have strongly demanded that additional funding be provided now. I know that my colleagues in the House from Massachusetts and others will join the battle to relieve our disabled veterans and their families from lack of adequate hospital facilities, and the worry and anguish on the part of their families caused by this deplorable situation, which is a story of negligence and deprivation of disabled veterans who should be the first beneficiaries of our compassion, care and treatment they so completely deserve and urgently need.

Our Massachusetts VA hospitals are approximately 400 positions short of needed staff. These extra positions would cost about \$3.6 million annually, but whatever the cost, they must be provided at the earliest possible moment.

Salaries must be adjusted to insure that all necessary specialist employees are hired, and they are known to be recruitable.

Massachusetts veterans' hospital community nursing care programs were underfunded in fiscal year 1970 by \$389,000 and our Vietnam veterans are being sorely affected by these conditions.

Bedford psychiatric hospital is short

\$589,000 additional funds, and 60 more positions are required to staff the hospital properly. Shortages in drugs, medicines, hospital linens, medical and dental supplies, maintenance and repair supplies and services and other recurring operating expenses must be promptly replenished.

One of the greatest doctors in the country, Dr. Francis B. Carroll, is in charge of Boston's 300 bed hospital at Jamaica Plain where our fiscal year 1970 funding deficiencies amounted to over \$400,000.

Dr. Carroll told the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that—

One of the most pressing problems which has given us great concern has been the inadequate staffing of our nursing service.

This means that our desperately ill patients are not being provided with the amount of nursing care they need.

There is inadequate nursing support, and there are times when we only have one nurse to oversee two acute wards.

Moreover, because of non-competitive salary rates, the hospital is losing two radiologists, including the chief radiologist.

Up to this time they have been unable to recruit replacements.

He also reported a shortage of funds to place veterans in nursing homes at VA expense who no longer need continued hospital care.

The distinguished doctor stated to the committee that it has been necessary for him to divert over \$153,000 from his maintenance and repair funds and new equipment acquisitions in order to keep from reducing personnel below the already substandard levels.

The situation at Northampton psychiatric hospital also shows very substantial funding deficiencies, including funds to replace a fire protection system, a 28-year-old fire truck and a fire alarm system that does not meet local, State, and Federal regulations. Also, they state that sometimes snow covered fire escapes are insufficient and antiquated.

These conditions add up to playing fiscal roulette with the lives of disabled American veterans.

The able hospital director, Dr. Benepe was also highly disturbed that the VA is failing to recruit new and competent psychiatrists primarily because the salary level is not competitive.

He said that because of, "wage inequities currently I believe we are locked into a future of second-class care," and it is second rate.

Dr. Winick, another fine doctor, head of Brockton's 988-bed psychiatric hospital, also reported very substantial funding deficiencies covering about 30 positions, and also shortage of funds to place veterans in community nursing homes.

He also reported that over \$90,000 had been diverted from the hospital's maintenance and repair and new and replacement equipment funds in order to support salaries for the hospital staff. Part of these funds were needed to provide additional space for rehabilitation programs, to install handrails in corridors of older patient wards, for fireproof doors and to replace radiological apparatus.

In January 1970 only \$9,960 had been

received to apply toward a reported shortage of \$46,000 for the community, nursing home care program.

The story from West Roxbury VA hospital by another able doctor was in the same tenor—shortage of funds for 1970, \$260,000—shortage of personnel—integrated medical and surgical intensive care units because of inadequate staff—shortage of nursing personnel for the operating room and staffing for the spinal cord injury units was barely minimal—impossible heavy workloads, impairing morale of staff—therapists to provide guidance and training for an increasing number of young Vietnam veterans—and so on.

Another fine doctor, Thomas J. Quigley, Director of VA outpatient clinic, also reported substantial funding deficiencies to be made up by deferring the purchase of clinic equipment, and in maintenance and repairs—shortage of funds in dental care for Vietnam veterans.

No wonder Chairman Teague has been aroused about these reports. They are truly shocking, and these conditions cannot be tolerated. The supply of hospital beds lessens, while patient care is substantially increased and outpatient visits have very substantially increased.

The real worry is now: Shall Congress and the American people tolerate a Veterans' Administration medical system—once the best—to deteriorate into a second-rate system through neglect and shocking cutbacks of appropriated funds.

Efforts will be made to justify this situation, but it is truly intolerable and cannot be justified. It must be remedied at once, and I have powerfully urged the Veterans' Administration and the executive department to take immediate action to restore any cuts that may have been made. If necessary, Congress should, and I believe it will, provide money to take care of the hospital needs of our disabled veterans adequately.

Meanwhile, I demand in the name of our disabled veterans that VA allocate all funds Congress provided to meet veterans needs.

I am glad that our esteemed friend, Chairman TEAGUE, has declared that he does not intend to sit idly by and allow shortsighted policies to destroy a medical program that is absolutely necessary to care for American veterans. I have assured him of my vigorous cooperation in any efforts he may make concerning all adequate funding to eliminate the very disturbing conditions to which I have alluded in these remarks.

Congress cannot escape its share of the responsibility for this calloused neglect of disabled veterans. It must act now.

BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY IN ISRAEL 15TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently in New York City supporters of Bar-Ilan University, America's only chartered institution of higher edu-

cation in Israel, met to celebrate the 15th anniversary of its founding. On this occasion I had the good fortune to share the dais with such good friends as the dinner chairman, Counselor Albert Parker; his cochairman, Edward Adams; Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg; Prof. Sidney Z. Lieberman; Phillip Stollman, chairman of the Board of Trustees; his brother Max Stollman; New York City comptroller, Abe Beame; and Chancellor Dr. Joseph H. Lookstein. It was indeed a happy occasion, notwithstanding the troubles that beset Israel today, for it marked another step in the growth and development of a dream of a substantial majority of American Jewry. I am happy that I have been able to share in that dream. Under the permission heretofore unanimously granted me, I include at this point the program of the dinner recently held at the Waldorf-Astoria marking the 15th anniversary of the founding of Bar-Ilan University in Israel:

PROGRAM

Dais Processional.
Anthems: Stephen J. Texon, Soloist, Opera Orchestra of New York.
Invocation: Dr. Sidney Z. Lieberman, Headmaster, Ramaz School.
Grace.
Welcoming Remarks: Albert Parker, chairman.
Greetings: Phillip Stollman, Chairman, Board of Trustees; the Honorable John J. Rooney, Member, The House of Representatives.
Remarks: Chancellor Joseph H. Lookstein.
Address: The Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg.

The following were my brief remarks on this occasion:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN J. ROONEY, AT 15TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY

JOHN J. ROONEY. Mr. Toastmaster and our good friend, Albert Parker, revered and respected rabbi, Professor Lieberman, the Messrs. Stollman, those generous and great benefactors of Bar-Ilan, Comptroller—and I thought we had the day when we were going to call him the Mayor of the City of New York—Abe Beame, the Chancellor, Dr. Joseph H. Lookstein, and my friend Ambassador Goldberg.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure for me to once more greet all of you who tonight celebrate the fifteenth anniversary of Bar-Ilan University.

It is gratifying, indeed, for me to be able to share with all of you the magnificent realization of the hopes and dreams we shared for such a university many years ago.

Bar-Ilan is the fulfillment of the heartfelt yearning on the part of a substantial majority of American Jewry. As it marks each annual milestone in its growth and development, it brings to all of us who had a part in its nurture, a feeling of great satisfaction.

As its student body increases and as its graduates multiply, all of us marvel at the contribution it is making to the enrichment of so many facets of Israel's present day defense and development.

I wish that all the efforts I have made to secure the cooperation of my colleagues in the Congress to enact legislation were crowned with the same type of success as those which have been directed to bring aid to Israel as a nation and to the special educational and cultural institutions in Israel in which we have a truly paternalistic interest.

I congratulate you, Chancellor, Dr. Look-

stein, the Board of Trustees, the Board of Overseers, and the many loyal friends of Bar-Ilan for the expert organization and planning, which so largely contributes to Bar-Ilan's success and to which Harold Blond contributes such a great deal.

I commend the faculty for its stimulation and wise teaching extended to the ever increasing student body. I congratulate the students for their splendid academic achievements. It is not necessary to remind them of what they owe and to whom they owe a deep and lasting debt of gratitude for the priceless benefits of advanced educational opportunities.

May all of you who give of your time, your efforts, and your assets to make Bar-Ilan the university of your dreams be richly rewarded this new year as you have been rewarded during the past fifteen years.

Thank you.

It is now my privilege to insert the remarks of the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, former U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., who was the principal speaker at the 15th anniversary dinner:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG

Mr. Chairman, my old friend, Albert Parker, Chancellor Lookstein, distinguished rabbi, Congressman Rooney, Comptroller Beame, Mr. Stollman, Mr. Adams, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman, I was interested in your comment, Mr. Chancellor, about Dr. Weizmann.

I guess he was right when he said that our Jewish cause depends upon the leg of a chicken. It reminded me somewhat of what my great predecessor of the United Nations said of his tenure of the United Nations. He said that as he looked back at his experience, the dominant characteristics were alcohol, protocol, and Geritol.

Mr. Chancellor, I am very honored that a scholarship has been endowed in my name at your great university. It is not the first time that I and my wife have been honored by Bar-Ilan.

I remember when I went to Chicago and was honored when I was Secretary of Labor by Bar-Ilan. My wife, who could not be with me tonight because she is watching after her grandchild—she is baby-sitting—was recently honored too.

I am particularly glad tonight that among those who are here and who have supported the university and extended greetings is my very dear friend, Congressman Rooney.

Now, you know, most people who have served in the diplomacy of the United States quake and shiver when the name John Rooney is announced.

