

## FALSE HOPES FEARED

Zion said that recent statements by Communist sympathizers and would-be Presidential candidates have been either deliberately misleading or the results of wishful thinking.

"Statements attributed to Ambassador Bruce and Vietnam representatives in Paris to the effect that POWs will be released if we set a date for withdrawal are patently false, Zion said. He added that he had transcripts of these discussions and that "in no instance is this statement made."

"To imply this," he said, "in order to discredit the President's Vietnamization program is the epitome of reckless and irresponsible conduct. . . . The only purpose served by these statements is to give Hanoi more fuel for its propaganda machine. Our prisoners are given daily broadcasts of statements by American protestors. Nothing could bring them more discouragement, nor could be more helpful in urging the enemy to hang on until American public opinion forces us to surrender in Southeast Asia."

Zion continued: "Wives of men who are prisoners and missing in Southeast Asia have asked me if capitulation in Southeast Asia would guarantee the return of their husbands. I must answer in all honesty that nothing could be further from the truth."

## WORLD OPINION ONLY WEAPON

Shortly after Zion delivered a strong letter of protest from the American Congress to the North Vietnamese in Paris last August, the amount of mail from POWs increased significantly. After the "National Week of Concern for POWs/MIA" last March, the flow of mail increased again and letters contained more information. In some instances the letters indicated that better treatment was being given, Zion said.

The Indiana congressman also pointed out

that Communist propaganda recently indicates concern over the POW question, pointing out that "quotes" have been broadcast from the men indicating they are being treated well. He said that they have sent out a few pictures showing prisoners in good health. "It is apparent," Zion said, "that there is concern in Hanoi over world opinion."

Zion said that discussions about whether or not we should bomb, whether we should invade Communist sanctuaries, whether we should set a date for withdrawal are of questionable value at best, and when pursued by demonstrators are counterproductive. "They serve only Hanoi," he said.

The only issue in which there should be no disagreement is that concerning our prisoners of war and men missing in action, Zion pointed out.

"If all of the civilized people of the world continue to insist on the provisions of the Geneva Convention and press the Communists to accept them, perhaps we can take the most important step that will lead to peace."

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it takes little investigation to become aware of the incredible record of J. Edgar Hoover. In this country, we have had such efficiency, yet cautious and considerate service by the FBI for so long that most

Americans have taken it for granted. We ought to consider the possible types of bureaus and conduct we could have had in the area of intelligence. Mr. Hoover was faced with the task of providing security in this country—a gargantuan task in itself. But in a democracy, he was charged with protecting citizen's rights as well. Many techniques could have been applied. We need only look at national police forces in Germany and Russia to see the potential power and threat of a "protective" organization.

Mr. Speaker, not only has Mr. Hoover made the FBI an organization which has continually thwarted attacks against our Nation, but he has initiated an ideal for all law enforcement agencies to follow. In the 47 years of Mr. Hoover's direction, not one agent has been charged with a crime. The FBI force is itself a monument to the talents and decency of J. Edgar Hoover. No other man in the history of this Nation has served America so effectively, so conscientiously, so constantly, and with such a minimum of criticism. It has been an honor for Presidents of both political parties, conservative and liberal, from all parts of the country to ask Mr. Hoover to serve as director of the FBI. He has been recognized—and more importantly trusted and revered—not only by officials, but by the grassroots citizens of our Nation. Such widespread, continuous applause is not token. It is a sign of the deep appreciation which Americans have held and will continue to hold for the legendary gentleman, J. Edgar Hoover.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 12, 1971

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

*Send out Thy light and Thy truth: Let them lead me—Psalm 43: 3.*

Eternal Spirit of Life, in the glowing beauty of springtime and the blossoming glory of an awakening earth, we turn to Thee praying that the beauty of Thy presence may be upon us as we pause in prayer before Thee. Thou hast called us to live our lives and to play our part in these frustrating yet fruitful years. Amid all the tumult of these troubled times grant unto us the calm of those whose minds are stayed on Thee.

At this altar of prayer steady us with the truth that back of all the tensions that try us and the disturbances that distress us there is an abiding good in which we can believe and to which we must be loyal if we are to walk with steady feet leading our Nation in the paths of peace at home and abroad.

In all the experiences of this day grant us the healing of Thy hand, the peace of Thy presence, and the security of Thy love. In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 932. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a revision in the cotton ginning report dates;

S. 1131. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that review committee members may be appointed from any county within a State;

S. 1806. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide for insured operating and other type loans, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to direct the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to make a study with respect to expanding the basic national rail passenger system.

## ADMINISTRATION HARD ON CAPITALISM

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, after careful investigation I have concluded that the current administration has not been

soft on communism. However, it has been hard on capitalism.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, May 10 I unavoidably missed a rollcall vote on the District of Columbia firemen's bill because I was attending a meeting away from the Hill on official committee business.

H.R. 5638 is an excellent bill and I most certainly would have voted for it if I had been able to be present. The bill would provide a penalty of \$5,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both, for interfering with or assaulting a District of Columbia fireman in the course of his duties.

This is becoming an increasing problem in this era of civil unrest and I emphatically believe that our firemen, who do so much to protect our lives and property, must themselves be protected from unwarranted assaults.

## VA TO AID NEW MEDICAL SCHOOLS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined my distinguished chairman, "TIGER" TEAGUE, in introducing legislation that would authorize the Veterans' Administration to help pay for the es-

establishment of as many as five new State medical schools. The new medical schools would be established in proximity to VA hospitals, and would be in geographically dispersed States.

Mr. Speaker, the VA presently operates the largest medical-care system in the world. Furthermore, the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery has an active and close affiliation with more than 80 medical schools.

The Veterans' Administration is thus unique in its capacity to assist in the establishment of new medical schools, the new schools so desperately needed to alleviate the current national shortage of 50,000 doctors of medicine.

Establishment of new medical schools in conjunction with the VA, in addition to alleviating the national shortage of medical personnel, would also mean that the VA hospitals could deliver even better medical care to our sick and wounded veterans. The VA now has a wise policy of locating VA hospitals near to centers of medical and academic research, and we know of several existing VA hospital locations that would be excellent sites for new medical schools.

The more than 80 VA hospitals which are currently affiliated with medical schools have demonstrated positively that these affiliations are beneficial for the veterans' medical program, for the medical schools involved, and for the general public.

The bill would authorize \$15 million this year and the same amount for each of the next 6 years in grants to States to pay for faculty salaries at the new schools. It would also authorize an additional \$15 million per year in matching grants to help improve existing medical schools affiliated with the VA.

#### ADMINISTRATION'S RHETORIC DOES NOT MATCH REALITY

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed this body regarding the administration's impoundment of \$34.5 million appropriated for regional medical programs. These programs are intended to make a massive attack on heart attack, cancer, stroke, and kidney disease.

My point of emphasis yesterday was the badly needed kidney program, but I also mentioned the fact that these four diseases account for millions of deaths yearly in the United States and all efforts to eradicate them should be pursued; certainly funds appropriated should be used.

It was, then, a pleasure to note yesterday that the President also recognizes the high number of fatalities resulting from at least one of these—namely, cancer—for he made a major statement yesterday promising special efforts and funds for combating that disease.

I find this all amazing. Clearly the words do not match the reality. If we cannot spend, in 1971, \$34.5 million out

of an appropriation of \$106,502,000 for the whole regional medical program, aimed at four major killer diseases, how can we hope to provide extra and special funds for one of these and to spend them? Why not support the program that we already have, that Congress has passed on and appropriated for, that is already functioning?

I think this is simply another example of this administration's failure to match its rhetoric to its reality. Some time ago we were advised by the administration itself not to go by what this administration said, but to observe what it did. This is exactly what I have been doing. And what this administration has done is to deliberately withhold funds intended to fight cancer this year and to make promises for the future. I cannot take too seriously, then, those vague hopes.

#### GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the press reports this morning are correct, the Democratic National Committee policy council, apparently the highest policymaking body in the Democratic Party, is going to issue a searing indictment of the Nixon administration's welfare reform and revenue-sharing program, attacking the latter on the grounds that it is dangerous and would destroy the major domestic achievements of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Mr. Speaker, there may be a legitimate difference of opinion on these Nixon administration initiatives, but I think it will come as a shock even to the Democratic mayors of the hard-pressed cities across the country to know that this kind of demagoguery is being used to attack a program like revenue sharing that ought to be seriously considered and debated in this Congress. Surely we are responsible here for trying to find solutions to our Nation's problems. The domestic programs of the Kennedy and Johnson years may evoke a warm feeling in the hearts of many of our colleagues, but the problems remain. Constructive attempts to meet them should not be dismissed out of nostalgia for earlier legislative accomplishments.

Let us debate these new domestic initiatives on their merits. These are new times, and they call for new answers.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

Abourezk	Roll No. 88]	
Alexander	Ford,	Mikva
Ashley	William D.	Miller, Ohio
Baring	Fraser	Moorhead
Bevill	Green, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffin	Murphy, N.Y.
Clark	Gubser	O'Hara
Clay	Harsha	Poff
Collier	Hébert	Rees
Conyers	Howard	Runnels
Corman	Johnson, Pa.	Scheuer
Dent	Jones, Tenn.	Schneebell
Edmondson	Kee	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, Calif.	Long, La.	Stelger, Ariz.
Edwards, La.	Lujan	Stephens
Fisher	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Foley	McEwen	Waggonner
	Mathis	Wilson, Bob
	Mayne	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-111)

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

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, I have the honor to transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Office of Economic Opportunity for Fiscal Years 1969 and 1970.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 12, 1971.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a certain privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

#### SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8190) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8190, with Mr. ASPINALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through page 17, line 10, of the bill, and an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) had been offered and read.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 17, strike out lines 6 through 10 and insert in lieu thereof:

"CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

"For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including the construction of two prototype aircraft of the same design, \$85,330,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I know that the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will say that we have been here before—and so we have. This is an important issue. In my opinion, the action that the House will take today on this matter has some very deeply significant meaning for this Nation of ours. Because of this, the Members of this House ought to have an opportunity to vote again on this program.

This issue was fully debated last March 17 and March 18. When the recorded-vote was taken on March 18, on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike funds for the continuation of the supersonic transport program, 217 voted in favor of his amendment and 203 opposed—a difference of 14 votes. Just a matter of a switch of seven votes would have defeated the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. When the Committee of the Whole reported the bill back to the House, the amendment was considered by the House, that amendment was carried by rollcall vote of 215 to 204 or 11 votes.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my judgment that the Members of this Congress ought to have the chance to vote again on this matter. The closeness of the vote on March 18th warrants the chance.

The gentleman from Illinois, I am sure, is disturbed because this motion was not made in the subcommittee of which I am a member and was not made in the full committee. That argument is an empty one. I think a Member who is interested in this program, whether it is the Member now speaking in the well of the House or whether it is a Member from any part of the United States, has the right to do what he thinks is right

when he comes to this floor. That is why I am doing it.

I could have offered the amendment in the subcommittee and it would have carried. We have the votes in the subcommittee to continue this program.

I could have offered the amendment in the full committee and it would have carried. We had the votes in the full committee to continue with the SST program. But I felt then and I feel now that this is a matter that ought to be resolved by the full membership of this House—by the Congress itself—and so that is the reason I have offered the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the program is too important to our Nation to permit it to end without further opportunity to review the past action of the House. Now we are some weeks removed from the heat, passion, and pressures of March 17 and March 18. Members have had an opportunity to stand back in a rather calm, cool, and collected atmosphere to examine for themselves whether or not the vote that they cast on March 18 to stop the SST was a vote which was in the best interest of this Nation.

I think on the basis of the cost alone—the cost alone—we should continue this program. To date, as of March 30, 1971, we have spent \$864 million on this program. The closeout cost—and there is \$85,300,000 carried in this bill for costs share refunds of \$85.3 million—plus \$11.9 million that the committee did not approve but which are legitimate costs and which will have to be paid.

There also is an item of \$58.5 million, the airline risk money payback. This is certainly a moral obligation. I think this Government is obligated to pay. That \$85 million, plus the \$58 million, plus the \$11.9 million, comes to \$155,800,000 and that, added to the \$864 million that has already been spent, amounts to \$1,020,000,000. To continue the research and development program, the construction of the two prototypes and the 100 hours of test flying will cost \$1,342,000,000. This figure could be higher, because slowdowns and stoppages necessarily increase cost.

So I think the Members ought to look closely at this. We have a lot of chips on the table—and this is no time to throw in our hand. Just think of it—we have already spent \$1,020,000,000 on the program. To finish the research and development and test fly the two prototypes will require another \$342 million.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, that is the real issue here. Think of the money we have spent on this program.

I think we ought to understand what we are doing here. This argument has been made before, but I make it again because it is an important argument, 76 percent to 80 percent of all the commercial aircraft flown throughout the free world is built here in America by American manufacturers, by citizens of the United States. And, mark this, the

aeronautical exports are the second largest item in U.S. exports—\$2.7 billion in aeronautical exports in 1970. Think of it! That \$2.7 billion was equal to the entire trade surplus!

Is there any danger of losing this? Oh, you bet there is. In the debate on March 17—and I quote from that debate—the House's attention was called to a meeting that was called by the executives of the British and French companies building the Concorde. The speaker said:

They will meet, and they will meet in order to decide whether or not to continue the production of the Concorde.

Well, they met. They met on April 22d, and it was their unanimous opinion that they would continue the authorization of that program. I quote from Mr. Jeffrey Knight, the Chairman of the B.A.C. commercial aircraft group, which is responsible for the British part of the Concorde program, wherein he said—

This is great news and encouraging, based as it was on the fact that the Concorde does what we said it would do. We now have both the essential continuity that we need for our highly skilled work force, and a vital impetus to the big program going on to secure airline contracts throughout the world.

What happened last Friday? The President of the Republic of France, President Pompidou, took a ride in the Concorde. He rode in it for 77 minutes and, as I recall, 17 minutes at supersonic speed. When the plane had landed, he was questioned by the reporters and he said, "It is one of the finest crafts I have ever flown in." So you bet there is a danger of losing our lead in the field of commercial aircraft. We are going to lose it, and we are going to lose it to England and to France, and we are going to lose it to Germany if we do not continue the research and development on our own SST.

Some mention has been made in the press about this being unbridled technology. Poppycock. Nonsense. No program has been more bridled, and none with a tighter rein. Noise abatement, air pollution, sonic boom—all of these have been considered, and this program has been reined by the considerations that have been given to these matters—and properly so. This program has been bridled and reined like no other research and development program in the history of the United States. The Department of Transportation has been auditing the program closer and more stringently than any program that I am aware of.