He has a reputation of being a very stern guardian of the public purse. But I am going to tell you a secret tonight about John Rooney, and it is the truth. I swear it is the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

When I became ambassador to the United Nations, I had much to do with Congressman Rooney. I had much to do with him before in my public service, and I always remember what he said to me on one occasion.

He said, yes, he was the guardian of the public purse. When it came to those appointments by a President which constituted a reward, not for ability or for service to the country but for being an affluent supporter of the President in power, Republican or Democrat.

With respect to such appointees and such ambassadors, the chairman of our committee who scrutinized public expenditures did not exactly see why we ought to present them with the public purse to carry on their duties.

But, since the chairman has reported, I was the youngest of a family of eleven, not very well endowed in those days. Since I had given up my Social Security when I had

left the Supreme Court of the United States, and that was quite a Social Security after you had given them the last increase in salary after I left, he said—and I remember those words very well—Arthur, if you need anything for the conduct of your office, you can have it. Now that doesn't sound exactly like a Scrooge, does it? It sounds like the warm, generous man he is.

I want to thank John in your presence for the great support he always gave to me in all of the offices I occupied. He was a real friend. And he and his lovely wife, I remember the great occasion when we all gathered together when his Holiness, the Pope, came to the United Nations, and gave the memorable speech, which I shall never forget—I regarded it as one of the highlights of my career—something we can all share, he said in concluding his speech that war never again, never again war.

Let us hope and pray that in this new year that it will be realized.

Now, ladies and gentleman, despite the fact that the Yarmulka keeps falling off my head, and it was falling off of yours too, I have a great feeling for Jewish tradition. That is why I have a great feeling for Bar-Ilan.

I am not going to talk very long. But as we meet for Bar-Ilan—and it is a most worthy cause because it would be inconceivable to have a university in Israel that did not blend tradition with education.

As the chancellor said, there are other great universities in Israel. I am honorary chairman of the Hebrew University board. But supporter as I am of that great institution, I say to you very frankly, as I just said, it would be inconceivable to have Israel without a great university, which this has become, which merges all that is the best in modern education with our great tradition.

It is important that that university is well endowed. It would be an indictment of American Jewry if American Jewry did not respond to that. We have the resources, we have the capacity, and it is very, very much needed for the continuity of a rich Jewish life in Israel. So I support this university very much.

Now the University, of course, depends upon the continuity of Israel. That is obvious. As we meet, there is great concern about the question of whether our government's policy with respect to Israel is undergoing a change.

This concern arises from reports which we read in the press that perhaps now we ought to have a more even handed policy than we had during the period when I was in the United Nations, during the period of the last administration.

I would like to say a word about that to you tonight. Of course, you all know what our policy was. You were participants, as, indeed, all of the American people were.

I believe that, judging by the amount of mail that I received when the June war was going, before the June war was started, during the June war, and after the June war of '67, there was a nationwide involvement in the fate of Israel by Jews, which is highly understandable and natural and never need be apologized for, and by non-Jews throughout the country.

I can tell you that with all of the issues with which I have dealt with in three years, all the great crisis of the period of three years—and there were many crises, Viet Nam, the Pueblo, India-Pakistan, oh, there were a dozen—the amount of mail, the amount of public concern, the amount of telephone calls was greater with respect to Israel than any other because our whole country was very, very much involved and concerned in this matter.

When I pick up the papers and I read that inspired reports out of Washington that now

we ought to move to a more even handed policy, this prompted me to look back over that period. You can't trust your recollection because your recollection fades, even in a short period of a few years.

So just recently I reread all of the debates, all of the documents, everything that was determined by our government, and everything I recommended, and everything I said on behalf of our government, as well as other important officials of the government.

Having done that I want to say in the most categorical terms that I would reject completely the implication that the policy we pursued was in any way not even handed. I would express the fervent conviction and the fervent hope that our country would in no way change the policies that we enunciated.

This is a matter of utmost importance, and it is not a political matter. I want to emphasize that. It is a matter of the utmost importance because the only solid friend among any major power that Israel has today is the United States.

It is highly important that that friendship be maintained and continued in full measure. When I say it is highly important, I say that it is highly important to the United States. I want to emphasize that. And no Jew need feel at all apologetic about urging this policy—no American Jew.

It is in the national interest of the United States that that policy be maintained. Now what was that policy? It is a very simple policy. It is a policy that says that looking over the last twenty-one years the policies that our country pursued in those past twenty-one years weren't adequate, and we made some mistakes.

The principal mistake we made was at the time of Suez, when we forced the Israelis to withdraw on the promise that if they withdrew they would get a permanent peace. Also, the international waterways would be open for their shipping. But more importantly that now the armistice agreement in '56-'57 would be replaced by a peace agreement. That promise wasn't realized.

That promise was recorded in papers that we filed at the United Nations as an assurance to Israel that if they followed the dictates of the United Nations at our instigation that they would be permitted to live peacefully, free from force and the threat of force.

So in 1967 we made a very simple decision. I am entirely convinced it was the right decision at the time and is the right decision now. It is not a very complicated decision. It is a very simple, simple one. It is this:

This time Israel is entitled to peace and that withdrawal this time should be in the context of a peace agreement. Now that isn't very complicated.

By the way, that isn't harmful to any of the Arab states in the region. How do they benefit of a continuation of this situation, which calls in Israel's case for half of its budget being devoted to war—half of its budget.

We think we are spending too much when we say 70 billion of our 200 billion dollar budget is devoted to defense, and we are a great, big country. When you look at Israel, a small country, a developing country, you can imagine what a burden that is, and the same thing is true in the Arab countries as well. They are in a less developed situation than Israel is.

So I believe that we should adhere to the simple policy we had, which is that this time something better is required than a fragile and violated armistice and a virtually non-existent cease-fire because a cease-fire we arranged in June of 1967 has completely fallen apart.

Now our country ought to stand resolutely behind that idea and ought to use all of its diplomatic influence in support of it.

When we enunciated that policy, it was supported by both political parties. I had congressional advisors, one Republican and one Democratic, who assisted me at the United Nations in all that I did in this area. They were closely in touch with their congressional colleagues.

It is interesting that the charge of one-sidedness was not leveled at us at the time, but anybody in political responsibility in the United States, Republican or Democratic. It was leveled at us by the country, it was leveled by the Soviet Union.

You perhaps will recall how I answered it at the time, and I would not take back a single word of what I uttered at the United Nations. I believed it when I said it and I believe it at this time.

There was another principle we operated on in 1967. We determined we would not let Israel be pushed around or bullied by the Soviet Union, and I think that was a right policy and I think we ought to adhere to it now.

By the way, I think when the United States does that it gains the respect of people in the Soviet Union, not their disrespect.

I believe the President of the United States, President Nixon, is friendly to Israel. I think he demonstrated that when Mrs. Meir visited in the most cordial terms. I believe the danger is a different danger; that is, that the congressman certainly knows better than most, there are other officials in our government, some well disposed and some who for a long time have better relations with other countries in the area.

That's an illusion. I must say from my experience. You try to curry favor with other nations in the area by sacrificing Israel, you will finish up with the worst of all possible worlds. The thing it seems to me to do is to preserve the balance that we tried to maintain in '67, and that is simply this.

We want to be friends with every country in the area. However, that friendship cannot be bought at the expense of our being unfriendly to Israel. We would be faithless to the United Nations charter if we had any other principle because the United Nations charter to which all these countries are parties—it's a treaty—says that every nation is entitled to be recognized in its sovereignty, in its existence, and in its right to live free from war and the threat of force.

Now I notice that there is a great disposition now to say that we ought to make special efforts to resume relations, diplomatic relations, with these countries. I happen to believe that it is a good thing to have diplomatic relations with all countries, but—there is a big but in this area—in 1967 we made another resolution. We did not break off relations with those countries that broke off relations with us after the 1967 war between Israel and the Arab countries.

They broke off relations with us. They broke it off in the most flimsy of all grounds. They broke it off on the grounds that we participated through our Air Force in the six day war. That was a libel, it was entirely false, and they knew it was false at the time it was made as we now know from the published evidence.

It was a very dangerous libel because, had the Russians not known better since they were shadowing our sixth fleet, it could have resulted in a confrontation between the Soviet Union and ourself. It would have been very dangerous.

It was fortunate, I think, at this point that they knew better. Our policy at that time was very simple, and I hope we do not change that policy because I am a strong believer in the dignity of the United States.

When I was approached—I was approached in this area about resuming diplomatic relations—I had a very simple answer. I said to any of the countries involved, "you broke off relations with us, you are welcome to go

to Washington and apply for a restoration of diplomatic relations. It is not the function of the United States to go running after you."

I would have thought that that is a most elementary way to handle any situation, any diplomatic situation, when you have not been at fault.

The best thing that all of us can do at the present time—I'm a private citizen like yourself—in our concern about Israel is to give its institutions support. There is no better way you can do it because life must go on. It is very important to have it go on while they remain in a state of partial mobilization.

They are in a state of partial mobilization. Faculty members must go off and serve their service, students must go off and serve their service. But it is important that the institution go on so that they come back and they obtain the skills, the education which makes this country such a unique country in that part of the world.

I commend you on what you are doing to support this effort.

WORKINGMEN—THE LATEST VICTIMS OF THE USURPERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the President delayed in calling for additional authority from the Congress to encourage settlement, an apparent deadlock was reached in the railway labor situation.

We were asked to act at the last minute, and in the dark. The appropriate committee of this House had no opportunity to hold adequate hearings, to learn anything from the individuals and organizations involved in the present controversy, or from the public generally. We were simply told by the White House that it was the same old railroad problem; we were urged to immediately rubberstamp a decision made by the administration.

Neither compulsory arbitration by the force of law, nor the greater evil of Government-enforced work agreements, are in our American tradition. These are Soviet solutions. We should avoid them like the poison they are. Freedom of choice is still the law of our land. Unless men are free to negotiate their wages and working conditions, they must either become slaves or starve.

Unless and until the President is prepared to ask the Congress for a declaration of war, it is totally inappropriate to talk about the relationship between a railroad work stoppage and the so-called war effort. While we trade with the supplier of the enemy, refuse to purchase strategic chrome except from the Soviets, and permit the propaganda and demonstrations in this country designed to aid and abet the enemy, there is no justification for crying "war emergency" to justify the application of naked power by some bureaucrat to the negotiations between labor and management in the transportation industry.

An example of the naked power sought by the Executive from us has already been exercised by a Federal judge at the

request of the Executive in my State of Louisiana.

Not only are U.S. district court judges sitting as school boards, but in a labor case in my district and at the instruction of the Attorney General, a Federal judge has handed down as a court decree a 26-page labor contract and internal reorganization of a craft union.

The whole Federal role in labor disputes should be reexamined instead of regularly asking Congress or the courts to apply Federal power in selected situations to put out fires according to the whim of some ivory tower bureaucrat.

While I voted for the committee bill extending the cooling-off period, I did so in the knowledge that we were applying a bandaid to a broken leg. The same old railroad problem should be put to rest by carefully drawn amendments to the Railway Labor Act. It should either be amended to protect the rights of all, or it should be repealed en toto.

Mr. Speaker, I include the decree in civil actions 66-749 and 66-833 in section A, U.S. District Court for Eastern District of Louisiana, New Orleans division, as part of my remarks, as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, New Orleans Division]

ORDER

Paul Vogler, Jr., Juan Galaviz and Casimere Joseph III v. McCarthy, Inc., a Corporation and Local 53 of the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers—Civil Action No. 66-749, section A.

United States of America v. Local 53 of the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers, et al.—Civil Action No. 66-833, section A, consolidated cases.

This matter having come on for hearing on February 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16 on the motion of the plaintiff United States of America for supplemental relief, and the Court having heard the testimony and received the evidence offered by the parties and heard the argument of counsel for the parties to the within consolidated cases:

It is hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Motion for Supplemental Relief of the United States of America be and it is hereby granted in part and ruling thereon deferred in part as more fully herein-after set forth.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the following criteria for membership and plan of referral shall be implemented and be continued in effect until June 1, 1970, and thereafter until further order of the Court:

A. CRITERIA FOR MEMBERSHIP IN LOCAL 53 OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HEAT AND FROST INSULATORS AND ASBESTOS WORKERS, AFL-CIO

1. Admission as new mechanic members and improver members shall be available to all persons on an equal basis without regard to a person's race, color, religion or national origin.

2. Eligibility for membership shall be determined on the basis of the standards set forth herein. Any person meeting those standards shall automatically be admitted to membership subject to the limitations on the number of members as hereinafter set forth. No person otherwise eligible for membership shall be required to obtain the approval, vote or voucher of any officer or member of the Local or of the membership

or of any part of the membership of the Local as a condition to his acceptance into union membership.

3. The Local shall publicly announce and disseminate and furnish to each applicant or prospective applicant in writing the procedures to be followed and the standards to be applied in accepting and acting upon applications for union membership, apprenticeship training, and work referral. In addition, the Local shall forthwith disseminate the same information to all organizations and schools specified in paragraph 2 D v a of the preliminary injunction entered May 31, 1967, and to all persons who have registered for work referral and/or worked in the asbestos trade within the jurisdiction of the Local since the effective date of said preliminary injunction, such information to be mailed to each of said persons at his last known address as shown in the work referral register, or where not shown on the register, to the address provided by the Association.

4. Applicants for membership shall file with Local 53 a completed application on a form furnished by the local union, or when such forms are not available, on a blank sheet of paper. Any assistance necessary in completing the application shall be furnished by the union whether or not special assistance is requested. Written instructions will be furnished all applicants for membership and for referrals to work. Any person who has completed a written application, or who has taken appropriate measures to attempt to do so, shall be considered an applicant for membership. Applicants shall be considered eligible for membership if they meet the following qualifications:

A. *Physical Capacity.* Applicants must have no disabling physical defects for work at this trade. The union may require evidence of this fact in the form of a certificate from a medical doctor of the applicant's choice, obtained at the applicant's expense and submitted to the local union. The union has a right to send to the union's expense any applicant to a doctor of the union's choosing if a question arises over applicant's physical qualifications.

B. *Citizenship.* An applicant must be an American or Canadian citizen or become one not later than five years after the date of admission to the local union.

C. *Residence.* An applicant must be a resident in the geographical jurisdiction of Local 53 at the time of his application.

5. The Local shall within 90 days after the entry of this Order admit as mechanic and improver members only enough individuals to bring the total active membership to 390 and the total active improver membership to 130, as follows:

a. Advance to mechanic membership all present improver members who have accumulated at least 4800 hours' experience in the insulation trade within the Jurisdiction of Local 53.

b. Admit as mechanic members the 118 white persons with the most hours worked within the jurisdiction of the Local who accept such membership.

c. Admit as mechanic members the three Negroes named in paragraph 6 and the 41 Negroes named in paragraph 8. To the extent that any of these named in paragraph 8 declined membership in the Local, their names will be deleted and the names of other Negroes will be substituted therefor based on hours worked within the jurisdiction of Local 53, first those who have so worked as mechanics and then those who have worked as improvers.

d. Admit as improver members a total of 55 whites and 55 Negroes, including such of those Negroes named in paragraph 7 who accept membership in the Local. Priority in granting such membership to Negroes will be given first to those who have worked on

referral from Local 53, next to others who have heretofore signed the referral register, next to those who have worked in the insulating or related trades, and last to all other applicants.

6. The Local will, by letter, renew the offer of mechanic membership to the following individuals named in the preliminary injunction dated May 31, 1967: Leo Chester Green, Hurlin Mogilles, Charles Mogilles.

7. The Local will, by letter, renew the offer of improver membership to the following individuals named in the preliminary injunction dated May 31, 1967: Casimere Joseph, Leroy Chandler, David L. Bartholomew, Jr., George French, Elvin J. Young, Norman Watson, Monroe Bean, Clifford H. Thompson, Girod Tillman, Jr.

8. The Local will, by letter, offer mechanic membership to the following individuals, who are the Negroes who have worked the most hours reported to Local 53 since August 7, 1967: W. Blue, Lawney Broussard, Andrew J. Brown, Sr., W. R. Brown, Michael Cameron, Alfred Cotton, Anthony J. Cotton, Frederick Daliet, C. Dalton, E. J. Dobard, M. G. Dorsey, Joseph W. Ellis, Samuel Ellis, III, Edward Ferguson, A. Frazier, E. Frazier, Melvin Gabriel, F. Gibbs, Charles R. Harry, E. Hockaday, Raymond Hunter, H. Jackson, R. Jackson, John Jefferson, James Jenkins, Jr., W. L. King, Wayne J. Legendre, Larry W. McKinney, O. D. Moses, Joseph O'Brien, Calvin P. Poree, Charles Ricks, R. Ricks, Albert Robertson, Dale Simmons, Morlin Smith, F. Turner, Joseph Vigeo, Leo G. Vigne, C. J. Williams, Norman Woodward.

9. The Local will, by letter, offer mechanic membership to Paul A. Vogler, Jr.

10. The letters to the persons named in paragraphs 6 through 9 shall set forth the steps which those individuals must take including specifically the initiation fee and terms on which such a fee may be paid consonant with the terms set forth in paragraph 11, *infra*.

11. The initiation fee charged to any of the persons named in paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9, *supra*, shall be the initiation fee in effect at the time of the entry of the preliminary injunction herein, to-wit: \$200, provided, that not more than \$100 thereof shall be required to be paid by a person admitted as an improver member until such time as he is advanced to mechanic membership. The initiation fee for whites newly admitted to mechanic membership shall be \$300. The additional initiation fee to be paid by those present improver members advanced to mechanic membership shall be \$100. The initiation fee to be paid by those individuals admitted as improver members pursuant to paragraph 5d, *supra*, shall be \$100 at the time they are admitted, and one-half of the then initiation fee prescribed at such time as they are advanced to mechanic membership. All such initiation fees shall be due and payable out of the hourly earnings of the member and shall be withheld at the rate of fifty cents per hour with respect to mechanic members and twenty-five cents per hour with respect to improver members until such time as such initiation fee is fully paid. No person admitted to membership shall be required to make any other payments on his initiation fee than those prescribed in this paragraph.

12. Not less than ten days prior to the admission of any persons as members pursuant to this order, the Local shall file with the Court and serve upon all counsel a list of the persons to be admitted setting forth each such person's name, race, experience at the insulating or related trades, and class of membership.

13. On or before the 30th day after the end of the month of February, 1970, and monthly thereafter, the Local shall submit to the

Court and serve upon all counsel a report covering the period through the end of the previous month of persons who applied for membership and those admitted to membership or promoted from improver member to mechanic member, setting forth each person's name, social security number, race, whether or not admitted and resulting classification of membership, and cumulative years' or hours' experience in the trade.

B. PLAN OF REFERRALS OF PERSONS AS INSULATION WORKERS

1. Effective with the entry of this order, no person shall be newly employed by defendant contractors or by any other contractor reporting to Local 53 to work as a mechanic or improver in the area served by Local 53 without first making an application to the Local for referral as an insulator. Applications for referral out of New Orleans shall be accepted at the Local's New Orleans office during all normal business hours. Applications for referral out of Baton Rouge shall be accepted by the Local's representative in Baton Rouge at an office to be designated by the Local during the hours 8 a.m. to 12 noon on Monday through Friday, and at the Local's New Orleans office during all normal business hours.