The oversight that the Office of Supersonic Transport has kept upon Boeing and General Electric is an oversight that all of us ought to be proud of and this oversight, let me say, that has been demanded by the subcommittee.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Science, and Space completed hearings recently. One of the agencies under consideration was the National Science Foundation.

This morning the subcommittee sat all morning listening to outside witnesses with respect to that budget.

I have received a great number of letters from colleges throughout the United States; from scientists, engineers, physi-

cists, and mathematicians. You name it and I have got it.

A great number of those letters have been directed to the technological progress that our Nation has enjoyed in the past, and the real danger of losing it in the future.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Let me quote from one of the letters that comes from a physicist, from one of our great colleges. He says:

Our nation is now a technological society and as such its progress and prosperity depend on the generation of new knowledge—new knowledge and the opening of new technical areas of endeavor.

That is precisely what we are talking about in the research and development program on the SST. That is all it is; it is a research and development, test and evaluation program, and that is all. Our commitment to this program ends with the research and development, the building of two prototypes, and 100 hours of test flying.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to burden the House with all the arguments that have been made here in the past. There have been a lot of them. The subcommittee had 4 or 5 days of hearings, with 709 pages of testimony this year. It was one of the finest hearings ever conducted by any committee on any proposal the Congress has had to deal with.

Many opinions have been expressed by both sides on this question.

Economists have been on both sides of the question. I believe someone some time ago said that if one took all of the economists of the world and laid them end to end, they would not come to a conclusion. I do know that if one took all their conclusions, these would fill volumes.

We have to make our own judgment here on whether this program is good for America, whether it is the kind of program we ought to continue, and what the costs have been so far. These are the judgments Members ought to make today.

In my judgment, it would be a mistake to kill this program. It would be wrong because it would harm the technological progress this Nation needs to move ahead as it has moved ahead so many times in the history of the world.

Someone has talked of priorities. I look at the distinguished gentlemen from New York, who sit here, who probably know more about priorities and problems which beset our cities than most Members of Congress. Anyone who comes from a large city knows what the problems are.

How do we pay for the programs? How do we pay for health, education, welfare, crime control, housing, medical care? How do we pay for control of pollution? How do we pay for these programs and a host of others unless we have the economic viability to pay for them?

This program—the advance in aeronautical knowhow and technology will

help pay for these much needed programs—programs I vote for and support.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I want to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts, when he was chairman of the subcommittee handling transportation, did an excellent job in that capacity. He is a real legislative expert on this program. I believe he ought to be heard, and what he has said ought to be heeded. I want to associate myself with the remarks he has made.

The gentleman has now moved to the chairmanship of another important subcommittee, but he still serves on the subcommittee which deals with the Department of Transportation. The gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) is now working in this field. He has been all along, of course, but he is now chairman of the transportation subcommittee. And he is also an expert in this matter.

I hope that today the House will grasp the significance of what this amendment undertakes to do and that we may provide the necessary support for the amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

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

As I pointed out in March when funding for the SST was considered and rejected by this body, if the SST is an economically viable program, it should be nurtured and supported by private industry—not by the Federal Government.

What we are being asked to do here today is to open up a Pandora's box and come to the aid of the financially troubled air industry. Today, we are being requested to bail out the Boeing Co. Sometime in the near future, we will be requested to bail out the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Should we succumb to these requests, more and more private industries will seek the easy way out of their financial difficulties and come running to the Federal Government for help, with their hats in their hands.

If you vote for this, be ready to vote for a whole line of industries also seeking that help, and if you give it to this industry, then in all equity you must give it to the other industries that are in financial difficulties in this country.

Unless we resist this attempt to unleash the floodgates of governmental largesse, the very basis of our free enterprise system will be engulfed and swept away. We must resist the temptation to establish such a dangerous precedent.

You may recall that my objections to the SST, and the reasons I voted against it, were not based on any argument that the prototype would injure the environment. I would quickly like to summarize them now. My opposition was based on the following points: First, whenever private industry stands ready to reap the benefits of a project, it should be willing to sow the financial seeds needed to bring it to a successful harvest. So, in keeping

with my long stand against Government subsidies, I repeat, "If the supersonic transport is the economic marvel that its advocates claim it to be, let it stand the test of the marketplace."

Second, the fact that not a single U.S. airline has made a contract to purchase a foreign SST belies the claim that Government subsidy is needed in this instance to meet the test of foreign competition.

Third, only one-half of 1 percent of the country's population travels internationally on a regular basis. Only one-half of 1 percent. I fail to see how we can justify a governmental outlay of more than \$1.3 billion for a program that will serve such a small segment of the public, especially in light of the serious deficiencies in adequate funding for domestic health, education, welfare programs.

Fourth, the past history of the SST program indicates that the Federal Government may have to finance not only the prototype phase, but also the production phase. I ask you to look at the last hearings we had on the SST when I propounded these questions.

Finally, I am not at all convinced that the Government will regain its investment in the program, despite claims to the contrary.

I elaborated more fully on these reasons during debate on the SST proposal in March. The House wisely saw fit to reject the program then. Since that time, absolutely nothing has happened nor has any new evidence been disclosed which would refute any of these arguments.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one further point. I find it incredible that some of my colleagues who yesterday voted to deny the release of the District of Columbia's \$34.2 million share of the Metro's fiscal 1971 construction program today are supporting an \$85 million effort to reinstate and reinvigorate and bring back to life funding for the SST prototypes.

I find it shocking that the fancies of a tiny elite of jet-setters are being catered to while the legitimate needs of the millions of District of Columbia area residents are being flouted and ignored. On no scale of values can the whim of arriving overseas 2 or 3 hours faster outweigh the just desire to reach one's job or residence without suffering the anger and frustration of being suffocated in an endless stream of bumper-to-bumper traffic.

It would be nothing short of hypocritical for this body to turn around and fund the SST project today in the name of technological progress after so cruelly rejecting the subway project yesterday. We face a mass transit crisis in this country of alarming proportions. To bury our head in the sand, to ignore this situation and casually vote Government funds for a program that will benefit only a few—a select coterie of bon vivants—is justly to invite upon us derision and scorn. I, for one, will have no part of such a contemptuous and irresponsible action.

I, therefore, call upon you, my colleagues, to defeat this attempt to secure Federal funding for the prototypes. It is especially important that we refuse to fund the program in this supplemental appropriations bill, which should be reserved for funding mandatory projects

and those vitally needed programs that were overlooked in the basic appropriations process.

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

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

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

May I ask the gentleman did I hear him say that this amendment is designed to bail out the Boeing Co.?

Mr. CONTE. The Boeing Co. is in some financial condition. The gentleman from Washington knows that better than I and better than anyone else in this body. The SST program will mean a great deal to keep the Boeing Co. going and in a healthy condition.

Mr. PELLY. For the information of the gentleman, if this amendment does not pass, the Boeing Co. would be far ahead. They are getting their money back and are paying off their debts. They are in a strong financial condition. If they proceed they will have to encounter the risks that this program covers.

Mr. CONTE. What risks?

Mr. PELLY. These risks under this whole program, because they have money in this program. So I hope the gentleman will correct the record when he says that this amendment would bail out Boeing. It is not designed to bail out the Boeing Co.

Mr. CONTE. I shall be glad to do so, if I find that the Boeing Co. is in good shape. If they are in good financial condition it gives me another reason as to why I should vote against this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we witness here today the culmination of a carefully organized effort to restore the SST funding, a carefully organized effort.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend (Mr. BOLAND), did not offer his amendment in the subcommittee. He did not offer it in the full committee as he said he did not. He wanted it to come to the floor. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, at the time the committee considered this bill on last Thursday I am sure that those who are a part of this carefully organized effort knew that the amendment was going to be offered although it is customary for such amendments to be offered in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, as the matter now stands, as I tried to bring out in my colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts does not have the committee's approval but, rather, the bill as it now stands has the committee's approval.

Frankly, I am shocked that the chairman of the committee would not stand by the committee's own position, and ask that the amendment be upheld.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman from Illinois knows that in a supplemental bill of this nature, the various subcommittees work out their recommendations and present them to the full committee. We had a full committee meeting when we met, all members of the Committee on Appropriations knew of the previous action by the House in rejecting the continuation of the SST program. So it was decided, insofar as I know, subsequent to the full committee meeting and full committee action approving this bill, that an amendment would be offered to restore the funds for the SST. As the gentleman from Illinois knows, the members of the Committee on Appropriations are more or less overwhelmingly in favor of the SST program, as shown by the funds which have been recommended over the years.

Mr. YATES. But as of right now the committee is on record as being in favor of the provision for the termination of the SST program. Is that right?

Mr. MAHON. The Committee on Appropriation is, in this bill, on record as favoring termination cost payments for the SST in accordance with provisions of the prototype development contracts.

If, of course—

Mr. YATES. There is no "if."

Mr. MAHON. If, of course, the funds are restored—

Mr. YATES. There is no "if" to the provision in the bill that the Committee on Appropriations voted on.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, at the time the committee acted on this bill the SST program had not been restored, and in view of the previous action in respect to termination it was necessary to provide a part of the termination costs.

Mr. YATES. As the matter now stands, the Committee on Appropriations of the House is in favor of the provision that stands in the bill, and the full committee voted for the provision that is in the bill.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) made the motion to report the bill, and that provision was in the bill.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, the members of the Committee on Appropriations favor providing termination costs unless the SST development program is resumed.

Mr. YATES. But that is not in the bill, as it now stands.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YATES. Yes, I yield further; yes.

Mr. MAHON. As the gentleman from Illinois knows, the Committee on Appropriations has voted consistently to approve funds for the SST.

Mr. YATES. I am saying what the committee's position is right now.

Mr. MAHON. And there has been no indication that they have changed their minds from their previous votes to continue the development program.

Mr. YATES. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and I will not yield further, that the position of the committee is in favor of the provision that is in the bill. There is no other provision in the bill, and the committee approved the bill in its present form.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I will not yield further at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the reason that the amendment was not offered in the committee was part of the carefully organized attempt to restore the funds, because there was to be no movement that would arouse or excite the anti-SST forces to enable them to work over the weekend before this bill came up.

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

Mr. YATES. I will yield later.

Mr. Chairman, I saw the movie, "Patton," over the weekend, and one of the most dramatic parts of that movie is the race by Patton to get to the place where our troops were surrounded during the Battle of the Bulge. You will recall the Germans were hidden in the silence of the Ardene Forest to obtain maximum surprise. So, too, have the pro-SST people been most secretive in order to avoid arousing the country. There is no doubt the country is opposed to the SST.

There is more involved in this bill today than merely the \$85 million that is in this amendment. The question that is involved is whether or not we will restore the entire SST program, which is now dead. The \$85 million is only the bait, the bait of the huge amounts which will be requested in the future. It is only a part of the \$290 million which was originally asked for.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for responses if the gentleman is granted this additional time?

Mr. YATES. I will yield for responses as soon as I may finish my own statement.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is only the first step in the requests that are still to follow. \$290 million for this fiscal year. \$230 million in the next fiscal year, until a total of \$1,300,000,000 is reached and perhaps more will be necessary as a result of this delay. But that is not all. Where is Boeing going to go to finance the additional \$3 billion to \$4 billion that will be necessary to turn out the first commercial SST? Who is going to finance the \$3 billion to \$4 billion which will be necessary to obtain the repayment of the Government's investment? Where will funds be obtained to finance the \$3 billion to \$4 billion that will be necessary in order to turn out the first commercial airplane? Obviously, it is the taxpayer. Make no mistake about it.

This vote is going to be watched all over the country. The American people do not want the SST. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) carries, it will be accounted a tragedy—a real tragedy.

When the House voted 6 weeks ago to kill the SST program, there was exhilaration and satisfaction throughout the country. But the mail that flowed into my office clearly showed that the people believed that at last the Congress was responding to the wishes of the people and not voting for aerospace.

But today we have an attempt to restore this. For whom? Yesterday my appropriation subcommittee presented statistics as to how many people would be using planes like the SST's. Only 10 percent of the Americans fly internationally. Only 3 percent pay first-class fare.

The SST when it flies would require a fare that is higher than first-class fare. So how many people are going to use it? Obviously, only those who are privileged or those who charge it off as a business expense.

Apparently the aerospace industry has become the darling of the White House. Millions of dollars for Boeing and the SST and millions of dollars to bail out Lockheed. Last year in the defense bill Lockheed received \$200 million as a bonus. This year it is expected Lockheed will receive another \$200 million as a bonus on the C5-A settlement. The White House has recently indicated it will request the Congress to approve a loan of \$250 million.

There are other businesses in the country that are hard pressed. There is the transformer business in the Massachusetts district of Mr. CONTE. It receives no subsidies. Why should the aerospace industry be given this very privileged position?

The arguments have not changed since the House voted to kill the program 6 weeks ago. The arguments are as firm and sound today as they were before. Only one thing has changed. Only one thing has changed and that is the position of the Government of Canada. Listen to this.

The Government of Canada on March 23, 1971, and I am reading from the record of the House of Commons debate for that day an interchange between a member of the House of Commons and the Minister of Transport. The member, Mr. John L. Skoberg, is questioning the Honorable Donald C. Jamison, the Minister of Transport, and the record is as follows:

MR. JOHN L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw). Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of concern being expressed throughout the world about the results caused by supersonic planes flying over and landing in countries, will the minister say whether Canada has made clear to all other countries its position on the use of our air space and landing at Canadian airports?

HON. DONALD C. JAMISON (Minister of Transport). Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally known—certainly I have repeated it often enough—that at the moment there is a prohibition against the flight of any aircraft at supersonic speed over Canadian territory. I have certainly made that known, for

example, to the United States. As to other countries I am not sure; I have not done so personally.

How is the SST plane going to fly over the arctic regions and Canada? There is a prohibition against it. How are they going to maintain their schedule? That fact was not brought up the last time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) referred to the Concorde and the fact that the President of France has flown the Concorde and had expressed great satisfaction.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come to try to be a little rational and practical in this argument on the SST. I recognize that we have been down this road before, but I think a little history ought to be recalled here. It was back, I believe, in the late days of the Kennedy administration or the early days of the Johnson administration that a decision was made. This decision was that it was in the best interests of the United States to enter the supersonic transport field. As far as I am personally concerned, I am not much interested nor do I care whether I fly that fast, and if we could have had an international agreement that nobody would build the SST this would be fine.