2. Requests for referral of employees through Local 53 shall be made in writing to the union specifying the number of mechanics and the number of improvers required, and, consistent with present practices, the specific job site and the time and place of reporting; provided, that a request for referral of employees may initially be made orally by an employer, subject to being later confirmed in writing as above provided within not more than three business days thereafter. The Local shall maintain orderly records of the persons requested, by classification as mechanic or improver, and the number of persons referred by race and classification to each contractor.

3. The employer shall have the right to reject or terminate any person referred to him for employment for good cause, provided that the basis for rejection or termination shall not be inconsistent with the practices which have applied in the area with respect to such rejection or termination in the past. Whenever a person is so rejected or terminated by an employer, the employer must send a letter or other written report to the Local stating the name of the person together with the basis for rejection or termination. When a person is so rejected or terminated by three or more employers in any one year, the Local shall notify the Chairman of the Joint Trade Board provided for in Article V of the collective bargaining agreement within seven days after the receipt of such letter or other written report from the third employer.

Any person rejected or terminated pursuant to this paragraph shall retain his place on the referral list. Any person so rejected or terminated by three or more employers in any one year shall have his capacity as a mechanic or improver determined by the Joint Trade Board, after opportunity for a practical test, if applicable, and a hearing. All parties to these consolidated cases shall be notified of such hearings and given an opportunity to be present, and the rejected or terminated person may be represented by counsel. If the Joint Trade Board finds that any of the contractors rejected or terminated the person without good cause and that the rejection or termination was based on the person's race or his association with members of minority races, it may award back pay to the person in the amounts that he would have earned if he had not been so rejected or terminated. If the person is determined to lack the capacity to perform as a mechanic

or improver, he shall be so advised, his name shall be deleted from the referral list, and a report shall be made to the Court and all counsel. A decision by the Joint Trade Board shall not be subject to arbitration. However, within ten days after a decision by the Joint Trade Board, the person involved in the proceedings, any of the employers involved, or any of the parties to these consolidated cases may file a petition with the Court for review of the decision of the Board.

The Court may affirm or set aside the decision of the Joint Trade Board. In the event that a rejection or termination by any of the contractors is found by the Court to have been without justification and based on the person's race or his association with members of minority races, the Court may award back pay to the person in the amounts he would have earned if he had not been so rejected or terminated without justification. In the event that there is no appeal from an award by the Joint Trade Board of back pay, such award shall be final. Any grievance of Paul A. Vogler, Jr. against any of the defendants with respect to referral or employment shall similarly be referred to the Joint Trade Board, with the same right of appeal to this Court.

4. The union shall select and refer applicants for employment without discrimination against such applicants by reason of membership or non-membership in the union, and such selection and referral shall not be affected in any way by rules, regulations, by-laws, constitutional provisions or any other aspect or obligation of union membership policies or requirements.

5. The union shall maintain a work referral register which shall contain the following information as to each applicant: name, age, address, telephone number, date and time of registration, experience at time of registration, registration number, race, social security number, status as a member or nonmember of Local 53 or any other asbestos workers local, date of referral, name of contractor and job site to which referred, classification and rate of pay, and the number of hours regular or overtime worked on that referral to that contractor. Persons shall be referred as hereinafter provided in the order they register for referral.

6. A work referral register shall be kept in Baton Rouge for applications for referral to job sites located in the area presently served by the Baton Rouge office, and New Orleans for applications for referrals to job sites located in the area presently served by the New Orleans office. For work in the area presently served by the Baton Rouge office, referrals may be made from either the New Orleans office or the Baton Rouge office. The work referral register shall consist of separate books or portions of one book for mechanics and improvers, and the books or portions of books as to applicants for referral as mechanics may be further broken down into two categories, first those individuals with more than five 1200-hour years of experience in the insulating or related trades, and second, those with less than five years of such experience, and preference in referrals may be given to persons in the first category over those in the second.

7. The work referral register shall further be divided by race, and all referrals shall be made in order of registration on a one-for-one basis, one white mechanic and one Negro mechanic and one white improver and one Negro improver except to the extent that persons of one race or the other are not available in the city involved. In the event that the books as to mechanics are broken down into categories as provided in paragraph 6, the preference herein described shall be given only with racial groups, and shall not affect the alternating referrals by race prescribed by this paragraph.

8. On or after February 20, 1970, no person shall be newly employed as an insulator on a job over which Local 53 has jurisdiction without having obtained a referral slip for such work from Local 53. The slip shall be in the form now used and shall set forth the data therein provided, together with (1) the cumulative hours worked by anyone referred out as an improver, and (2) where applicable, the balance of any payments due to such person's initiation fee.

9. Whenever a person is passed over in the referral register for lack of contact or otherwise, the Local shall notify him of that fact by mail, and such notice shall state that if within ten days after such notice is mailed, he contacts the Local by mail, by telephone or in person, he shall be reinstated on the referral register without losing his place by virtue of being passed over.

10. If the work referral register list is exhausted and the Local is unable to refer applicants for employment to an employer within 48 hours from the time of receiving the employer's request, Saturdays, Sundays and holidays excepted, the Local shall so notify the employer, and the employer shall be free to secure applicants without using the referral procedure, but such applicants must be directed to the office of the Local in Baton Rouge or New Orleans and obtain referral slips before they can begin work for the employer. Such applicants will be given precedence for referral over any other applicants for referral if they present themselves at the office of the Local within a period of 24 hours, Saturdays, Sundays and holidays excluded, after the employer is so notified or is subsequently informed that the Local is unable to refer any applicants. In the event that such inability of the Local to refer a man to a contractor for employment occurs with respect to a job assignment which begins on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday, the contractor may employ independently of the referral system the men necessary to perform that portion of the work which must be completed on such Saturday, Sunday or holiday.

If any of the referral register lists should become exhausted, the Local shall go back and recontact individuals who may have been previously passed over. Further, the Local shall have the continuing obligation to take positive steps to make sure that it always has adequate persons available for referral on all lists included in the work referral register. Specifically, the Local shall develop and implement a program to attract interested Negroes through advertisements and announcements disseminated by means of newspapers, radio and television directed wholly or partly at Negro audiences in the New Orleans and Baton Rouge areas, including the *Louisiana Weekly* and Radio Stations WBOK, WXOK and WYLD, and through appropriate communications with the New Orleans Urban League and with traditionally Negro schools and colleges in the area, including those listed in paragraph 2 D v a 2 of the preliminary injunction herein.

11. All persons currently employed as mechanic insulators as of the time of entry of this order by the defendant contractors and any other contractor reporting to Local 53 may be retained as employees by such contractors and transferred to jobs running concurrently, provided that this provision shall not permit the transfer of employees from contractor to contractor or by a contractor from one job to a second job which begins more than one business day after the end of the previous job.

All persons currently employed as improvers as of February 20, 1970 by the defendant contractors and any other contractor reporting to Local 53 may be retained as employees by such contractors until the com-

pletion of the job on which they are working, or the expiration of thirty days, whichever occurs sooner. Subsequently, the contractors shall retain or employ Negroes, to the extent they are available for employment, in such numbers that not less than half of the persons employed by them as improvers shall be Negroes. The above limitation of completion of a job or the expiration of thirty days, whichever occurs sooner shall remain in effect until such time as the 1:1 ratio of Negro to white improvers is achieved. Notwithstanding this limitation, the contractors may retain white workers beyond the period specified to the extent that the retention of those white workers will not delay the achievement of this ratio. During the period while this ratio is being attained, the Local shall refer sufficient Negroes to the respective employers, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 7, supra. Once the ratio is achieved, and as long as it is maintained, contractors may retain improvers as employees in the same manner as above provided with respect to mechanic insulators. The tasks assigned to improvers will to the extent feasible include work which will be related to that which they will be required to perform at such time as they become mechanics. Contractors with five or more insulator employees must maintain a ratio of at least one improver insulator for every three mechanic insulators on their work force.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 7, supra, to the extent possible, the Local and the contractors shall take appropriate steps to insure the immediate employment as mechanic insulators for the 41 Negroes to be admitted as mechanics pursuant to paragraph 8 of the provisions relating to membership, and shall see that those Negroes are given priority as to initial referral as employees, provided that in the event a contractor needs more than three mechanics referred at one time for a specific job, there shall be referred to such contractor one white mechanic for each three Negro mechanics referred pursuant to this paragraph.

13. On or before the 30th day after the end of the month of February, 1970, and monthly thereafter, the Local shall file a report with the Court setting forth the following:

a. As to each individual who worked for one of the defendant contractors or any other contractor who files reports with the Local, his name, social security number, race, his status as a member or traveler (including local with which affiliated) or permit man, classification and rate of pay, hours worked, regular and overtime, and the contractor for whom he worked. If he is a member of a local of another international union whose members are normally considered to be engaged in construction trade, the affiliation should be specified.

b. The total hours worked by status as members, travelers or permit men, by race, and the total hours worked by classification as mechanics and 1st-, 2nd-, 3rd-, and 4th-year improvers, by race.

c. As to each man issued a referral slip during the previous month, his name, social security number, race, contractor and job to which referred and the date of referral, his status as a member or traveler or permit man, the classification under which he was referred, and, if he was referred as an improver, his cumulative hours' experience in the trade at the time of the referral.

d. To the extent that under the one-for-one referral system set forth in paragraph 7, supra, disproportionate referrals were made of persons of one race for lack of the referral register of persons of the other race, the names of persons so referred and the

steps taken to remedy such lack of such persons of the other race.

e. The name, race and classification of each person passed over in the referral register for lack of contact or otherwise and the reason therefor. When the reason is that a person was not contacted, the report shall indicate what attempts at contact were made and the reason for failure to contact.

f. The name, race and classification of each person rejected or terminated pursuant to paragraph 8, supra, together with the date of and reason for rejection or termination and the name of the employer rejecting or terminating such person.

14. Within 20 days after the entry of this order, each of the defendant contractors shall file with the Court and serve upon all counsel a report setting forth the name, social security number, classification and rate of pay of each of the persons employed by them as mechanic or improver insulators as of that date.

15. On or before March 15, 1970, and on or before the 15th day of each month thereafter, the defendant contractors shall submit to the Local their customary reports on an approximately monthly basis, together with data setting forth the rate of pay and the number of hours, regular and overtime, worked by each person named on the report. Counsel shall have the right to inspect at reasonable times the defendant contractors' payroll and other records showing jobs worked and the dates thereof by each person named on one of that contractor's reports; provided, within seven days after the receipt of such a request, the contractor may apply to the Court for a review of such request, but if no such request for review is made within said seven days, the request will be complied with.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that a ruling will be deferred until on or after June 1, 1970 on the question of qualifications for mechanic membership and for referral as mechanics and 1st-, 2nd-, 3rd- and 4th-year improvers and on the question of the creation and implementation of an apprenticeship or training program, and that at that time the Court will consider any proposals submitted by the parties during the interim period relating to those questions.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that pending the final determination by this Court of the question of qualifications for referral, no person shall be advanced from the improver classification to the mechanic classification for referral purposes, except those persons who are to be offered mechanic membership pursuant to this order.

The Court retains jurisdiction during the period that this order is in effect.

Dated and entered this 19th day of February, 1970.

HERBERT W. CHRISTENBERRY,
U.S. District Judge.

Presented by: Herbert A. Goldsmith, Jr.,
T.A., Attorney, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, 202-737-8200 Ext. 3866.

OVERSTIMULATED RHETORIC IS CLOUDING POLLUTION CRISIS

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, out of the masses of words being spoken and written about man's environment, I welcome the sober and tempered analysis of columnist William S. White. Here, he has said in a few sentences what needs to be said; and, moreover, what needs to be practiced to put the challenge of our

environment in a reasonable perspective. It is because I believe that every Member can profit from careful contemplation of Mr. White's remarks that I place his column from the Washington Post for Saturday, February 28, 1970, in the RECORD:

**OVER-STIMULATED RHETORIC IS CLOUDING
POLLUTION CRISIS**

(By William S. White)

There is no deeper trait in the American character than that of ignoring a great problem beyond all reason and season and then overnight leaping at it with shrieks of frenzy and hysteria. We lock the barn door not only after the horses are all out and running away, but are also running away in many different directions.

Thus it is today with what is both the long-manifest and undeniable danger of national pollution and the dangerously unquestionably over-stimulated rhetoric with which we are suddenly flailing away at "the environmental crisis."

Whole states, it is intoned upon the television, will perhaps be literally uninhabitable in a matter of a mere half-dozen years. Men, it is said, may continue to exist, if they exist at all, only as "animals." And so on and on.

Someone once wisely said that war is compounded by 90 per cent apathy and boredom and 10 per cent of acute and intense action and danger. So, now, with the newly fashionable war of ecology—which means the relationship between organisms and their environment.

That there is indeed an environmental crisis—a widening pollution of air and water and all the other primary resources of life—is the simple truth. And it is, of course, a truth that must be faced. But this truth is in turn being blown up into a kind of imminently hovering planetary catastrophe that is very far from sober truth.

The only useful way to cope with a frightful—and frightening—condition is to recognize it for what it is without at the same time falling into a paroxysm of self-inflicted terrorism that can do nothing but harm to all concerned. Still this is precisely the mass neurosis in which as a nation we seem now about to plunge, as new-founded Cassandras emerge from behind the potted palms of lecture halls to vastly overstate a real state of affairs that is quite bad enough in itself.

This is why the White House has now moved—and not a moment too soon—to try to consolidate into a coherent instrumentality, to deal with the question, a multitude of agencies and plans and committees that have suddenly sprung up into public notice. The idea is to try to do it without ringing every alarm bell in the country.

It is the old, old story. Quiet and solid and real scholars in the environmental field began years ago to warn of some trouble already at hand and much more trouble to come. But the country—and the politicians, for the most part—simply yawned, as so often it does until the ball game reaches the last half of the ninth inning and it penetrates the consciousness that our side is two runs behind.

At once, then, there is tumultuous uproar in the stands and the fellows down there on the playing field are exhorted in the most violent of terms to get in there and fight.

We let a racial crisis chronically fester for a century and when at last we began to do something about it we did far too much without enough calm thought as to ends and means. Thus, we now have what nearly all reasonable people can see to be something approaching a crisis in integration.

This columnist, then serving on journalistic leave as Regents (visiting) professor at the University of California, also recalls the absolute hysteria that swept the nation when the Russians put up their first Sputnik into space where the United States had put up nothing. The instant conclusion of the public was that the Russians would shortly control such as Mars and Venus, possibly attacking us from one or both. The instant demand from the public was that we grab every lad of 14, prodigy or lout though he might be, by the seat of his pants and hurl him forthwith into the nearest class in advanced physics.

One recalls that a gentleman scarcely to be impeached as anti-preparedness, the nuclear whiz called Edward Teller, raised mild protest that not mere excited motion in circles but rather more dispassionate thought was the indispensable ingredient here. So it is now, again, with the environmental thing. Confront it, yes. Collapse in hopeless terror before it, no. Let the two political parties pull and haul at it for partisan advantage—never and never and never.

AGNEW HIT THE MARK

(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, in the wake of Vice President AGNEW's comments on the quality of the news media in the United States, the television networks, especially, reacted with angry indignation and insinuations that the administration was threatening the media with censorship, or worse. While the press was at least willing to admit that there is some basis to the criticisms, the television networks would hardly concede that much.

In light of the fact that most Members have had reliable reports of marches being staged for TV cameramen covering demonstrations, and dramatic, violent events receiving disproportionate coverage even though only a few people are involved, it is significant when by-lined reports of such activity appear in the press. In an excellent article describing foreign news coverage of the aftermath of the fall of Biafra, Jim Hoagland of the Washington Post exposes a disturbing lack of concern for accurate reporting by members of his own profession. Among the scenes described was that of a British television crew throwing coins in front of hungry people, and then filming the fight as a scramble for food.

It is nothing short of scandalous that reporters would file copy describing the fall of Biafra on the basis of only 3 hours of interviews and filming. Instead of reacting indignantly to Vice President Agnew's criticisms, the news media ought to put its own house in order.

I urge people to read the following article by Jim Hoagland, which appeared in the Washington Post on January 26, 1970:

**NEWSMEN, LAGOS OFFICIALS GOT IN EACH
OTHER'S WAY**

(By Jim Hoagland)

LAGOS.—The collision last week between foreign newsmen and the Nigerian govern-

ment was probably inevitable. They seem to bring out the worst in each other.

Certainly, in the telling of the story of the end of the Nigerian civil war and its sordid aftermath, the press was its own worst enemy, with the Nigerian government a close second.

One of the greatest press stampedes in the history of Africa and the Nigerian government's self-confessed inability to handle it have made newsmen a part of the story they were assigned to cover.

This may well have affected the tone and substance of the first dispatches that described the obvious lack of Nigerian relief being provided to Biafran refugees, and the alleged widespread looting and raping by Nigerian troops.

Many newsmen frenetically fought to be first with eyewitness accounts of occupied Biafra, no matter how hastily gathered or, in some cases, contrived the accounts were.

On the other hand, the Nigerian government gave demonstrably false descriptions of conditions in the war area to foreign journalists and to diplomats, and thereby created many of its own problems.

The Nigerians also attempted to suppress stories after the first critical ones filtered out, and has launched stinging attacks on the foreign press, especially British reporters. The government is now squeezing foreign journalists out of the country by refusing to extend visas as they run out, and has again barred foreign journalists from entering the war area.

This has now turned into a cause celebre. The British Parliament will debate on Monday the discrepancies between the horror-filled stories and pictures disseminated last week by London papers and television stations, and the rosy account given to Prime Minister Harold Wilson by his special envoy to Nigeria, Lord Hunt.

Nigerian officials say that more than 300 foreign journalists poured into this tropical port city after the fall of Biafra two weeks ago.

With pro-Biafran sources describing alleged massacres and mass starvation, and the federal government saying that the relief situation was "under control" and that the Nigerian soldiers were fraternally feeding the millions of refugees, most newsmen wanted to get into the area to see for themselves.

BARRED FOR WEEK

The government barred them from the area for a week, then changed its mind, saying it would send 89 reporters, cameramen and television crewmen into the war-devastated area 400 miles to the east.

But officials seemed to have second thoughts as the group prepared to leave at daybreak last Sunday. An airborne plane carrying reporters was called back and the journalists taken off. The other two aircraft were not allowed to leave. The group waited, without any explanation of the delay, until mid-afternoon.

After a desperate scramble for seats (14 of the group were left behind) the planes left for Port Harcourt, a city near the war area.

There the journalists referred to by Nigerians as "world press"—were put on the back of an open cattle truck, driven 40 miles to Aba and given some canned food and enough camp beds for half their number. The rest slept on the floor.

The next day was spent voyaging on the back of the truck, through dust, fog and a drenching rain, over bumpy roads, without food.