However, we are faced with a very practical fact that unless the United States becomes a part of the endeavor to build a supersonic transport, we are going to lose the largest balance-of-payments earner that we have, and we are going to lose an investment of over \$1 billion.

It just seems to me that sound economics would dictate that we go ahead in this area, because it is in the best interest of our country to do so. The jobs that are involved are not unimportant. We are going to vote probably next week to spend \$2 billion for manpower training, and the cost for job training will be more per-job-trainee than it would cost to keep these people on the payroll.

Another interesting thing is—and I support it—we pass every year a maritime program of about \$400 million so that we can have a strong merchant marine, which is absolutely essential and necessary. We have a ship construction subsidy program and an operating subsidy program. Here is a program that we know we have to support because we cannot compete economically with other nations of the world.

Now we have this program where we know we can compete. We have a history of having competed. Over 80 percent, as you know, of the airframes used around the world today are United States made. As I said, it is our greatest balance-of-payments earner.

It would seem to me that it would be in the best interest of the taxpayers of this country, rather than to send down the drain over \$1 billion. Some of those who are now in opposition to the SST have been supporting it over the years, because we have had appropriation after appropriation after appropriation. It was only recently that we got into the real problem of the SST when the question of ecology was raised, and I am not saying that that is not a legitimate question, but I believe that practically all the answers have been given on that question now, and the facts are that there will be an SST. The question is whether the United States is going to be the manufacturer and prime seller in this field.

So all of the emotional arguments aside, it seems to me, from the taxpayers' point of view, that the best thing we could do is to go ahead and produce these two prototypes with 100 hours of test flying on each one, with a recapture clause, containing the possibility of getting back \$1 billion and maybe \$2 billion in the meantime. If we scrap it, we get nothing back, and I think that is absolutely wrong.

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

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

Mr. YATES. How does the gentleman propose that we get the \$1 billion to \$2 billion back?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Because that is a part of the contract with Boeing on the SST.

Mr. YATES. Only if Boeing is able to sell 400 or 500 SST's, and before that it will have to raise \$4 to \$5 billion to produce the plane.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have enough confidence that the aircraft industry will be competitive enough so that they can do that.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Withington, the president of Boeing, has said that Boeing does not have enough supersonic resources to do that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am sure the entire aircraft industry, when the prototypes are available, will be able to do it. I have confidence in their ability to do it.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The entire industry is now in a very bad financial condition. The entire industry will not be in a position to help finance production.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This is one of the principal reasons why we do not want to bring them down further.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, the industry is on its heels because it has been buying too many types of planes. It has not been building the 747 in the numbers it was anticipated they would be purchased.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I might say an interesting aspect about the argument of the gentleman from Illinois is that he has abandoned his ecology argument. I did not hear him say a word today about the ecological problems.

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

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is aware of the fact that I was cut short in my argument. I was prepared to argue about the ecological damage of this program as well.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman had 10 minutes, and that usually has been a priority thing. If those issues had not been raised, we would have gone along, as we did in the past, and voted for the SST.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will examine the record, he will find that I have filed dissenting views in the past 3 years.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What about the years before?

Mr. YATES. Before then I was not in the Congress, for the first year and the year after that, the SST was in transition from a swept-wing to a fixed-wing version.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not want to downgrade the gentleman's position, because I believe the gentleman has been quite consistent in a position of opposition to the SST.

The facts are that we will have \$1.2 billion or so involved in this, which the taxpayer is going to lose, and there is an opportunity to recover it. It is just an economical matter to me.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield further.

Mr. YATES. If there were that much money involved, the request would have been made by the Government, by the Appropriations Committee, for the funds. The only request made was for \$85 million for the contract and \$12 million for the purpose of housekeeping.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I believe the gentleman will have to recognize that the vote in the House was very narrow, eight votes or so difference on the amendment to strike funds which were agreed to by the Appropriations Committee.

As a matter of fact, this opposition was generated throughout the country by those who felt they had a legitimate interest. I believe they did not have all of the facts.

Mr. YATES. The people did speak, and that is the reason this affair was conducted in such secrecy.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Illinois asked a question about who is going to buy an American SST when it is on the market.

The fact is, even if we proceed in an orderly fashion now, the American SST will not be on the market until 1978. By that time the economic circumstances in this country will be greatly different from what they are now.

In the second place, we will have the Russian SST and the British-French Concorde regularly flying around the

world for about 4 years by then. But we will have a better mousetrap, and we will see the world beating a path to our door for our better version of a proven product.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to conclude with this statement: As far as I am personally concerned, I recognize that the most politically expedient thing for me to do would be to oppose the SST, because I have few if any in my district who are interested in the SST.

It seems to me from the facts I have heard over the years, the testimony taken and the evidence all indicates it is in the best interests of the taxpayers whom I represent to support the SST and to get it on the way, so that the United States will maintain its technological leadership in this very fundamental and basically important industry to the economy, and certainly to our balance-of-payments position in the world.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman from Illinois made several comments about the fact of this either being in secrecy or that it had not come before the Appropriations Committee, and so on.

I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois that we who favor this program contacted other people who were in favor of it. Those of us in Congress did this last week, because the British-French model flew over this weekend.

This is not any big "bailout" for Boeing, because, as the gentleman from Washington said, the termination costs are involved. We knew they would be argued in the committee, and the gentleman from Illinois argued against paying termination costs.

We are ending up with this slated to be more expensive to terminate than to continue. The gentleman knows he opposed the \$12 million for DOT, and he opposed payment to the airlines of \$58.5 million, so the bill eventually came out of the committee and would not even pay the termination cost.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am perfectly willing to admit that this is a last minute desperate effort to save the taxpayers \$1.25 billion, plus the hope of saving an industry which has several thousand jobs that are involved, and maintaining our technological position as an exporter of aircraft rather than an importer.

I believe this is a rather vital question, and quite important.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The whole idea here is that we are being asked to guarantee a quarter of a billion dollars for Lockheed. Will we be asked a few years from now, when the SST is having difficulty being sold, to guarantee SST several billion dollars additional to make sure these planes are sold?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think you have to weigh each problem on its merits. We have a lot of problems that can have a very serious impact on the economy. Lockheed may be one, and I believe we should look at it.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I think we should decide now whether in several years from now we will not be putting out billions of dollars more to buy these planes.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is great doubt in my mind, even if this amendment passes today, whether the SST forces will let it end there. I think you can bet that if this amendment passes, after the prototypes are developed you will have the same people back in here a few years from now asking that we invest in the \$3 to \$5 billion no man's land that exists beyond the prototype stage.

I base my statement on a meeting which took place last December in New York. That was a meeting between a number of top airline presidents and after that meeting a spokesman made the following remarks. He said, "Will we be able to pay for our own part of the program?" And he answered his own question by saying, "We believe the Government and the aerospace industry and the airlines will be able to arrange for each to pay its part in the time period 1976 to 1980."

Mr. Chairman, that sounds to me like a flat out expectation that the taxpayer will be footing the bill long after the prototype stage has passed.

As the gentleman from Illinois indicated, what we really have today is a back door attempt to subsidize this plane for two reasons: No. 1, because the spotlight of public opinion is off, temporarily, and, No. 2, despite all assurances to the contrary, when Mr. Magruder tried to explore the possibility of private financing he was told by several sources that it was too risky. Only one thing has happened since we turned down the SST a few weeks ago. Mr. Pompidou took a ride. But I doubt very much if Mr. Pompidou paid full fare, and I doubt very much that the ride which Mr. Pompidou took proved in any way the economic viability of that airplane. I do not think it did at all.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I am sure that Mr. Pompidou did not want to take the ride in the Concorde but he had to do it in an effort to instill some confidence among his countrymen in the plane, and that was the only reason he took the ride in the plane.

Mr. OBEY. I am sure that is true.

We have a peculiar situation here as it involves the aircraft industry. If today we provide funds for the SST and tomorrow we provide funds for Lockheed, gentlemen, what we might as well do is nationalize the entire aircraft industry and recognize the fact that when it comes to the aircraft industry the Congress does not give two hoots about private enterprise. I do not think the people in this House want to do that, but the demands and the pressures will be there and we will be facing that kind of alternative if you adopt this amendment today.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I should like to correct what the gentleman from Washington said a few moments ago.

He indicated that I had opposed the termination costs. That is not correct. I voted for termination costs originally, and then I voted "present" to give me a chance to check the costs further.

Secondly, with respect to the question of the \$58 million that the airlines had been seeking from the committee, I took no position on that nor did any member of the committee.

The chairman of the committee (Mr. McFALL)—and I should like his attention—told the members of our subcommittee that there was no need for us to take up for consideration the \$58 million which the airlines had requested because the White House had made no request for those funds; the subcommittee took no action. Therefore the committee took no action. Is that not correct?

Mr. McFALL. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman not agree that the private financial sector has answered the question why we should cancel the SST perhaps better than anyone on this floor and did so the day after we shot down the SST in this House. A syndicate of financiers in New York looked at the project and estimated that it would be a bad investment for private capital even with \$1 billion of research. The president of the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, the day after we took action on this floor on the SST, said that there is no foreseeable market for the SST and that it was totally inconceivable to expect private investors to invest any money in this project, even though we are willing to give them the \$1 billion that has already been spent on earlier research. The reason for this is because everyone knows that, before we can get 1 penny out of any sale of the SST, they have got to sell 300 SST's at a price in excess of \$70 million each. There is no foreseeable market for that kind of a sale.

Mr. OBEY. I agree with the gentleman; because industry would not underwrite a lemon we are being asked to do it.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I think the gentleman misunderstands the present position, vis-a-vis of Boeing as to this contract.

The Boeing Co. gets not one dime. In fact it must invest in the next 2 years \$200 million of its own capital. This is a joint program. They do not get any money from it. They have to spend money for it. What we are talking about are the jobs involved for the men who were working on this.

Mr. OBEY. I understand that. What it amounts to is that we are being asked to approve socialism for risks but private enterprise for profits.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, first of all, to

make the statement that I, too, have always opposed the SST since I came to this body, because it seems to me this is not the rightful responsibility for our Government to undertake to finance. However, I do recognize the fact that we have been into it for quite some time and spent nearly \$1 billion.

I wish to ask the chairman of the Appropriation Committee the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), a question or two, questions which have not been answered.

I will yield to the chairman and ask the distinguished gentleman if he could explain to this body why we have to pay this termination cost. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MAHON. The contract that was entered into for the development of the prototypes included termination costs. They are usually required in these types of contracts. So this is a matter of contractual responsibility. That is the reason there are funds for termination of the contracts contained in the bill.

Mr. MYERS. Who entered into the contract? The Department of Transportation?

Mr. MAHON. The Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. MYERS. It is my understanding that the \$85 million under consideration today will not fully pay the termination cost?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS. The Concorde has now been flown and in the gentleman's judgment will the SST coming to the airlines of this country and be flying into the United States and, if not, will they be flying into some other country?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know what will develop with respect to the Concorde flying to the United States. I feel we have spent \$800 million-plus, and the termination cost would run it into a billion dollars. It seems to me that we should go forward and maintain our technology and expertise in this field. In my opinion this matter is almost past the point of ignoring. It was all right to oppose the SST many months ago before we had made such a heavy investment in it, but to stop the prototype development now would not make sense.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In response to the question asked by the gentleman from Indiana, will the Concorde fly to U.S. airports, I can answer it in this way. American airlines have options on the Concorde. In other words, they are going to buy the Concorde. I am sure that American airlines flying the Concorde will be landing at U.S. airports.

Mr. MYERS. Would I be correct in assuming today that if we vote to continue to terminate the SST, we are not excluding the SST from flying into the United States?

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. American airlines are buying the Concordes and

they intend to fly them from the United States to other places around the world, and as long as they meet the noise requirements of any airport, I believe they will be able to fly in and out of the U.S. airports.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think that the answer to the gentleman's question is not as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) has indicated. It is true that American Airlines do have options to buy the Concorde. That option, however, is not a firm commitment to buy that airplane. And, as a matter of fact, the American Airlines requested the manufacturers of the Concorde to extend the option so that they did not have to buy the airplane.

Now, with respect to the viability of the Concorde, you need look no further than the president of Continental Airlines, Mr. Six, who in testimony before our committee said that the run between Hawaii and the mainland of the United States would not be an economical run for the Concorde. He indicated that he was not one of those who was going to use the Concorde on that run.

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS) for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in reference to the option by American Airlines I submit that if American Airlines did not pick up the option to buy the Concorde, then certainly they would pick up an option on the Boeing SST, particularly since it would be an American-built plane. That is the purpose of an option rather than outright commitment to purchase. They will maintain their flexibility up to the last moment and then make the decision on the best available air transportation unit.

As far as the question on entry or access into the United States, I would suggest that if the Concorde is built, and it does not meet our standards, that it certainly would be able to fly into Montreal to and from France, Britain and other countries, or the Japanese might well use it to fly from Japan to Vancouver, British Columbia, on the west coast, or an airport in Mexico and then the passengers would transfer to subsonic aircraft for flight to various parts of our country. They can, in this way meet the demand of people requiring this type of service.

Mr. MYERS. I wonder if the gentleman would care to make a comment as to the comparison with respect to the threat to our ecology between the Russian- or French-built supersonic planes, and our own SST? Can the gentleman make any comparison between theirs and our SST?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Indiana, in the first place if there is a threat to our environment on an international scale, it will be the same with all SST's, whether the Concorde, or the Russian-built planes.



Mr. MYERS. Then our SST is not significantly better?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Based on the research information we have, it will be significantly better.

In further response to the gentleman's question, I will comment briefly on the matter of SST pollution of the atmosphere, the sonic boom, and the noise problem.

It is my understanding that Dr. William Kellogg of the National Center for Atmospheric Research testified there is no environmental basis for delaying the development of the prototype SST's.

There are theories that the SST might alter the weather or disrupt the stratospheric ozone layer which shields us from solar ultraviolet. However, the weight of scientific opinion refutes such theories.

Preliminary studies regarding climatic impact of large-scale SST operations indicate a negligible influence on the heat balance of global atmosphere and a negative increase in carbon dioxide.

The ozone in the atmosphere could decrease by 1 or 2 percent but this would have trivial effect on ultraviolet radiation reaching the ground. This testimony contrasts sharply from the expressed views of Dr. James McDonald who has been publicized as having observed unidentified flying objects.