The only escort was an army lieutenant who raced ahead in a jeep, waved at civilians to keep them from talking to the reporters,

and in midafternoon, decided the tour should end, refusing to take the reporters to other places they wanted to see.

After the trip, a Nigerian newspaper editorialized, "The Ministry of Information, the most inefficient organ of the entire Federal government, appears to have the unique capacity of lousing up almost every thing it undertakes."

Adding to the chaos was the supercharged competition between the television crews and London's daily newspapers.

A quick walk through the streets of Owerri and a few conversations with some of the hundreds of people who thronged there looking for a scrap of food was sufficient to establish that relief was not being distributed in this area, and that people were desperately hungry.

CREW THREE COINS

But a British television crew made the point by throwing coins in front of starving people and then filming the fight. Nigerian soldiers apparently liked the idea, and soon began copying it.

Some of the correspondents competed to seek out the most lurid tales of starvation and looting, which certainly seemed to be substantiated by appearances in Owerri, and of alleged rape, which also appeared to be credible. Words were put into the mouths of the refugees, soldiers were called "monsters" in the questions put by some of the newsmen.

The trip was scheduled to last until Wednesday. But after ending Monday's trip, some of the correspondents immediately rushed to the airport to try to get one of the few seats on the one plane scheduled out of Port Harcourt on Tuesday.

This set off a stampede, and the majority of the 89 correspondents and TV men who had pleaded to be allowed to tell the full story and to spend time in the Biafra enclave, bedded down at the airport, ready to fly back to Lagos and describe fallen Biafra on the basis of no more than three hours of interviews and filming.

Even some of the 14 who had been left behind Sunday, flown in Monday, and who had missed the trip, were scrambling to get out Tuesday, having established a dateline.

Only a few got out to Lagos, where dispatches could be filed, and the rest were forced to stay the extra day. Many managed to get some new reporting done, and to get a broader picture, almost despite themselves.

ALMOST ALL CRITICS

But after the first stories went out of Lagos Wednesday, and were almost uniformly critical, the government sent orders that the rest of the group would be kept in Port Harcourt.

The government relented the next day, after strong unofficial protests from several Western embassies.

The angry journalists arrived back in Lagos just in time to attend Gen. Gowon's first press conference since the Biafran surrender.

It should have been a moment of triumph for Gowon. Instead, it quickly degenerated into acrid exchanges between the newsmen, many of whom had never seen, and perhaps never believed, the conditions under which the people of Biafra had lived for the past two years, and the general, who steadfastly stuck to what appeared to be incorrect reports of great strides being made in relief work.

"You can write whatever you like," the usually even-tempered Gowon shouted at one point. "It is your affair. We have never had a good press and we don't expect one now. You never thought we would win this war . . . and now you come here looking only for things to discredit us."

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. In 1967 the United States produced 21,010,000,000 pounds of veal and beef. This was about one-third of the world total and nearly 2½ times more than the Soviet Union.

CLEVELAND LAUDS VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

(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, I am pleased to announce that a young lady from my district has been chosen as the winning contestant from New Hampshire in the annual Voice of Democracy Contest of the Veterans' of Foreign Wars and its Ladies' Auxiliary. Rita E. West of Concord, N.H., delivered her prize-winning speech in New Hampshire, and is now coming to Washington, D.C., to compete in a similar national contest on March 10, 1970.

Miss West eloquently discusses the freedom of speech, carefully pointing out the constitutional limitations on destructive dissent, and the right we all enjoy to constructive dissent. Combining the dynamic vitality of youth and perceptive ideas, Rita West exemplifies the willingness of the youth of New Hampshire to accept freedom's challenge.

The national news media tends to focus on the tiny minority of young people who are disrupters and who abuse the freedom of speech. Yet the vast majority of our youth are people like Rita West, who recognize that disruption in the name of free speech is indeed a challenge to freedom. They also realize that order is essential if the freedoms of the people are to be protected and preserved, for future generations as well as this one.

Perceptive, reasoned speeches like this one reinforce my belief that our youth are indeed a source of pride, and that those of us who favor lowering the voting age to 18 are indeed right.

I commend this penetrating essay for the attention of my colleagues:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Rita West)

One of the greatest challenges to America's freedom today is how its dissenters and oppositionists shall be handled under the law. The greatest freedom enjoyed by American citizens is the freedom of speech. This freedom allows all citizens to speak their conscience on any action of the nation, be it for or against administrative policy.

This right to peaceful dissension has helped make this country a true democracy.

However, when freedom of speech or assembly is practiced to the extent where it infringes on the rights of others, it is no

longer a tool of democracy, and becomes instead a weapon of destruction, with freedom itself one of its victims.

If students feel they must show their opposition to a schoolwide or even national policy, and they demonstrate to show their discontent, they are enjoying a freedom—their right to dissent. When, however, they disrupt them or deny them their freedoms, they are no longer within their own rights.

The challenge to America is to decide where the thin line will be drawn between constructive and destructive dissension. Certainly the line must be drawn, for without it there will be utter chaos; the question is where and how firmly it will be enforced.

This is a great challenge to freedom, for if the line is too strong and consciences are suppressed, it shall destroy many of our freedoms as we now know them; and we shall become a nation of silent followers, intimidated too strongly to express our own opinions for fear of being labeled agitators.

If, however, the line is not strong enough to stop disruption and violence, the country will no longer be a democracy and will be ruled almost exclusively by a minority.

The task seems insurmountable, but it is not; for the line between freedom and disruption can be made using the guidelines in the Constitution. In this document are clauses which insure that all people are to be granted their rights, even those accused of crimes. These rights must be granted freely, for if a person is denied any of them he cannot be convicted. These laws protect people from being forced into convictions or into being witnesses against themselves.

With these inherent rights it is almost assured that no person shall be convicted of conspiracy or un-American activity unless he is truly guilty.

But the real answer lies in the limits set to freedoms, for all rights must be limited to prevent them from infringing on the liberties of others. And, until the dissidents' focal points are settled, the limits of rights will be one of America's greatest challenges.

WATER POLLUTION PROBLEMS IN CENTRAL NEW YORK

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, very early in my first year in Congress, I made the determination that water pollution problems in central New York would have high and continuing priority in my work in Washington. Principal among our concerns was Onondaga Lake. Initially, the task was to bring to the attention of the Federal Government the fact of Onondaga Lake's existence and its polluted and degraded condition. I also began an investigation into the current Federal legislation, with a view toward suggesting improvements which could benefit Onondaga Lake.

In 1965 and in 1966, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was substantially amended and strengthened. The 1966 act authorized greatly increased Federal financial support for the construction of waste treatment plants by localities. That act also provided for an expanded program of research and demonstration projects. Onondaga County moved to secure from the Department of the Interior a Federal grant of some \$350,000 to plan a comprehensive program to end

the pollution of Onondaga Lake. I was privileged to work with the county in securing this Federal grant from the Interior Department. Very recently, the county submitted an application for a \$50 million project to substantially expand and upgrade waste treatment at the main metropolitan plant, and this project is an outgrowth of the Federal study grant.

In 1966, I prevailed upon the House Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee to come to Syracuse to conduct a hearing into the water pollution problems of our area. Along with many others, I testified at that hearing and urged that the Federal Government expand its concern and its commitment of resources into the pollution problems associated with lakes.

Out of that hearing developed a Government Operations Committee report, entitled "To Save America's Small Lakes," August 23, 1967. One of the report's recommendations calls for pilot demonstration projects to rehabilitate small lakes, and it made mention of the situation existing with Onondaga Lake.

In 1968 and again in 1969, the House approved legislation amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Neither bill resulted in an enactment into law, but the 1969 bill is currently the subject of a House-Senate conference which is working to resolve differences between water pollution bills approved by the House and Senate. Both versions of the legislation contain language which was suggested by me and by others to stimulate greater Federal involvement in financing research and demonstration projects to find the ways to restore severely degraded lakes. Once the bill is enacted into law I am hopeful that Onondaga County will be seeking a Federal project to continue the work begun with the 1967 grant.

In October of 1969, the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development proposed a pilot technological study of lake restoration. The Council proposed that a lake of manageable size be selected and existing environmental technology and techniques be tested, including pollution measuring devices, methods of artificial destratification by aeration, mixing, and thermal upwelling techniques, thermal pollution control and enrichment, artificial bottom coating, filtering, harvesting of living plants and animals, and restocking of fishery resources.

I have contacted the President's Office of Science and Technology on several occasions since October in order to make absolutely sure that Onondaga Lake is given full and fair consideration in the selection process that will take place to determine which lake is chosen for the restoration project. I intend to continue in this task and to work closely with all interested parties.

At the present time, Onondaga County's application for Federal and State assistance for the major project to expand and upgrade the metropolitan treatment plant is pending before the State. Like all applications for construction of waste treatment plants in New York, this project is eligible for 55 per-

cent Federal share of the total cost. This, coupled with a 30-percent share on the part of New York State, should leave local government with the task of producing 15 percent of the total cost. However, largely because of the regrettable failure on the part of the Federal Government to provide enough funds for water pollution control, it is unlikely that anything near the promised 55 percent will be provided by the Federal Government. The State of New York, for some time, has been prefinancing a minimum Federal share of 30 percent, thus leaving localities with the heavy burden of 40 percent.

Last year, I supported an unsuccessful effort to push the President's budget request for water pollution control facilities from \$300 million to \$1 billion. This year, I have already petitioned the Appropriations Committee to provide the full \$1.25 billion authorized by the Clean Waters Restoration Act. It is obvious from the situation which has developed in New York State that the Federal dollar going into water pollution control will have to be doubled, if we intend to achieve that 55 percent Federal share called for. I intend to ask the House Public Works Committee to review the formula for allocating Federal funds to the States to see if it can be changed to increase the share being made available to New York.