Also, the median ozone layer is at 80,000 feet of altitude above the earth's surface and it decreases proportionately above and below this level. The aircraft will fly at 60,000 feet, 20,000 feet below the altitude where concern has been expressed.

At present, it cannot be proved conclusively that there will be any noticeable effect and most of the questions being asked are hypothetical or speculative, at best.

The SST Community Noise Advisory Committee members have testified there does not appear to be any technical reasons why commercial SST cannot be built which will meet the noise standards as set out in Federal regulations.

Sonic booms should be no problem because the Department of Transportation has stated categorically that no flights are planned or would be permitted over the land areas of the United States at supersonic speeds. The takeoff, climb-out, approaches, and flights over land will be at subsonic speeds.

The noise problems are categorized as "community noise" during takeoffs and landings. SST noise is less than half as noisy as current jets because with additional thrust capability, the aircraft can approach or leave an airport at a steeper angle of climb.

"Sideline noise" is confined to the immediate airport proper. The FAA standard is 108 EPN db—the "equivalent perceived noise decibels"—the psychoacoustical annoyance level of noise. This is about as noisy as a loud truck on the highway.

The anticipated SST EPNdb is 112 and this will decline appreciatively during the steep climbout. I might add that projected SST airport sites are planned to be located far from communities or population centers.

I hope this has been helpful. Suffice it to say that intensive research will con-

tinue, in all of these potential problem areas, from this day forward. All of us have the responsibility to seek further answers before permitting production models to fly in and out of U.S. airports.

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

Mr. Chairman, during the years that the SST program has been receiving appropriations for its research and development and the production of two prototype planes, I have had misgivings from time to time about it. I have been one of the doubters—and I will admit that I have. I had some doubts as to the economic viability and feasibility of it, but during the past 6 months, and especially during the past 60 days, I have tried to do a good deal of individual, personal research and study on this.

As a result of that research and study, I have resolved every question that I have had in favor of the continued production of the two Boeing-General Electric prototypes, and the 100 hours of test flying to see what those prototypes can do.

Last month, in company with four of my colleagues, I went to France. One of the main purposes behind my going was to spend some time at the aircraft plant in Toulouse, France, where we spent the better part of 2 days, April 15 and 16.

We saw one of the Concorde's immediately after it had landed. The following day we went on board this aircraft. We went through it. We saw the instrumentation inside it, which was being studied even at that moment, to evaluate the results and the effectiveness of the flight which that particular aircraft, designated "001," had made on the 15th of April. We were there on both the 15th and the 16th.

At that time the director general of the plant told us that they had plans for President Pompidou of France to fly in that aircraft on the 7th of May. Quite frankly, some of us—although we did not doubt their word—doubted the optimism of their estimates. But I am sure everyone here today either saw on television or heard over the radio or read in the press that the President of France flew in the prototype Concorde on last Friday, the 7th of May, and he was reported to have flown at approximately twice the speed of sound. The President of France reported a magnificent flight. I hope that the President of the United States will someday fly in an American built supersonic transport.

Now if anybody had any doubts about the technical viability of an SST aircraft, I think those doubts should have been resolved when the President of the Republic of France flew for over an hour in the Concorde at a supersonic speed.

Now while we were there we also saw some of the merchandising literature that the Soviet Union is putting out on the TU-144 which is the Russian version of the SST. The Soviets are already flying that aircraft. I am informed that they have flown it for over 450 hours on test flights. I do not know how much they have flown it, but that is what has been reported. They are saying that they are going to be the first country to put a supersonic transport on an international commercial airline. They also say—and

we may or may not doubt the accuracy of this—that in either September or October of 1971, they are going to fly a regular scheduled commercial TU-144 supersonic flight from Moscow to New Delhi, India.

Now let us see the status of the Concorde that the Anglo-French consortium has developed up to this point. They have two models flying. There are the two prototypes. One of them is No. 001 and the other one is No. 002. They are in flight now and they are flying at supersonic speeds.

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

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, the two preproduction models, the 01 and 02, are models on which they plan to train the crews of the international airline companies that are going to fly the Concorde, and those two are almost completed. They are not in the state of completion of the two prototypes, but they are nearing completion right now, because we saw them.

In addition to the prototypes and to the two preproduction models, there are six other SST's on the production line. Each of them bears a specific production model number and it is designated for a specific airline. One of them is designed and being tailored to the specifications of the Pan American World Airways, an American international airline. They tell me that one of the next ones that is going to be put on the production line is going to be for another international carrier that flies the U.S. flag.

As I said in the beginning, I did have some doubts about this thing and I have had them for a good many years. But those doubts which I formerly had have been resolved in favor of the continued production and the 100 hours of test flying of these two Boeing-General Electric aircraft.

Supersonic commercial aircraft are going to fly through the international airways within the next 2 to 2½ years. I think that one of them, at least, will be flying during this calendar year, 1971. When the time comes that the international airlines carrying the flags of many different nations may be flying the supersonic transport, I want American-produced supersonic transports to be in the sky at the same time that ones made by Russia, France, and England are there.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are two sides to this argument, but in view of the state of the art, the development of the supersonic aircraft, the investment that we have made, and the potentials in other nations, it seems to me that it would be foolish not to go on and produce two prototype airplanes.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the Speaker and I concur with what he said.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I am puzzled by the gentleman's emphasis given to the ability of the Concorde to fly last week. No one has ever suggested that the Concorde could not fly. The question has always been whether it could fly profitably. Could the gentleman tell me if he saw anything at all in that flight which would indicate that the airplane can fly at a profit?

Mr. FLYNT. I think I can. Let me give the gentleman a comparison. Many of my friends and some members of my family consider me somewhat old fashioned. In the 1950's I had some of the reservations about the switch and transition from propeller-driven aircraft to the 707's that many people have about the transition from the 707 and the DC-8 jets and to the supersonic transport. I think that the development of the state of the art will be such that when these aircraft are able to fly through the skies, there will be enough people who will wish to ride them and pay whatever premium fare may be charged.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was one of those who were with the gentleman on the trip, which he described. I believe we can answer in part the last question by stating the fact that six copies of the airplane, the Concorde, that has not even yet been completely proven are already in production after being ordered by various airlines all over the world.

The thing that worries me most, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we are giving up our predominance in the aircraft industry and thereby furthering our unfavorable balance of payments position. The gentleman in the well and I were standing on the apron at the airport in Nice, France, and within a period of about 20 minutes we witnessed the landing of six airplanes belonging to six foreign airlines. One of those airplanes was a 747, two of those airplanes were 727's, and three were 707's. We are talking about balance of payments. If our technology did not put us in the lead in this field, we would not be selling our airplanes all over this world, and it is a darn shame that we are going to give that position of leadership as far as supersonic technology and aircraft are concerned.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank my friend from Texas for his observations and his contribution to this debate.

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

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

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. I appreciate the gentleman's point that we wish America could be first in airplane production, and continue to be first in airplane production. I think it would be nice if America could be first in everything; but it costs money. Very regretfully, I think we all have to con-

cede that we are not first in the world in the care of our older people and in the development of a good health program. We are told we cannot be first in those fields because we do not have the money.

Frankly, I think it would be better—and I wonder if the gentleman would not agree with me—to be first in those areas which would really affect the welfare of millions of our people.

Mr. FLYNT. I take issue with the gentleman from Maryland. I do not agree with him. I think we are first in taking care of our elderly people. I think we are first in providing health facilities. I think we are first among nations in many humanitarian fields.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am sorry to say that we are not.

Mr. FLYNT. I am proud of everything that America is first in. But I say to the gentleman from Maryland that if we cease to be first industrially, we surely will not be first in taking care of our elderly people and the health of our citizens, and cities and people of the United States of America.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would want the House to know that the costs of the Concorde have risen from \$400 million to over \$2 billion and, second, that the operating costs of the Concorde are twice those of the 747, and that a BOAC official stated in the press a few weeks ago that he was not sure they would be flying them because of the operating costs.

Mr. FLYNT. Of course the costs are higher than the first estimates. This is true in the case of every major breakthrough of this kind. Bear in mind that included in the \$2 billion figure, quoted by my friend from Illinois, all the costs to date of not two—but 10—aircraft: The two prototypes, the two preproduction models, and the six production models already started.

I will further say to the gentleman from Illinois, that in my opinion when the Concorde comes off the production line in commercial models, BOAC, British Overseas Aircraft Corp., will be flying them, and so will every other airline which can buy one of them. It will be the same development in the state of the aircraft art that the 707 and the DC-8 were.

I believe supersonic aircraft are going to fly commercially. I believe it is going to be economically feasible and that they will be economically viable. When they do, I want an American-produced supersonic aircraft flying through the skies.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Apropos of what the gentleman from Illinois said about the rising cost of the Concorde, this is true, but I want to remind the Members that these are total Government programs. In France and England the \$2 billion is being put up by the taxpayers of France and England. In Russia the entire production is by the government itself.

I do not see how one can justify opposition to this program on the basis that the Government is putting up some money that it will get back—every dime back—with the sale of the aircraft.

Mr. FLYNT. I agree with my friend from Massachusetts and I, too, believe that the eventual sales of aircraft will make possible most or all of the public money appropriated by Congress.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I again yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I was under the impression that our system was different from the Russian system and different from the French and British systems.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not reiterate the arguments of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) who like myself feels it is in the National interest to continue research on the American SST.

Instead, let me emphasize certain changes that have occurred since March when the House by 14 votes eliminated the funds for two SST prototypes.

First, Mr. Chairman, those who opposed an American SST in the House last March inferred that the British-French Concorde was in trouble and from a competitive standpoint need not be considered.

That argument was refuted last Friday when via Satellite one of our networks carried a live broadcast showing President Pompidou of France speaking to the French people from the Concorde in flight and expressing his pride in its progress and achievement.

And speaking of Foreign SST's the Russians, of course, now have announced theirs is scheduled for domestic service next year and international flights in 1973.

As for the sonic boom fears that were causing such concern in March, let me point out that according to the May issue of the National Aeronautic Association News between our own Air Force and Navy, more than 26,000 supersonic flights were flown over the United States last year alone with few Americans being aware of them, and no one has found these flights damaging to the environment. These are not necessarily small planes, either, Mr. Chairman. One is designed to cruise at more than 2,300 miles an hour.

What I deeply hope is that reason will prevail here today and that prototype development of the SST will be permitted to continue so that our knowledge will be advanced, not hampered. If experimental research prototypes meet the standards that their designers say can be met then private investment, I am sure, will finance the production of the SST in future years.

To throw in the sponge now, Mr. Chairman, is not the American way. Let us keep SST research alive.

With the U.S. dollar faltering in value abroad, America needs to develop products for export and heretofore the United States has sold 80 percent of the world's civilian transport planes. It is the major export item in which the

United States has not priced itself out of the world market.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the Boland amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very fine debate today. I believe we are now coming to the point where the Members have had an opportunity to express themselves, and the Members now know how they are going to vote on this issue.

I want to express my appreciation to my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) for allowing the House to have another opportunity to vote on the SST project, at a time when the emotions are not as high as they were last time, because, I believe, of the misunderstanding perhaps in the House and certainly throughout the country about the effect on the environment of the SST.

I think the Members recognize now and the country is beginning to recognize that there is no environmental reason for not constructing the SST. The issue then before the country was that here was technological progress destroying the environment and none of us wanted to do this. I think it is abundantly clear that this is no longer the question. Rather, I would say to you, the question is the other way now. It is whether or not technological progress may be permitted to solve the problems of poverty and the other problems that we face in our country. The question then becomes, when we get away from the emotional issue of our environment and its destruction, an economic question, as has been the debate today.

This is an important problem, but it is the same class as the usual important economic problems which we have to decide every day in this House, namely, how we will spend the taxpayers' money in order to develop the resources of our country.

You have heard people discuss the question of priorities. Let me give you another little slant on priorities. The amount of money is small, really, that is involved here. This is not a question of priorities. The net amount is only \$300 million. That is all we are talking about, because that is the difference between the cancellation of the project and going ahead with the project. After we have paid back General Electric and Boeing and the airlines we will have over \$1 billion in this project. We can go ahead with it with something like a total expenditure of \$1,342,000,000. The Federal investment in just one—just one—mass transit project in the District of Columbia will equal that amount.

You have heard the problems of economic leadership in the aerospace industry being discussed. I will not go into that because it has been adequately touched on.

There is the matter of the debate being held last time about whether the airlines needed this plane. They do not need it today, but the plane will not be available for use for 8 years. Certainly by that time there will be a use for this plane in the 1980's.

Some say that we are committing ourselves to the construction of the air-

plane itself and to the sale of the airplane. I point out to you that is not involved in what we are doing here today. Future Congresses will decide that in a separate vote.

I certainly would ask you, to rely on the wisdom of future Congresses to determine the matter.

The really important question is the use of our resources to improve our environment. I have great faith in the inventive genius of man to use those resources for the benefit of man. I am confident that this project will help produce a better life for everyone in America and I ask your support of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, two points have been raised to which I should like to address myself and include some facts, if at this point of the debate anyone is interested in facts. Let me give them to you.

The question was raised as to who is going to buy the SST that will be available for sale about 1978 if we continue this program to completion. The answer is that Boeing and General Electric and the SST subcontractors have already invested \$85 million in this project. The airlines have invested another \$59 million for a total of \$144 million. And another \$132 million has been invested in facilities and other costs by these prime and subcontractors and potential investors.

What about that airline money? What airlines are interested in buying the SST? I happen to have a list of those who have put up \$200,000 per copy in options on what they would like to have in the way of an American SST, and I will read it so that we know to whom this money will have to be refunded should we terminate the project.

The list is as follows:

American Airlines, six planes at \$200,000 a copy. Braniff two, Continental, three; Delta, three; Eastern, five; Northwest, six; Pan American, 15; TWA, 12; Trans Air Corp., two; United, six; World Airways, three; Airlift International, one; Air Canada, six; Air France, six; Air India, two; Al Italia, six; BOAC, six; Canadian Pacific, three; El Al Israel, two; Iberia, three; Irish Air Line, two; JAL, five; KLM, six; Lufthansa, three; Pakistan, two; Qantas, six.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this list represents a pretty good number of airlines throughout the world which are interested in the American SST. In addition a total of 26 U.S. airlines having indicated their support of it.

I would say to the gentlemen who oppose the continuation of the project that we would suffer a sure \$1 billion loss as against a profit of many, many billions of dollars in favorable trade balances when America sells its SST's.

Mr. Chairman, the question was raised as to who will fly in the SST's. Let us ask the question as to who will ride the already subsidized methods of transportation in this country. We have recently seen the formation of Railpax. I noticed that last night one of its trains came into Cleveland with the blaring of a 6-piece band and a lot of people at the depot to

greet the train. Unfortunately, there were more people in the band than there were riding on the train.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is worried about who will ride subsidized transportation, let us look at Railpax.

Mr. Chairman, we have the bargelines into which we have put many millions of dollars and yet no one rides on them. We have a \$400 million annual subsidy to our merchant marine, merchant ships which haul very few passengers. What percentage of Americans ride the inter-urban mass transit Metroliner?

If people do not want to get to Europe faster, why are we not still using the *Queen Mary* which at one time plied back and forth to Europe but which is now sitting in drydock in California waiting for someone to take it over for use as a hotel or for restaurant purposes.

If only 6 million Americans fly abroad today, 25 million transoceanic air passengers will be flying abroad in 1985. Of transatlantic passengers today 26 percent are business and 50 percent transpacific passengers are on business—selling American products. These are not jet socialites. These are people helping our trade balances.

Mr. Chairman, the question is whether or not we are willing to spend, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) said so effectively, the very minimum amount of money that we need to complete this project, by comparison to what is already invested in it and which would represent an already assured billion-dollar loss if we end it now.

In order to get the return that we can anticipate from this project we must have planes to sell in 1978, and to that point I would add in a factual way, but not as eloquently as did the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNN), that this bears directly on the preservation of our favorable balance of trade in future years.

In recent testimony Maurice Stans stated:

It is to such technology-intensive industries that America must look in future years for a preservation of our balance of trade.

This was a statement contained in recent testimony by Commerce Secretary Stans before the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve:

In 1970 our trade balances were negative by \$6.1 billion in non-technology-intensive manufacture products and by \$2.3 billion in raw material. We were only enjoying a \$1.5 billion favorable trade balance in agricultural products. But in the technology-intensive industries, our favorable trade balance in 1970 was \$9.6 billion—enough to offset the other categories by \$2.7 billion.

Mr. Chairman, that \$2.7 billion could go into the paying for the social needs that this country will face in the future about which all of us—not just those who oppose the SST—are concerned.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). I think it comes before us here at a very logical time, and under very understandable circumstances, because

the bill as presented to the House contains money for the termination costs resulting from our earlier decision to terminate the SST.

When we were discussing this matter originally we were told that it would cost \$1.1 billion for us to terminate the SST contract, and eventually have nothing to show for it, and only \$1.3 billion to complete the contract, and have two prototypes to test.

People argued at that time for \$200 million would it not be worth it to complete the contract and at least have a look at what the prototypes would offer us? However, in the months that have elapsed since that discussion we have found out that the termination costs will actually be greater than the costs of completing the SST project, because of the more than \$200 million that will have to be paid in unemployment compensation to the 16,000 workers who are being laid off as a result of our decision.

The actual figures which the head of the FAA presented publicly just the other day are \$1.37 billion to close this program out, with nothing to show for all our expenditures, and \$1.34 billion to get two prototypes produced.

So this is an economy move, and quite properly comes out of the economy-minded Committee on Appropriations.

In other words, to complete the development of the SST will actually save us \$30 million, and that is certainly not hay.

So it seems to me that when we are talking about money, it makes a great deal of sense to save money by completing this SST program, getting a look at what the prototypes will offer us, and then deciding whether to go ahead with the commercial production of these new modern aircraft.

At the time that the original debate occurred a few months ago, although the people back home were primarily against the SST on account of environmental reasons, there was general agreement here that there was no real environmental problem involved in building these two prototypes. But the one argument that did appear to be persuasive then was the argument of how could we possibly spend \$290 million today on the SST when we have all of these other unmet needs? And therefore, it was argued, we ought to put the money into something else that was more urgently needed.

But today we find that that argument has collapsed, because it is going to cost us more than \$290 million to terminate the SST program. So we are really saving money by going through with this project.

Second—

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

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will wait until I have completed my thought, then I will gladly yield to the gentleman.

Second, Mr. Chairman, this question of environment, I think, has had some real rethinking in the last couple of months. It has been pointed out that, whether we get an American SST flying or not, a Russian SST is soon going to be flying regularly or an Anglo-French SST will be

flying, and if we are going to get skin cancer from an SST we can get it just as easily from a Soviet SST flying over Siberia as we can from an American SST flying over this country.

But the interesting point is that we will not get any of the answers to these very important environmental questions unless we complete the environmental research that has been going on in connection with the SST. And I might point out that this vital research on environmental questions has been performed by the research and development center of the General Electric Co. located in my district in Schenectady. And if we are really worried as we claim to be, about the environmental impact of the SST, and if we really want to know the answers to these questions, then we obviously have to complete that research so we can find out just what will happen to us, if anything, when an SST flies, whether it is a Soviet, a French, or an American SST that is in the air.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman on the environmental aspect. I think this has been very much overemphasized. To me the real objection to the SST has been on economic grounds. The gentleman talks about money. While we are talking about money do we not have to take into account one additional cost factor in the SST program, and that is that there have been a lot of rumors of a package deal in connection with Lockheed? So do we not have to add \$250 million to the cost of the SST to bail out Lockheed?

Mr. STRATTON. As a matter of fact, I am against bailing out Lockheed. I opposed the bail-out funds in our Committee on the Armed Services, and I oppose the proposed \$250 million loan to enable Lockheed to purchase Rolls Royce engines for their Tri-Star, rather than good American jet engines, built by American workmen. But this is a completely separate matter, and it ought to be handled separately.

I am glad that the gentleman from Maryland agrees with me that there is no environmental problem and that we will be saving money by completing the two SST prototypes.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of asking this question. Is it not true that every single airline in this country today is strangling to death because of competition and the only reason why there are any airlines in the country that are even talking about taking options on the SST plane is because of competition—and if we, in fact, implement the SST several airlines in this country are going to go totally bankrupt. They did not even want the 747—why would they want the SST?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on March 18 when we had this matter before this body the last time, there were many, many speeches made, where there had to be speculation. There had to be speculation about whether the cancellation of the SST would result in substantial unemployment. There had to be speculation about the possibility of the termination cost.

On March 18 there had to be speculation about the impact on the balance of payments. Speculation on whether or not the United States' problem as to the balance of payments would be acute and whether we were going to have an outflow of gold.

In March of this year there was some question raised and some speculation about whether or not the British-French Concorde would fly and whether the Russians were serious about their TU-144.

Let me say now that the moment of truth has arrived on most of these questions. A Member earlier today raised the question: Has anything changed between March 18 and today? The facts are that the circumstances have changed. No longer are we talking about speculative unemployment because of the cancellation of contracts—we are talking about the reality of 12,629 people who have been terminated from employment because of the action of the House of Representatives. That is pretty real.

Now in the second tier—because of the vote on March 18 in the House an additional 25,258 people also have lost their jobs. That is not speculation—that is totally serious to some 37,000 people.

As I said a moment ago, we were speculating about termination costs. Now in the bill before you today we have a down payment on termination costs—that \$85 million is a down payment. It is not the full amount. We are being asked at this stage of the consideration to vote \$85,330,000 to pay in part the termination costs. The net result is, if we continue to be adamant against the SST, that the added termination costs are going to be on our doorsteps—or more money out of the U.S. Treasury for absolutely nothing.

Now, let us talk about where we are. You have an opportunity this afternoon to put \$85,330,000 back in the program, to continue the program. Now let us compare how much it will cost to terminate it and how much it will cost to continue. The figures balance out this way.

To cancel the program—to pay off all the bills and to end up with nothing—nothing—it will cost \$1,371,500,000.

On the other hand, you can put in a total of \$85,330,000 today to continue and to complete the whole project, which will cost \$1,342,000. In fact, it will cost \$29½ million less to complete it and end up with two aircraft than if you let the thing go down the drain.

So from an economy point of view is it not better to spend less money to complete the program and end up with two aircraft than to spend more money and have nothing to show for it? It is just that simple.

Now, let us talk about balance of payments. We have gone through a finan-

cial crisis overseas. We have gone through that crisis because America has not been selling enough of its products to people overseas, and there is some question about whether we will be able to do that in the future.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, one of the biggest earners for the United States in the balance of payments has been our aircraft—the 707, the DC-8, et cetera. It has produced a big plus in our U.S. exports. Now, if we cancel this program, we are cutting off our noses to spite our faces, because this version of a U.S. aircraft will dominate the market in the future just exactly as our present versions have dominated the commercial aviation market.

The Concorde, the TU-144 cannot compete with our SST. We will dominate the market, and we will continue to have a plus in our sales efforts in the balance-of-payments struggle.

I cannot comprehend us at this stage complicating our gold flow problems next year and for the next 10 years by continuing an adamant attitude against the SST.

In the past there has been some speculation as to the flyability, the salability of the Concorde. I think the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) made a most persuasive argument, and I will not seek to add to it. But it is real. That plane is flying, people have options on it, it will be sold, and it will fly commercially.

News announcements last week indicate that the Soviet TU-144 is in production and for sale. They are going to demonstrate it at the Paris Air Show in the latter part of this month. The facts are that they are going to sell it, it will be flown, and we will be the loser.

One final observation: To complete this whole program this fiscal year, the next fiscal year, and the following fiscal year, the revised figures show that it will cost us \$392 million.

Next week we are going to be asked to approve an authorization bill for a 5-year period, for \$4,900,000,000, to train people for jobs that do not exist. They are jobs we hope will materialize. We hope they will be available. For \$392 million in a 3-year period we can provide 37,000 jobs that have been lost since we canceled the SST contracts. It just makes sense that you put \$392 million into a program where you end up with 37,000 highly skilled jobs rather than a program of almost \$5 billion to train people where there is no certainty that jobs are going to exist.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. I just want to make a personal observation with reference to my district regarding the employment which the gentleman mentioned. Seven thousand people were laid off after March 18. We are spending \$500,000 a week in unemployment benefits for nothing. Those people want to work. They would other-

wise be paying income taxes. When you have that kind of situation, those employees cannot be retrained. They are 40 or 50 years of age. They are aeronautical engineers, tool and die makers, and other skilled people. It is unfair to say that we will train those people for jobs that do not exist.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. YATES. In respect to the point the gentleman made on unemployment and on the balance of payments, Prof. Milton Friedman, who seems to be the sage on economics for the Republican Party, said this:

The arguments made that the SST program will give jobs or that it will add to the balance of payments surplus and the like are all red herrings and have no economic validity whatsoever.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me answer that. I will be glad to do so.

Does Dr. Friedman deny that since we took the unwise action on March 18, people have lost jobs? Some 12,000-plus have lost their jobs in the first tier, and another 25,000 in the second tier have lost their jobs. So I am not convinced at all about Dr. Friedman's speculation.

I am talking about jobs people had that they no longer have because the gentleman led the fight to cancel the program.

Mr. YATES. Yes, but that was not the only place they lost jobs.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I was in hopes I would find a bill from the Appropriations Committee that I could support. Since I am opposed to this bill, with or without the SST, I have no compunction about offering a motion to strike the enacting clause.

This is a \$7 billion supplemental appropriation bill for this fiscal year, which has only 5 or 6 weeks to run. Now there is the request to add the publicly unwanted and costly SST. That is beyond comprehension.

I wondered as I listened to the debate today, and the previous debate on this subject, whether the SST represents a welfare program or whether it has some economic value. Are we voting here today for welfare and employment or to produce an airplane of dubious value? I do not know.

There has been much talk about priorities, leadership, and preeminence in the field of aviation. I will tell you where we are preeminent. I will tell you where we are first. That is in debt—d-e-b-t, debt. We lead the world in debt. We have more debt than all of the rest of the nations combined.

If they want to demonstrate that they can produce a supersonic commercial airliner and make it pay, God bless them.

Let them be first once in a while. We are first in debt and until we stop mortgaging ourselves and the generations to come, with billions of dollars of debt let them experiment with white elephants. Yes, it is long past time that we stopped the business of plunging the country deeper and deeper in debt.

I have been here too long, I guess. I went through the F-111 debate. I heard the Members as they stood in the well of the House, one after another, to tell us how they were going to sell F-111's around the world. This was to be the last word in a supersonic fighter-bomber. The governments of the world, we were told, would fall over themselves to buy this aircraft.

Well, where are the F-111's today, on which we have spent billions of dollars? These Edsels of the air are again, and I do not know for how many times, grounded because of defects.

The British were going to buy a number of F-111's. They canceled their agreement or their contract, whichever it was.

The Australians took a few copies of it.

We cannot sell this supersonic plane because the cost is at least \$8 million a copy and the French Mirage can be purchased for about \$2 million. Who is going to buy an unairworthy F-111 when the French have an acceptable \$2 million plane?

We have been licked in the fighter-bomber business because of the manipulations that went on under Robert Strange McNamara.

Mr. Chairman, I am tired of being duped by people who say we have got to be first and then come up with an almost unmitigated failure. These other nations demonstrate the feasibility of a supersonic commercial airliner. Let them spend their money to do it. But do not ask the taxpayers I have the honor to represent to finance something that is completely unproven—to buy a pig-in-a-poke.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are no funds in this bill for the procurement of the F-111.

Mr. Chairman, the funds in this bill are principally funds which are mandated by the actions of this Congress in raising the pay of Federal workers both in 1970 and in 1971; for public assistance benefits; plus various other items. Funds for increased pay costs and public assistance payments in the bill total over \$5 billion. We have to meet these requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 25 minutes.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Will

those standing who have already spoken be given additional time over those who have not spoken?

The CHAIRMAN. If the request made by the gentleman from Texas is granted, they will be given an opportunity to take part in the debate within the required time.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think the environmental issue is more or less a dead issue, but if there are any questions on the environment that do still exist in the mind of any people certainly the production of the two prototypes can clear up those questions by actual test flights.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly impressed by the statement of our distinguished minority leader concerning jobs and job loss.

We are going to be asked to vote shortly in this House on a public service employment bill involving about \$2 billion to create 200,000 jobs. That would represent a figure of about \$10,000 per job.

If you take the 12,600 people who have already been laid off and divide that into the \$85 million, we are talking about a figure of \$6,750 per job. And, if you expand it to cover the estimated 37,000 who will be laid off if this program is not carried forward, that would represent on the basis of this request of \$85 million, \$2,200 per job.

Mr. Chairman, if we are concerned about jobs, let us vote for this amendment because by this we can keep people employed at a lower cost per job than we can create new public service jobs, such as raking leaves, by appropriating \$2 billion.