The citizens of New York are going to find themselves in the same position with regard to water pollution control expenditures as they did in the area of highways. The fact of being ahead of other States in requiring water pollution control facilities will cause the citizens of the State to bear a much larger share of the costs than their counterparts in other, less progressive States.

FAILURE OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S ECONOMIC POLICY

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 issue for many Americans today is the question of finance. Every housewife and head of a household is attempting to make ends meet—to somehow stretch the weekly paycheck to cover necessary expenditures.

The Nixon administration has labored for over a year with this problem. To date, the President's major strategy has been based on high interest rates and tight money policies. Clearly his policy has failed. Inflation continues to run rampant through the economy, reaping havoc and distress to the average American's budget.

A man is hard put to pay for adequate housing to meet his needs. The housewife finds her food bill pathetically increased and her finances terribly inflated.

Every segment of the economy has felt the bite of the Nixon policy, yet it is the lower and middle class consumer and the small businessman who ultimately pays the cost of interest rate increases and the growing inflation.

Every week we read of further layoffs

of workers in and out of government. Just today it was reported that massive employee layoffs and large-scale base closures will occur this month. Some 130,000 civilian Federal employees will be told that "they are in the forefront of the fight against inflation."

There seems to be a major inconsistency in the President's domestic programs. On the one hand he argues for a welfare bill based on work-incentive. On the other hand he is fostering an economic policy which guarantees that the unemployment rate will rise upwards of 4.3 percent this year and possibly as high as 5 percent. This is a substantial increase over last year's 3.5 percent. These are cold figures that lead us to think only of mathematics. The reality is that we are talking about the lives and livelihood of hundreds of thousands of workers. How frightening it is to know that we may add 700,000 more persons to the jobless rolls this year. These rolls already stand at 3.4 million. Can we stand by idly and watch 700,000 more Americans receive the same fate?

Add to the jobless increase the fact that price increases continue to accelerate. The 6.1 percent cost-of-living hike during Mr. Nixon's first year in office was a \$10 loss in real purchasing power for every weekly paycheck of \$150. This represents the most inflationary 12 months since the Korean war.

We have heard a lot of talk from administration officials about the easing of inflation. How long can the Nixon administration ask the people of America to wait another month to let his policy take effect? As each month arrives, more and more are unemployed and prices continue to spiral further and further upward. The effect of the Nixon policy has been to bring the housing industry to its knees, to deny even such essential items as automobiles and home appliances to average citizens, and to seriously impair needed public projects such as school construction.

Let us be realistic. The Nixon policy has failed. Today, I join with over 83 of my colleagues from 28 States in introducing a concurrent resolution urging the Nixon administration to make every effort to reverse its policy of high interest rates in all programs and at all levels. In addition, the Federal Reserve Board should take steps to gradually roll the prime interest rate back to 6 per centum.

Congress has an opportunity to take the leadership in reversing this misguided economic policy. I hope my fellow colleagues will do everything in their power to see that this resolution is passed and its ideas implemented.

PENN CENTRAL'S REQUEST TO DISCONTINUE 34 PASSENGER TRAINS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was announced that the Penn Central Co. is seeking to eliminate all of its rail passenger service except along the eastern corridor, including commut-

er operations in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. This would mean a discontinuance of 34 east-west long-distance passenger trains.

It is my strong belief that this proposal is ill conceived and certainly not in the public's interest. For some time now the railroads have been telling us that they cannot operate passenger trains at a profit, due to the heavy competition of airplanes and automobiles. They claim that between 1946 and 1958, the class I railroads of this country and the Pullman Co. invested \$1,343,000,000 in passenger train equipment, but to no avail. During these years the railroads' share of the for-hire intercity passenger traffic decreased from 72.9 to 31.1 percent, while the airlines' share increased from 2.7 to 38 percent and the private automobiles' share increased from 58.8 to 90.1 percent.

The situation is somewhat altered today. Presently our airports are jammed to capacity. Our highways are quickly filled as soon as they are built. People are ready and willing to turn to trains, if only they can be guaranteed clean cars and efficient service.

We have but to look at the success of the Metroliner. The New York-Washington corridor rail passenger traffic increased by 273,000 in the January-June 1969 period, an increase of 55 percent over the same period in 1968. In addition, Metroliner load factors through June 30, 1969, have averaged about 75 percent.

The success of clean, high-speed trains can also be seen in other countries. High-speed electrified trains between London, Liverpool, and Manchester, England, brought about a 60-percent increase during its first 3 years of operation. Competing airline volume dropped 20 and 75 percent of all travelers between these points now go by train.

Certainly we cannot expect the Penn Central or any other railroad to improve their passenger trains without Federal aid. In the past the Federal Government has tragically neglected the railroads. Tentative Federal outlays for next year now have \$4,600 million for highways, \$1,600 million for aviation, and only \$280 million for mass transit.

But the Penn Central knows of the strong interest of many Members of Congress to see that additional Federal assistance is rendered. Last week several of their officials attended a meeting held by the Committee for Improved Passenger Service. While our interest at this meeting was specifically the Northeast corridor, I feel it is safe to say that we are all interested in seeing this country once again have a viable train system.

The railroads themselves, including the Penn Central, must receive much of the blame for the horrendous shape of passenger trains. Again and again the allegation has been made that railroads are purposefully downgrading passenger service, for there is a larger profit to be made in freight service. A report of the general board at the conference of transportation trades, October 30, 1969, went so far as to state:

Railroad companies have lumped cancellation of mail-hauling contracts and railway post office cars on passenger trains with their other excuses for discontinuing service. They have in many cases lost no revenue at all.

Over half of the volume of mail carried on trains now moves on fast freights rather than on passenger trains. What the rail companies have done is to switch mail to fast freights voluntarily—and then blamed the lack of mail revenue aboard passenger trains as the reason for cancellations.

Without commenting on the validity of these accusations, we cannot allow the railroads to place the entire blame for failing passenger service on the lack of Federal assistance. Certainly we must ask what assurances the carriers will give that Federal moneys will be spent more wisely in behalf of passenger trains than their own funds have been.

In 1961, the Senate Commerce Committee received an extensive study of national transportation policy known as the Doyle report.

One of its principal findings was as follows:

We believe that there will be an important demand for rail passenger service within the large urban regions developing in the United States. This requirement is ten to twenty years in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we are drawing close to that period which the Doyle report spoke of. Now is not the time to abandon our passenger trains. I urge the Interstate Commerce Commission to deny the Penn Central's request to discontinue 34 of their trains. With Federal assistance, I believe these trains can again be profitable to the railroads.

VIAIBLE NEW ENGLAND RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a meeting which was held on February 26 by the committee for improved passenger service—CIPS—whose membership consists of the entire New England congressional delegation. The purpose of CIPS is to determine what kind of rail passenger service will be viable in New England and how that service will be financed.

Last Thursday, February 26, CIPS held a meeting which was attended by approximately 200 people, including government officials from the local, State, and Federal levels, railroad personnel, and interested citizens. We were especially pleased to have Governor Sargent of Massachusetts and Governor Licht from Rhode Island present. In addition, Senators CLAIBORNE PELL and EDWARD KENNEDY attended, as well as the entire Massachusetts delegation from the House. My colleague from Maine, PETER KYROS, was a member of the panel at the meeting.

Seventeen persons testified at the CIPS meeting, each stating his view on what type of Federal assistance is needed to save passenger trains. One of those testifying was Prof. Roy Poulsen, director of the University of Rhode Island's research center in business and economics and professor of finance. Dr. Poulsen has written a number of excellent articles for various periodicals on the question of rail service. It was his suggestion at the CIPS meeting that the Depart-

ment of Transportation be empowered to assume "responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the railroads' signal systems, precisely as the FAA does in operating air navigation and traffic control systems." The Providence Journal ran an editorial on March 2 praising this and other suggestions made by Dr. Poulsen.

On that same day, the Journal ran another editorial explaining the success of a newly installed high-speed rail-transit system serving commuters to Philadelphia. The success of this system demonstrates that people are not irrevocably attached to their cars. The Delaware River Port Authority, which operates the Philadelphia service, reports that "40 percent of the line's regular riders are commuters who formerly drove their own cars into the city each day."

A similar success can be seen with the Penn Central's Metroliner which runs between Washington and New York. This corridor's rail-passenger traffic increased by 273,000 in the January-June 1969 period over the same period in 1968. Metroliner traffic represented most of this increase.

Mr. Speaker, it is the hope of the members of CIPS that we can agree on one specific recommendation on how to have passenger trains in the Northeast, for only by a concerted effort behind one bill can we hope to accomplish our goal. In the future I will be reporting on the progress of CIPS.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert copies of the two Providence Journal editorials:

PARALLEL AID

A University of Rhode Island professor has offered a formula of federal aid for the nation's railroads, particularly those in the crowded Northeast corridor, that proposes to give the rail lines the same kind of federal subsidies enjoyed by competing highway and air competitors. "Parallel aid in kind" might be the slogan for the plan by Dr. Roy G. Poulsen.

Dr. Poulsen is director of the URI research center in business and economics and professor of finance. He sketched his proposal, complete with text and chart analysis of the factors that bankrupted the old New Haven Railroad and that continue to shadow the effective operation of passenger and freight service of the line as a branch of the Penn Central.

Dr. Poulsen would empower the federal Department of Transportation to assume the responsibility for operation and maintenance of the railroads' signal systems precisely as the Federal Aviation Agency does in operating air navigation and traffic control systems. Can the airlines fight the granting of a signal subsidy they now enjoy?