Additionally, the money provided by this amendment will be repaid when 300 airplanes are sold and we will never get any money back, directly, from public service employment.

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, can my time be deferred until later in the debate? I ask unanimous consent that my time be deferred until later.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY yielded his time to Mr. YATES.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, rarely have I agreed with our colleague from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) but I do today, and I would just like to recall another instance when this House should have heeded his warning. Last year when the House was considering the International Coffee Agreement Act, the gentleman from Iowa opposed it and warned us that its passage would mean an increase in coffee prices. The act's proponents assured us that it would not affect coffee prices. The act was passed and coffee prices have increased by at least 15 percent.

Today the gentleman from Iowa urges us not to proceed with the further development of the SST and warns us not to be lulled by the same rhetoric that was employed by the proponents of the F-111 when they persuaded the Congress to appropriate funds for that misbegotten plane.

I agree with him and with the many cogent arguments given by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) who has led the opposition to the SST. I will vote against the Boland amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOW).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote a very distinguished Senator from Wisconsin of April 13, 1965, in which he said the figures which he used were conservative since recent forecasts indicate a market requirement for 400 to 600 SST's.

He noted the effect of such a transport on the gold flow and said surveys indicate that 150 American-built supersonic transports would be sold overseas, resulting in a favorable gold flow of \$5.4 billion.

Conversely, he said, if U.S. aircraft were not built, American carriers would be expected to buy more than 250 British-French Concordes, resulting in an unfavorable gold flow of \$4.3 billion.

This is the gentleman who has opposed the SST recently, but in 1965—and this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—he cited these figures with reference for the need for a balance of payments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think everything has been said, and that we do not have much time in which to develop a point in the short amount of time we have available to us in this limitation of debate.

Mr. Chairman, with your kind indulgence, I should like to comment briefly on some of the environmental aspects of the SST controversy which have been raised and which have caused a great deal of understandable concern in this body and throughout the Nation.

As we are all well aware, many charges and countercharges have been made as to whether or not the SST will pollute the atmosphere. As a professional pilot and one who has spent my entire lifetime in the general field of aviation, with particular emphasis on aviation-aerospace education, I have tried to follow the controversy in this area very closely.

Amid all the so-called findings and theories that abound on both sides of this

environmental question, one fact emerges rather clearly—there is no valid evidence that SST operations would be environmentally offensive. Nevertheless, so long as questions remain unanswered, it is absolutely essential that this concern be settled conclusively before the first commercial SST takes to the air. And, Mr. Chairman, I believe it can and will. We have had absolute assurances at the highest level of Government that this is, indeed, a condition for proceeding with the SST at this point in time.

One who certainly shares these views is Dr. William Kellogg who directed the MIT "Study on Critical Environmental Problems" who has stated forthrightly that nothing in the studies he has conducted to date would suggest that we would cancel or even hold up present plans for the development of a prototype SST. While I am well aware that other distinguished scientists and environmentalists disagree, I have full faith and confidence in Dr. Kellogg who has been deeply involved in these particular studies.

As has been pointed out already, all the commercial jet aircraft in the world could stop flying right now, today, and the instruments that measure pollution would not be able to detect any change in the atmosphere. I believe a point worth making is that of occasional volcanic action which puts hundreds of times more dust in the stratosphere than is potentially possible from an entire world fleet of SST's. In fact, three such eruptions alone have placed more particulate matter in the atmosphere than all of man's pollutant activities since time began.

Yes, I too am very concerned about the unanswered questions; especially as they relate to the ozone and atmospheric heat. But, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I hold the view that it would be worth the investment and all that has already been spent on the SST, to get these answers—even if it means never building an ultimate commercial SST.

Some nation's supersonic aircraft are going to be flying very soon and very possibly into Canada and Mexico. In my judgment, from what we already know about the atmosphere, that is close enough to this country to cause us all problems if, in fact, there is a serious environmental finding to come out of our research.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, the world needs the answers to these environmental questions and, at this point in time, only the United States appears to be genuinely concerned about the problem or finding the answers. This could be our only opportunity to control the environmental quality of SST operating aircraft.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which, in effect, would continue the funding of the SST program.

Even though the continuance of the SST program means very little to my district in Pennsylvania, or to Pennsylvania, in the way of jobs, I strongly favor the continuance of this SST program.

The fact is that the opposition to the SST program is based on emotion and comparatively small groups of people have conducted a vigorous campaign to generate opposition to the continuance of the SST program. Most of the arguments used by these groups have been based on the great harm that will be done to people, animals, and to our ecology. They have said that the SST will cause skin cancer, will destroy the polar icecaps, and many other fallacious reasons.

The fact is that none of these arguments has any merit and all have been completely disproven.

However, they have had an emotional appeal to people and many Congressmen have been deluged with letters opposing the continuance of the SST program.

We all know that our economy is in a slump and unemployment is rising. I have also heard the argument used that the SST program is nothing but a modern WPA program and nothing can be further from the truth.

By passing the amendment and continuing the funding of the SST program, we will give our economy the stimulant it needs. We will provide immediate employment for 15,000 people and ultimately over 50,000 people in a genuinely productive capacity.

By adopting this amendment, we will be assuring that the United States will continue to be the leader in the aerospace industry. The aerospace industry has paid many billions of dollars in taxes into the United States Treasury.

If the SST program is successful, the United States Government will be repaid every dollar it has put into this program. Further, when did anyone ever hear of the WPA paying any taxes or returning its appropriated funds to the Federal Government?

By continuing the SST program, we will be also helping our critical, unfavorable balance of payments which has resulted in the present dollar crisis abroad.

While I know that many Members of this House have been answering letters from their constituents by stating that they will vote against the SST program, I urge these Members to reconsider their position and I urge all Members of the House to vote for this amendment: thereby, stimulating our economy, reducing our unemployment and helping to obtain a favorable balance of payments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, it seems that as much time as we have spent in debate on the question of the SST, that there should be no questions left unanswered, but to me the questions relating to economics of the SST are still left dangling, and the ecology problem is still confusing. From the debate and discussion this afternoon, it appears that we are going to get an SST flying into our country. It is either going to be ours, or theirs. I have just about come to the conclusion that if we are going to get an SST we might as well have our own, so we can have some control over it, and so that we can make sure that it conforms to our standards on the environment and will be no threat to our ecology. I am cer-

tain this question of the SST will be argued here in this Chamber until we finally get it.

We still would not have some of the questions answered: Will it violate our environment? Can they be sold? For this reason, it seems we should proceed with the building of the two prototypes in question here. Then if they do not meet our minimum standards of noise level, air pollution, and so forth, that we have set, I hope that there will be a decision by this body to not continue with the financing of the supersonic transports.

I still have many questions about this program. I hope the questions can be settled and answered once and for always by the completion of the prototypes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken on this at great length. I think we have aired this both on March 17 and March 18 of this year, and that we have aired it again today.

I think every one of the Members here had made up their minds, even before we started on the debate today. The outlook does not look too bright. A lot has been said that if we do not do this, then the French and the British will go ahead with the Concorde, and the Russians will go ahead with their Soviet version.

This is reminiscent of the same arguments that we heard months ago when the British were developing the Concorde, exactly the same arguments. We said, "My goodness, if we are not going to get into this thing the British will take over the aircraft industry in the United States, and throughout the world."

What happened? The Comet was not successful and the United States developed the 707.

I suggest that if we do not adopt this amendment today that the Concorde and the Soviet TU 144 also may be flops.

Private industry then can develop an American SST without coming in here and having the American taxpayer pick up the tab.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations has been having hearings on military assistance. The Director of the military assistance program is General Warren. He is very knowledgeable, and supplied full information on his program.

I asked General Warren during those hearings, after our last debate on the supersonic transport, certain questions relating to supersonic planes.

I asked how many supersonic planes—military—we have sold to other countries.

His answer:

Since the early 1960's, the U.S. Government has sold approximately 1,100 supersonic tactical aircraft.

These are of various kinds: F-104's, which is a mach 2, twice the speed of sound aircraft. There were RF-101's; F-100's; F-102's. Some now obsolete—others growing obsolete.

When the report is released, a table will show that under our grant aid—this is a giveaway—we have given away 1,433

supersonic aircraft under our military assistance program. This, according to the information before our committee, started in fiscal year 1950—and through September 30, 1970.

So since 1950 we as a government have been giving away supersonic planes.

It is certainly not new.

Supersonics have been around a long, long time.

Over the past 2 years, military planes have flown approximately 200,000 hours of supersonic flight time over the United States. Such aircraft have been flying supersonically in large numbers over the oceans for more than 20 years, without any evidence of damage to ships or marine life.

And it should be pointed out that the sonic booms produced by the generally lower altitude, maneuvering military aircraft are often significantly greater than would be produced by the Boeing SST, which would fly at an altitude of 60,000 feet.

We do need further research—on sound, on noise, on problems relating to the environment.

That is what is involved here.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are asked to appropriate over \$85 million to terminate the SST program. And you add to that the \$864 million already invested by the Federal Government in the prototype program, and we still have nothing to show the American taxpayers for their investment.

The failure of the Congress to approve continued funding for this program earlier this year has resulted in increased unemployment in the United States and generated new excitement in France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union over the prospects of their respective supersonic aircraft.

The Boeing Co. in Wichita, in my congressional district, terminated an additional 1,200 employees shortly after the congressional decision in March. Most of those involved in the SST prototype program are still in the Wichita area and could be recalled should the Congress redirect the use of the \$85 million supplemental appropriation requested here for continued work on the prototype program.

I urge that this action be taken so that in the 1980's the United States can be a seller rather than just a buyer of supersonic passenger aircraft from foreign countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. I think it is an outrage. The people of this country need jobs—of course they do. But it is a calculated lie on the part of the SST lobby to pretend that we cannot have jobs without building a useless white elephant like the SST.

The simple economic truth is that anytime the U.S. Government spends a billion dollars, it can create a billion dollars worth of jobs. The question is not whether to spend the money—but how to spend it. Are we going to create those jobs by building an airplane to save a few wealthy people 3 hours of trans-Atlantic flight time, or are we going to create them by repairing slum housing, feeding hungry children, improving the Na-

tion's health care, providing mass transit, or cleaning up the environment?

I think it is an outrage that after voting down this boondoggle once before, we should be compelled to vote on it a second time, because the SST boys, and the administration lobby behind them, would not take no for an answer. This is the kind of thinking that has allowed the Pentagon, in a similar fashion, to spend billions of dollars on useless armaments.

Our earlier vote on the SST several weeks ago was the first House vote in a long time which was truly responsive to the people. The issue has been reopened again today only because of the special interest lobbies of the private corporation. It is regrettable that in permitting a second vote today, the House leadership has allowed itself so openly to serve big business interests rather than the interests of the people of this country. I urge everyone today to vote against the SST.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, first I want to comment briefly on the statement of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

If the Boeing Co. had not proceeded with the DASH 80—later known as the 707 and which was developed from the KC-135—then the British Comet would have taken over the world's jet airplane market.

Second, with regard to priorities and jobs. What many people are saying is before you start to change priorities you had better see that the new jobs are available. Right now we have 7,000 people who have just been laid off and there are going to be more who are going to be laid off. There is no place for them to go.

The gentleman now addressing you has been in the well of this House trying to help some of the other transportation industries maintain their jobs, and I will say to you that those of us on the transportation committee of this House know that we have a problem with many industries. For example, the railroads have 26,000 jobs involved, coming up in October on the Penn Central problem, and, yes, there is a possibility of a problem with Lockheed which has 30,000 more jobs involved. In this SST program you have 25,000 jobs involved. When you finally put all of these people out of work, then who is going to be working so that we can produce enough money in this country to carry out the change in priorities?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I heard a lot of arguments today. They are all very lawyerlike and expert—but nothing new has been brought out that was not brought out before. So why are we here debating the same issue that we debated 6 weeks ago?

Well, there has been, so far as the people are concerned, one new matter that has come out in the press that I read in yesterday's Wall Street Journal. It says:

Certain lawmakers who voted against continuing SST financing in March are thought to favor aid to Lockheed because of that company's importance in their States. The message being passed by some SST advocates to these lawmakers: "If you want support for Lockheed aid, you had better switch your vote in favor of the SST."

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that there is anything to this and I am not saying whether the Lockheed matter has any bearing on this. So far as I am concerned, there may be a good case for aid to Lockheed—but that is a separate issue.

The people of this country are watching us. According to a preliminary analysis of the over 30,000 responses received to a questionnaire mailed in April to all members of the 14th Congressional District of Ohio, 73 percent of the people in the district are opposed to continuing a Federal subsidy for the SST. Only 23 percent favor it, and the other 4 percent are undecided. It will be a major scandal if we in this Congress, on this record, now reverse ourselves and vote for the SST appropriation.

I would also like to point out that the \$85 million being sought to continue the SST is not the end of it. I quote again from yesterday's Wall Street Journal:

The effort to switch the \$85.3 million to development work, if successful, would be the forerunner of a new drive for much larger appropriations for the building of SST prototypes. Further funds to continue SST development throughout the fiscal year beginning July 1 would be sought when Congress considers the regular appropriations bill for the Department of Transportation. In the budget it submitted in January for the coming fiscal year, the Nixon administration asked \$281 million for SST work.

By emphasizing the financial aspects of the SST issue, I do not mean to imply, as has been stated by some, that the environmental issue is dead. The environmental issue is still a very serious issue. Nothing has changed. There is a deep division within the scientific community as to the ecological effects of a fleet of SSTs. This will apply to any SST's, whether American or foreign.

So serious and far-reaching are the possible adverse implications of these questions that I do not believe we in this House should proceed on the basis of assumptions and speculations as to what other countries will do.

We heard much talk about preserving American leadership. Is it too much to ask that America take the leadership in bringing the nations of the world to some sort of international consensus on this question before they rush pellmell into possible economic and ecological disaster? Certainly it is not too late to try.

With this thought in mind, I am, this day introducing a resolution authorizing the President to call an international conference to study the technical, economic, and environmental problems of the development and use of supersonic commercial aircraft. The resolution contemplates that pending the completion of studies by an international commission all participating nations would agree to prohibit supersonic commercial aircraft landings in and flights over their territory.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the serious dilemma that many Members have faced

on this SST issue. It is my belief that this resolution offers a way out of this dilemma. I urge my colleagues to give it their consideration and support.

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that when Columbus started out that there was someone on the shore shaking his head and saying, "He is going to fall off the edge of the earth."

When the Wright brothers flew their 200 feet, someone said, "No one but rich men will ever use that kind of a contraction."

When the old Ford Tri-motor made its first cross-country commercial flight back in the early 1920's, everybody said, "It is just a stunt and no one will ever use it."

When they developed the jet for war purposes, they said it would be too expensive to use commercially, and we should stick with the props because though they are slower, they are cheaper.

Now we have people shaking their heads saying that nobody will ever use the SST's. Others are saying to let someone else be first.

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, want us to maintain first position and I, for one, am not willing to depend on the fact that the Concorde is going to fall flat on its face, or that the Russian SST will not be picked up by other nations of the free world.

We underestimated the ability of the Russians in the space field, and it took a lot of "catch-up" and billions of dollars to get the United States out in front.

I will say to those who have been critical of our SST program that they can take pride and credit in forcing developers of this aircraft to consider the ecological impact. They have made the engineers aim for a better designed motor, which will have less noise, and hopefully, less emission.

Their sincere opposition, in my opinion, will see that we do have a better designed supersonic than any other nation in the world if we are allowed to complete the building of this aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, all my colleagues who have preceded me very ably pointed out the economics of this program, and it goes without saying that killing it now is somewhat fiscally irresponsible.

I repeat, I want our country to be first. I have the utmost confidence in the ability of American engineers and in the ability of American businessmen to see that our SST will not only pay for itself, but will earn for us in the long run.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I know of no one in the House for whom I have greater respect and affection than the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) or the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) even though they are rarely in the agreement they find today. But when they talk about the F-111 and the Comet, I think it should be pointed out that the 707 came from a military plane, the KC-135. If we had left the field to the Comet, we would not have the 707 being



sold around the world today, sales which give us the \$2 billion-plus balance of payments which help pay off with foreign trade dollars that immense debt the gentleman from Iowa is so properly concerned about.

We have seen something new in politics today. We have all heard about the politically demagoguery of offering something for nothing. The gentlemen who have opposed the SST are offering us a new political gimmick: "nothing for something." Apparently they want us to pay \$85 million to terminate this program and to have nothing left at all. Better said, they want us to finish spending \$1 billion and not have anything to show for it—no opportunity to get that billion back in improved trade balances. I think it is wrong-headed politics just as it is wrong-headed economics.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The best solution for unemployment is a job. Funding of the supersonic transport will supply over 150,000 jobs. I support it for that reason. I support this amendment because of the technology and the advancement of technology that have helped to solve many of the problems in our cities, our homes, and across the country. I support this amendment because of the balance of payments, a subject which has been spelled out on the floor today. I support this amendment because of the prestige of this great Nation. I support this amendment because of the economics which we have talked about and which justify creation of the supersonic plane. The orders for the planes are in. Americans want the supersonic transport. Americans will fly the supersonic transports, and I support the amendment because I want to see Americans flying on American-made supersonic transports flying the American flag.

If this Nation retreats from the SST program it will not merely be retreating from world leadership in aviation—one of the few industrial leadership positions we still retain—but it will be retreating in major degree from technological leadership as well. It will also be taking an enormous step backward in terms of the Nation's future economic health. For us to take such a step on totally false premises, however innocently or not-so-innocently derived, raises grave question as to our national capacity for sound decisionmaking.

One of the most puzzling things about the opposition to the development of a U.S. supersonic transport aircraft is that emotional charges against the program to develop just two prototypes are made over and over and over, but the facts that prove those charges to be false generally are ignored by opponents. Suddenly the medicine man spiel is more credible than the diagnosis of a trained doctor.

First of all, the SST exists. Two commercial prototypes are flying now—the British/French Concorde and the Russian TU-144. The only question before the Nation—and Congress—is whether the United States, in competition with other nations, will build one or two prototype

supersonic transport aircraft to determine the feasibility of such an advance in transportation, or whether a handful of legislators, apparently exploiting emotion for reasons of their own, will put a stop to inexorable technical progress for the time being.

If the British/French Concorde is successful, as there is every reason to believe it will be, U.S. airlines alone, flying aircraft they now plan to purchase abroad, probably will accumulate some 100,000 hours of supersonic flight experience against which to assess the so-called problems before the first U.S. SST takes off on its first commercial flight. The United States is building the second generation SST which will not be flying until at least 1978. Because of its advanced technology it will be far more productive than the British/French and the Russian SST's which are being rushed toward production using today's state of the art in metals and fabrication technologies.

U.S. military aircraft have logged half a million hours at supersonic speeds during the last 20 years. So what is so wrong with trying to adapt this advance to civilian travel, as we did with the subsonic jets that are commonplace today?

In this critical period of recession; of billions for health, education, and welfare; billions to fight poverty; it is ironical that our Nation falters over a decision which would produce more jobs and wealth, generally strengthen the U.S. economy, stimulate advance of titanium technology, and maintain U.S. world preeminence in commercial air transportation.

The Government's investment of \$1.3 billion, to be repaid through royalties on the sale of production airplanes, will be returned approximately by the 300th airplane, and an additional \$1 billion will be paid by the 500th airplane. The potential tax return benefits to the Government through nationwide production of 500 SST's will be some \$7.2 billion for an original \$1.3 billion investment.

The recent level of employment on the SST prototype program is estimated at approximately 4,500 with an additional 5,000 to be added as the supplying and subcontract network is expanded. More significant is the long-range employment picture. At its peak the program will employ directly more than 50,000 persons in more than 6,000 plants across the country and will create employment for more than 100,000 people in the supplemental labor force who will have generated a combined income probably in excess of \$33 billion by 1990.

Maintaining this capability at this time has another special importance. Cutbacks in defense and space programs, and a decline in commercial aircraft sales have forced a reduction of more than 263,000 people in the aerospace labor force over the past 2 years. Of this total 50,000 are scientists and engineers. It is in this category that the major immediate impact of a termination of the SST program would be felt, producing a loss in the research and development capabilities available to this industry and the Nation.

Leadership in aviation is the proven

ability to use American ingenuity, employ American labor, and develop American technology to make an American product that will generate American dollars at home and attract foreign currency to America.

Leadership in aviation is a national asset we have enjoyed since World War II. It was not earned easily or cheaply; but it can be easily lost and cheaply sold.

Leadership in aviation helps secure solidarity of our Nation. As for "spirit," I am not sure how strong the spirit of a country can be in the face of diminishing employment, technological inertia, and waning opportunities in a field where American and leadership have been synonymous for years.

Much of our Nation's defense strength resides in the technical capabilities of our aviation industry, and in a broadly applicable, readily available technological data base obtained from an aggressive research and development program. There are clear national advantages to the research and development in titanium, propulsion, operational techniques, and so forth, inherent in supersonic cruise vehicles such as the SST. Once such a national resource—the aviation industry—is allowed to weaken and become diffused, it is exceedingly difficult and costly to reestablish.

The potential economic impact of the SST program can be measured by many yardsticks—potential sales, return on investment, generation of tax revenues, employment, balance of trade, and profitability to the user. In each category potential benefits to be derived from the SST are impressive.

The SST could become another extraordinary American product, making a long-time contribution to U.S. progress and the world economy, and providing the improved mobility required by our changing times.

It is imperative to national growth in its broadest sense that the United States move promptly and forcefully to carry forward a viable SST program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here today with a very unique situation. We are being asked to appropriate \$85.3 million for accrued costs in terminating the SST contracts. It is admitted by all that these costs are obligations of the Federal Government and must be paid. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) has offered an amendment which would gain us two prototype planes for the termination costs. Hence, the question simply put is, Do the taxpayers get something or nothing for their money? Under such circumstances, I find myself compelled to vote in favor of getting something for all of this money and will accordingly vote for Mr. BOLAND's amendment.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, is it not strange how the SST cancellation costs have suddenly grown so great, much greater than the presentation to our Appropriations Committee? The costs which

were presented to our Appropriations Committee were but \$85 million for the contractors, \$12 million for taking care of the properties during a period of disposition. Now we are told that they exceed a billion dollars. Truly, this is an unwarranted exaggeration.

Would not one expect, Mr. Chairman, that the Government witnesses who appeared before our committee to present the costs accrued on this program would have given us all the costs if they really were valid?

It has been argued that the cancellation costs are more to the amount that is sought to be appropriated in this bill to revive the program. That is only the first step. The real truth is that the \$85 million in the amendment is just a drop in the bucket of costs which will come later.

My good friend from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) talked about balance of payments and about unemployment. The fact is that the balance of payments and the full employment he envisions cannot possibly come into being until Boeing is first able to raise \$4 billion to \$5 billion in order to produce the commercial version of the plane.

Where is Boeing going to get that money? The only place they will be able to get that money is from the taxpayers. So the \$85 million the gentleman from Massachusetts is requesting is only a first step. The SST program right now is dead. The contracts have been terminated. They were terminated as of March 25 of this year. If those contracts are to be revitalized and renewed, and if the plants are going to be restarted again, the startup costs will exceed the estimates by a very great margin.

I urge that the gentleman's amendment be voted down.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON yielded his time to Mr. STAGGER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, this bill originally came out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I was for it then and I am for it now. I heard one of the officials of one of our large airlines say that if America does not produce the plane, the airlines industry will be forced to purchase planes from Russia. Now, if you want them to do that, you vote against the amendment today.

History has recorded that many people have been against developments which have proven to be beneficial. Billy Mitchell was castigated when he proposed an air force for America. Future events proved he was right.

They said he was so wrong, that he was not keeping up with the times. It goes without saying, history has proven his wisdom.

At a time when there seems to be decline in America's prestige around the world we must not and should not retreat. America's slogan has been, is, and always should be "press on."

I say we should build this. We may meet some human error, but God help us if we do not try to do something to

keep our land going forward. This is the time. We must not slip backward.

As mentioned, there were those who, during the time of Columbus, when he wanted to come across the sea, said "No." If they had listened to those who said, "No, do not go," none of us would be in America today, but the Queen believed enough to pawn her jewels to send Columbus to America, thank God.

When Admiral Rickover tried to produce a nuclear submarine, it was said that he was "nuts" and that he was crazy, but thank God, we have one today, and that he persisted. The nuclear submarines we have now are the chief defense of our land.

If we want to kill the hopes and the dreams of a lot of people, yes, we can go ahead and vote against this amendment, but I say we ought to vote for it for the best interest of our Nation and carry and be proud and carry forward the progress we have made.

I do not despair for the future. I think we have a bright future. We must look and plan and work for the future. Look forward and not backward. America was built that way. It was built by those who say we will work and do good and progress. I sincerely believe we will continue to succeed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Members are ready to vote. I am satisfied we have made a good case here today. It is a very simple matter of cost, as to whether we want to close this program out.

The cost of this program has been over a billion dollars, and there is \$155 million as a termination cost. That is the whole really solid issue.

If we go ahead to spend \$342 million, we can complete the program. There will be some additional costs. I said this in the general debate. The gentleman from Illinois knows I realize there will be some additional cost because of the slowdown and stoppage of the program.

What about new facts? Of course, there are new facts. The gentleman from Ohio referred to the fact that nothing new has been added by this side. Well, they are going ahead with the Concorde. On March 17 and 18 they were saying on this floor that they were going to stop the Concorde that the British and French were not going ahead with it. The fact is they are going ahead. They will build it. President Pompidou of France flew in it and says he is proud of it.

We ought to be proud to go ahead with ours.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 8190.

This amendment would enable limited development to continue on the prototype supersonic transport. It would convert the \$85 million, which would be spent to shut down SST production, into funds to continue final work on this unique and most desirable aircraft.

Barely 2 months ago, I stood here and made a similar appeal which, as it turned

out, was futile. Several things have happened since then which I believe my colleagues must consider before they vote again. It is not often that we are given the advantage of hindsight to prevent an error in foresight. But that is precisely what has happened in the case of the American SST.

First of all, we can already see and feel the effects in our home communities. There are new names on the unemployed rolls back home. Plants which were geared up for production are cutting back, thus holding money out of our supermarkets, our retail stores, and our department stores. Seattle, where the airframe for the SST was being constructed, certainly has borne the greatest hurt.

In my hometown of Cincinnati, where the SST engines were being built, the first of 2,100 people are being laid off. Businessmen there are tightening their economic belts for less spending which has been estimated at \$100 million in only 2 years.

The impact has already rippled beyond Cincinnati. Components for the SST engines production were coming from suppliers in three States. Likewise, some of the SST workers came from Kentucky and Indiana. Curtailing the SST at this late stage is injurious to citizens of Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana in this one instance alone.

The most dramatic illustration of our failure, however, occurred only last week in France. President Georges Pompidou flew over his country at nearly twice the speed of sound in France's new Concorde supersonic transport. There was justified triumph in his voice as he broadcast over radio from the plane to his countrymen. They were told that France had gambled on the SST and was nearly ready to rake in the winning chips. They anticipate the sale of hundreds of Concordes to airlines and other countries—all to the glory and profit of France.

There was not salt rubbing. President Pompidou made no mention that America had dropped out of the SST race. He did not point out that the United States would have gotten back all of its investment, about \$1 billion, upon sale of the first fleet of SST's. I should not have to tell you that the American SST would be—can be—better than the Concorde and therefore, more salable.

All other arguments have been rebutted. Scientists have assured us that the SST presents no real pollution problem. All persuasion for the SST accrues to the benefit of the United States and its people. We could retain our prestige as the foremost nation in aviation. Sales of SST planes would greatly benefit our balance of payments with other nations. Production of them would keep our people employed. The goods which our people could then buy would further the prosperity and vigor which has always been a part of the United States of America.

We first voted approval of the SST nearly 10 years ago. We should vote now to complete it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, today, we have before us in the supplemental appropriations bill an opportunity to

reinstate and complete a job started by previous Congresses—that is the full development of two prototype SST aircraft.

The interval between the vote in March and today has only reinforced arguments of the proponents in support of the development of this aircraft.

One of the areas that is of extreme importance is the balance of payments. At a time when the value of the dollar has again declined, the balance of payment is jeopardized, we should maintain an area in which we are No. 1, and that is the continued development of the aircraft industry.

Today, we are asked to approve an allocation of \$85.3 million to terminate the SST program. It will also require another \$11 to \$12 million, plus another \$58 million to repay the airlines, or approximately \$155 million to terminate this program.

Would it not make more sense to preserve the investment of \$864 million by going forward with the SST?

It will take approximately \$1,342,000,000, including all previous investments to complete it.