The URI professor would have the department take over full operation and maintenance of all rail passenger and freight terminals, and be responsible as the FAA now is for overseeing of similar facilities for air facilities. Can the airlines fight the granting of a terminal subsidy they now enjoy to the fullest?

The DOT, Dr. Poulsen recommends, also should take over rights of way from railroads, include them as parts of the interstate highway system and lease them back to the rails, putting them in a position similar to that of interstate truck and bus operators who do not build or operate their rights of way. Can those operators fight this proposal meaningfully?

The proposal about the rights of way would ease a particularly heavy burden on

existing railroads. Between real estate assessments and maintenance of way costs, both rising steadily, railroads must increase payments for their rights of way to the competitive advantage of trucks and buses using highways on which no property taxes are payable.

The proposal about rights of way may draw heavy fire from cities and towns which look to railroad land as a price source of revenue under local property tax controls. So lucrative is this source for some communities that there is a deep reluctance to grant even modest abatement on the ground that fat-cat railroads can find the cash easily.

Unhappily, most railroads—not least among them, the New Haven Region of the Penn Central—are not fat cats. Financially, they are skinny, runty alley cats at best. Local communities expect top passenger and freight service from a private enterprise they are prepared to sock—and sock hard—with full-value property assessments.

Dr. Poulsen's proposals came with refreshing clarity and detail even as Gov. Frank Licht was protesting in Washington that "Our need for intercity rail passenger and freight service will continue, but the many demands upon our state tax dollars mean that our ability to continue financial assistance is questionable."

There, the governor let the matter lie. His thesis is simple: New England needs rail service. The states, including, of course, Rhode Island, can't afford to help the old New Haven. The railroad is an interstate business and ought to get all the help it needs from Washington. A lovely thesis, but offered without a single specific to match Dr. Poulsen's.

It will be interesting to note the reaction of air and highway people to Dr. Poulsen's proposals. How can they attack proposals which are based on programs that subsidize them heavily? What the URI professor has suggested deserves the closest review here in Providence and certainly in Washington. His tough-minded specific in the midst of vaporous generalities make good news.

TRANSIT SUCCESS

Most of the traffic-clogged cities across the land are barely holding their own in a desperate battle to avoid complete transportation paralysis. Washington is a bedlam in rush hour. Los Angeles presents a monumental tangle when the freeways fill up. New York City contends with jammed subways, street traffic slowed to a crawl, and commuter railroads that are dirty, unreliable, expensive, and usually late.

Yet here and there in an otherwise dismal picture are a few bright patches of promise. These are in the lucky cities—all too few—where enlightened planners and doers have wrestled with the problem successfully and produced solutions.

Commuters in the suburbs west of Chicago enjoy a swift, comfortable and convenient rail service provided by the Chicago & Northwestern. By any measure, it puts to shame New York's creaking Long Island Railroad.

Cleveland's 19-mile high-speed rail line, which links the downtown to the municipal airport and adjacent suburbs, has proved to be enormously successful. San Francisco's elaborate rail network, the first section of which is scheduled for service next year, promises to offer the last word in fast and reliable mass transit.

Closer to our area is another striking example of what can be accomplished when effort and imagination are applied. A new high-speed rail transit system serving commuters to Philadelphia is only a year old but already has demonstrated that a convenient and dependable mass transit service can lure commuters out of their private automobiles and thus reduce traffic congestion on downtown streets.

The new service at Philadelphia, operated by the Delaware River Port Authority, stretches across the river for 14 miles to the suburban New Jersey community of Lindenswold. It is now accommodating 30,000 passengers daily. New automated cars with the latest electronic controls provide a dependable service at fares (only 60 cents for a 14-mile run) roughly half those charged on New York's Long Island Railroad. The fare structure appears to be adequate because the line anticipates an operating profit of \$15,000 this year.

The most impressive aspect of the Philadelphia experience, however, is the proof that an attractive mass transit system can persuade commuters to leave their automobiles at home and ride the rails. Forty per cent of the line's regular riders today, the authority reports, are commuters who formerly drove their own cars into the city each day. The switchover has reduced traffic on the bridges and roads leading to Philadelphia and has lessened congestion on the downtown streets.

These several examples of what can be accomplished when mass transit is developed on an effective basis should be useful models for other communities now plagued with the threat of traffic strangulation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for March 4 and March 5, on account of official business.

Mrs. REID of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. PHILBIN, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. BUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. POFF, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 30 minutes, on March 10.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, on March 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. GRAY) to extend his remarks today immediately preceding the remarks of Mr. GRAY in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. BUTTON in two instances.

Mr. RUTH.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. SKUBITZ in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mrs. MAY in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. COLLIER in four instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in five instances.

Mr. REID of New York in two instances.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. ROBISON in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in four instances.

Mr. MAILLIARD in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in two instances.

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

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. OLSEN in four instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia in four instances.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. FISHER in two instances.

Mr. RIVERS in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3396. An act to make certain technical changes in provisions of law relating to the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3397. An act to permit the acceptance of checks and nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services; authorize the Postmaster General to relieve postmasters and accountable officers for losses incurred by postal personnel when accepting checks or nonpostal money orders in full compliance with postal regulations; and to provide penalties for presenting bad checks and bad nonpostal money orders in payment for postal charges and services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13008. An act to improve position classification systems within the executive branch, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 4, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8020. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide entitlement to round trip transportation to the home port for a member of the uniformed services on permanent duty aboard a ship overhauling away from home port whose dependents are residing at the home port; and

H.R. 15931. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1735. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period July 1, 1969, through December 31, 1969, pursuant to section 105 of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on House Administration.

1736. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the "Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report," to the Congress, for the period ending December 31, 1969, pursuant to section 4, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1737. A letter from the Office of the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting a proposed amendment to a draft of legislation which

was submitted February 2, 1970; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1738. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities for improving administration of Federal programs of aid to educationally deprived children in the State of West Virginia, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to (31 U.S.C. 53) and (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1739. A letter from the Chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 15628. A bill to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, with amendments (Rept. No. 91-869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15021. A bill to authorize the release of 40,200,000 pounds of cobalt from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 91-870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15831. A bill to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 91-871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15832. A bill to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15833. A bill to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15835. A bill to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 91-874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15836. A bill to authorize the disposal of type A, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. 91-875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15837. A bill to authorize the disposal of type B, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. 91-876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15838. A bill to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile (Rept. 91-877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Serv-

ices. H.R. 15839. A bill to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. 91-878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 15694. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard (Rept. 91-879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

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

H.R. 16311. A bill to authorize a family assistance plan providing basic benefits to low-income families with children, to provide incentives for employment and training to improve the capacity for employment of members of such families, to achieve greater uniformity of treatment of recipients under the Federal-State public assistance programs and to otherwise improve such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 16312. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish educational programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 16313. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 16314. A bill to establish a National Institute of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 16315. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide under the program of aid to families with dependent children, for the furnishing of three meals a day to all children under age 16 who are eligible for such aid or whose families are below the poverty level, at appropriate day-care centers and at public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 16316. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and an undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common and contract carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 16317. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16318. A bill to transfer from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Interior all functions, duties, and responsibilities relating to the effect of atomic energy on the health and safety of the public; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 16319. A bill to establish labor standards governing the public operation of transit facilities by any agency or instrumentality of the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 16320. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 16321. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16322. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 16323. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16324. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish educational programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mr. POPELL, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H.R. 16325. A bill to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend the provisions thereof to severely handicapped individuals who are not blind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 16326. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full widow's insurance benefits shall be payable at age 40 to a widow who is otherwise qualified therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 16327. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. BRADEMAS and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 16328. A bill "Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1970"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16329. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 16330. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to be utilized by the Federal home loan banks for the purpose of adjusting the effective rate of interest charged by such banks on short-term and long-term borrowing on residential mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 16331. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to be utilized by the Federal home loan banks for the purpose of adjusting the effective rate of interest charged by such banks on short-term and long-term borrowing on residential mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 16332. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 16333. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 16334. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 16335. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish drugs and medicines to any veteran with a service-connected disability for the purpose of treating any illness or injury suffered by the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 16336. A bill to assist in the effective and suitable disposal of passenger cars at the time of the discontinuance of their use on the highways by encouraging the disposal of such cars through persons licensed by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 16337. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and subdivisions thereof in the enforcement of State and local laws, rules, and regulations within the National Forest System; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 16338. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. SCHADEBERG, and Mr. BURTON of Utah):

H.R. 16339. A bill to improve public nutrition through the expanded use of dairy products and to increase the income of dairy farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 16340. A bill to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 16341. A bill to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend the provisions thereof to severely handicapped individuals who are not blind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. DWYER, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mrs. MAY, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H.J. Res. 1115. Joint resolution authorizing

the President to proclaim August 26 of 1970 as "Susan B. Anthony Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 1116. 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. BROCK:

H. Con. Res. 528. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to freedom of choice and compulsory transportation in connection with public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H. Con. Res. 529. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Con. Res. 530. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior prescribe and implement regulations for the harvesting of Northern fur seals to insure quick and painless death before skinning; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. POPELL, and Mr. POLLOCK):

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 869. Resolution authorizing expenses for conducting studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 268; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 870. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the National Collegiate Athletic Association; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 871. Resolution restricting Governor Maddox as a guest in the House of Representatives dining room; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FRIEDEL introduced a bill (H.R. 16342) for the relief of Gary Ward Meekins, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

320. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to achieve the objective that, no person shall, by reason of race, color, creed or national origin, be refused admission to or be excluded from any public school nor be compelled to attend a designated public school, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.