In order to terminate, it will take almost the same amount of money when you take into consideration the direct and indirect costs in addition to the sum already invested. The indirect costs are composed of sums lost by reason of lost taxes, lost revenue to local and Federal Governments, as well as an increase in unemployment compensation paid by reason of terminations of employment.

A few weeks ago, this Congress voted, and I voted, for a public works bill, to provide more jobs.

Soon, we will vote on an Emergency Employment Act to provide approximately 200,000 jobs.

Why not keep the people already employed in the SST program in addition to the efforts in the other jobless areas? I do not recommend the SST on a make-job basis. It is a viable program and one that can be logically supported on an economic basis.

It was said in previous debates that the British-French Concorde would fail, and the Russian TU-144 would not be salable in the West.

The other day, Mr. Pompidou, of France, flew in the British-French Concorde—it is in operation—it has been built—it will be sold, not only in Britain and France, but to airlines in the United States and the TU-144 will fly.

All of these things I have said before and will continue to say in support of this program.

It is essential that the United States continue to maintain 80 percent of the world market in the aircraft industry as opposed to forfeiting it to the British, French, and Russians.

The question that was raised in debate: Why do we have to be first in everything?

We should be first in many areas—in eliminating poverty, disease, unemployment, and so on.

The economic strength which will be promoted by the development of the SST will also help to eliminate many of these problems.

The environmental questions raised in previous arguments have been pretty

well disposed of and really do not need any attention here. We all know that there have been military aircraft flying supersonically and at high altitudes for years without the problems being attributed to the SST.

I respectfully urge each and every Member of this House to support the SST today so that we can get on with its completion and let it play its role in building the economic strength of this country.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, which would have the effect of refunding the already defeated supersonic transport.

Apparently the pro-SST lobby does not give up easily. It even chooses, when it so desires, to ignore the votes of the Congress of the United States.

Both the House and the Senate have made decisive statements on this issue within the last several months. In both bodies, attendance on the SST votes was unusually high. In the House, for instance, only 12 of 435 Members were not present—a remarkable record for a late Thursday afternoon.

I would suggest that if the House today reverses its decision on the SST, it will be primarily because of absences—and the short notice given prior to this critical vote—not because of any new factors introduced in the debate.

I have not heard any new arguments for the SST since we last voted on the issue. I have not seen any new evidence which would prove, for instance, that the SST would not pollute the stratosphere and the troposphere, or the economic sense is in any way related to the SST. Indeed, President Pompidou's comments appear concerned with national prestige—not the environmental or fiscal questions. And aside even from these questions, efforts in many states continue to attempt to deny landing rights to SST's. Our Government would do well to advise other nations of this concern, and of the implications thereof.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing funds to further the development of the SST, and instead, to support only the funds to terminate the Government's contract obligations to the companies and the people involved, consistent with our responsibility. These costs now or at an appropriate time should compensate the airlines for having advanced \$58 million at the urging of the Department of Transportation to Boeing to be credited against future purchases. Also, we owe a clear debt to Boeing workers and Seattle for transition and training costs for those affected by the termination of the SST.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, on March 18, I was among those voting to terminate Federal appropriations for the SST. In my judgment no compelling new information has been presented that would induce me to change my vote on the SST. Federal funding of the SST still represents an unwarranted incursion by our Government into the private sector.

This amendment proposes to spend \$85 million which would otherwise be used for termination costs. In addition, nearly \$500 million more would be necessary to

complete the project and produce the two prototypes. I do not believe that our Government should spend this money nor do I believe that the people of this country favor such an expenditure.

Proponents of Federal SST funding have indicated that the pressure on the dollar in Western Europe would be assisted by a vote for the SST now. In fact, we are a long way from producing the prototypes, much less selling a production model internationally. At best, we are many years away from lessening our deficit trade balance through sales of SST airframes.

It might be more appropriate to suggest that an immediate remedy for the dollar pressure would be a reduction of our military troop strength in Western Europe. In Germany where the mark drives the dollar down, we still have hundreds of thousands of troops at a cost of billions of dollars annually. A reduction in this force would ease international monetary pressures very rapidly.

In the meantime, it is not a good argument in my judgment to maintain that the SST will have any effect on the international money crises in the near or intermediate term. On the contrary, needless expenditures of any kind by our Government will continue to contribute to the international monetary crisis.

The SST is no more attractive today than it was last month or will be next month. I urge a vote against Federal funding of the SST.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment which would revive the SST program. The SST project, which began in 1963, has thus far cost the Federal Government \$864 million.

Now, to finish this project—to complete the construction of two SST prototypes—the Government will be required to appropriate an additional \$478 million. Thus, total Government expenditures would be \$1,342 billion, and the Government would own 90 percent of two SST prototypes.

On the other hand, the Government can terminate the SST program. To cancel the Government's participation in the construction of two SST prototypes, the Government will be required to pay a minimum of \$97 million. As a result, the Government would pay a total of \$961 million and have absolutely nothing to show for its efforts.

The question is "which way should we go—spend \$478 million and own 90 percent of two SST's, and collect royalties if the SST goes into production, or spend no less than \$97 million and wipe our hands of the matter?"

Mr. Chairman, I favor a continuation of the SST prototype project, but only after much study, and only after much soul searching.

First, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to look on this project in terms of the Nation—not simply what is good for my district. This has not been easy, for my district has been especially hard hit by the economy, and we presently have a 7.7 percent unemployment rate in the Los Angeles area. The SST program means direct employment for 1,800 persons in southern California. Nine hundred people

are working on the SST at North American Rockwell, and Northrop has 500 employed on the SST project.

However, Mr. Chairman, the environment must take precedence over economic considerations. What good are jobs if life is unbearable because of air pollution, airport noise, and constant sonic booms?

But will the SST degrade our environment? This is the basic question. I have read the reports from MIT. I have read the reports from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, the report of the chairman of the American Geographic Union's Committee on Environmental Quality, the testimony in congressional hearings on this topic. Finally, I requested an unbiased, scientifically accurate report from the Congressional Research Service—a part of the Library of Congress—evaluating the effects an SST might have on the environment.

No one has alleged that two SST prototypes would harm the environment. In fact, Mr. Gary A. Soucie, conservation director of the Friends of the Earth, stated on March 3, 1971:

From all the evidence that we have been able to get there is no indication whatsoever that the flight of two (SST) aircraft for a limited number of times will have any significant effect on the stratosphere.

First, critics have contended that the sonic boom would decimate our country. This charge is extremely valid. However, the FAA has forbidden sonic booms over land. Yet, the threat to aquatic life on transoceanic flights is a pertinent issue. According to the Congressional Research Service, the SST would create a "boom having a nominal overpressure on the ocean of 2 to 2½ pounds per square foot. Fish or the hull of surface vessels in the ocean experience pressure of this magnitude from the passage of a ripple about one-half inch in height. This is an insignificant pressure charge."

Critics have charged that noise levels would greatly irritate those living near airports. Again, this is a valid charge and action must be taken to produce engines which emit less sound. Industry has assured us that the earliest commercial models will produce less noise than today's subsonic jets, and later models will be even quieter.

However, I want more than verbal assurances. I want it written into the law that no SST would fly if it produced a higher noise level than current subsonic jets. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 3228, which would meet this requirement.

Greater air pollution by the SST is certainly a consideration that must be answered and I strongly believe that the SST must be demonstrated to be acceptable under the terms of the Nation's commitment to higher environmental standards. However, the available data indicates that pollutants will not be significant. In fact, according to the Congressional Research Service:

Jet aircraft emits the lowest quantity of pollutants in relation to the weight of fuel used of any vehicle. . . . The aircraft turbine, as compared with the automobile engine, produces less than 3% the toxic effluents for the same amount of fuel consumed.

Mr. Chairman, two SST prototypes will have very little effect on our environment; yet, there are questions which remain regarding the effect of a fleet of SST's on the environment.

For \$381 million more than it would cost to terminate the project, we can build two SST's. We can test these planes and see if they will meet the noise standards; we can determine what effect their flights in the stratosphere might have on the environment; we can establish the level of engine emissions and their effect on the air we breathe.

Mr. Chairman, the economics of the issue are extremely important. The Russian version of the SST, the TU-144, is currently in the flight stages of testing; the French-British Concorde is flying. If we do not build an SST, our airlines and foreign airlines will purchase foreign SST's. Currently, we hold 84 percent of the world aviation market, but to continue to hold this lead and to continue to export aircraft, we must enter the market for the estimated \$100 billion worth of SST's which will be purchased in the coming years.

The Congressional Research Service has determined that 60 Concorde's would be purchased by U.S. airlines and that 270 Boeing SST's would be exported, yielding a net \$10.1 billion in exports. If the Boeing SST were not built, it is estimated that U.S. airlines would acquire 300 Concorde's, yielding a net \$7 billion in imports.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the Government will realize a return on its investment if the SST finally goes into production and if Boeing can sell more than 300 SST's. If 500 SST's were sold, then the U.S. Treasury would realize a profit of \$1 billion.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, with an investment of \$1.3 billion, we have a tangible object which may prove to be a polluter of great magnitude; it may prove to be an economic flop; it may not be marketable. On the other hand, it may prove to be a tremendous technological achievement, and it may prove to be the least polluting of all modes of transportation. But, these questions remain to be seen, and we should answer them by producing two SST's.

However, if we take the other route; if we invest \$961 million, we have nothing. We have closed the door on these questions and we will look to Europe to provide the answers and, possibly, the leadership in aerospace development.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

## TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

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

Tellers were ordered.

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

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. BOLAND, CONTE, YATES, and CEDERBERG.

The Committee divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes "aye" and sends his ballot to the tellers to be counted.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 201, noes

195, answered "present" 2, not voting 35, as follows:

## [Recorded Teller Vote No. 89]

## AYES—201

Abbutt	Garmatz	Fassman
Abernethy	Gettys	Pelly
Adams	Gialmo	Pepper
Albert	Goldwater	Perkins
Anderson	Gonzalez	Pettis
Calif.	Gray	Peyster
Anderson, Ill.	Grover	Pickle
Annunzio	Gubser	Pirnie
Archer	Hagan	Poage
Arends	Hall	Powell
Ashbrook	Hammer-	Price, Ill.
Aspinall	schmidt	Price, Tex.
Baker	Hanna	Purcell
Baring	Hansen, Idaho	Quillen
Belcher	Hansen, Wash.	Randall
Bell	Harsha	Rarick
Betts	Hawkins	Reid, Ill.
Blackburn	Hays	Roberts
Blanton	Henderson	Robinson, Va.
Boggs	Hicks, Wash.	Roe
Boland	Hillis	Rooney, N.Y.
Bow	Hogan	Rousselot
Bray	Hollfield	Ruppe
Brinkley	Hosmer	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Sandman
Buchanan	Ichord	Satterfield
Burleson, Tex.	Jarman	Schmitz
Byron	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Cabell	Jonas	Sebelius
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Shibley
Carney	Jones, N.C.	Shriver
Carter	Kazen	Sikes
Casey, Tex.	Keating	Skubitz
Cederberg	Keith	Slack
Chamberlain	Kemp	Snyder
Chappell	Kluczynski	Spence
Clancy	Kuykendall	Springer
Clark	Landgrebe	Stagers
Clausen,	Landrum	Steed
Don H.	Latta	Stephens
Clawson, Del	Leggett	Stratton
Collins, Tex.	Lennon	Stuckey
Colmer	Lloyd	Teague, Calif.
Corman	McClory	Teague, Tex.
Cotter	McClure	Terry
Daniel, Va.	McCormack	Thompson, Ga.
Daniels, N.J.	McDade	Ullman
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Van Deerlin
Davis, S.C.	McFall	Veysey
Delaney	McKay	Ware
Derwinski	McMillan	Whalen
Devine	Mahon	Whalley
Dickinson	Mailliard	White
Dorn	Mann	Whitehurst
Dowdy	Martin	Whitten
Downing	Mathias, Calif.	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	Mathis, Ga.	Williams
Elberg	Meeds	Wilson,
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Fascell	Mills	Winn
Flood	Mizell	Wright
Flowers	Mollohan	Wyatt
Flynt	Montgomery	Wyman
Foley	Morgan	Young, Fla.
Ford, Gerald R.	Myers	Young, Tex.
Fountain	Natcher	Zablocki
Frey	Nelsen	Zion
Fulton, Pa.	Nichols	
Gallagher	O'Konski	

## NOES—195

Abourezk	Burton	Eckhardt
Abzug	Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, Calif.
Addabbo	Byrnes, Wis.	Esch
Alexander	Caffery	Eshleman
Anderson,	Carey, N.Y.	Evans, Colo.
Tenn.	Celler	Evins, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.	Chisholm	Findley
Andrews,	Clay	Fish
N. Dak.	Cleveland	Ford,
Aspin	Collins, Ill.	William D.
Badillo	Conable	Forsythe
Begich	Conte	Fraser
Bennett	Conyers	Frenzel
Bergland	Coughlin	Fulton, Tenn.
Biaggi	Crane	Fuqua
Bieber	Culver	Gallifanakis
Bingham	Danielson	Gaydos
Blatnik	de la Garza	Gibbons
Bolling	Dellenback	Goodling
Brademas	Dellums	Grasso
Brasco	Denholm	Green, Oreg.
Brooks	Dennis	Griffiths
Broomfield	Diggs	Gross
Brotzman	Donohue	Gude
Brown, Mich.	Dow	Haley
Broyhill, N.C.	Drinan	Hamilton
Broyhill, Va.	Dulski	Hanley
Burke, Fla.	Duncan	Harrington
Burke, Mass.	du Pont	Harvey
Burleson, Mo.	Dwyer	Hastings

Hathaway	Morse	Scheuer
Hechler, W. Va.	Mosher	Schwengel
Heckler, Mass.	Moss	Seiberling
Helstoski	Murphy, III.	Sisk
Hicks, Mass.	Nedzi	Smith, Calif.
Horton	Nix	Smith, Iowa
Howard	Obey	Smith, N.Y.
Hungate	O'Hara	Stafford
Hutchinson	O'Neill	Stanton
Jacobs	Patman	J. William Stanton
Karsh	Patten	Stanton, James V.
Kastenmeier	Pike	Steele
Koch	Podell	Steiger, Wis.
Kyl	Preyer, N.C.	Stokes
Kyros	Pryor, Ark.	Stubblefield
Lent	Pucinski	Sullivan
Link	Quie	Symington
Long, Md.	Railsback	Talcott
McCloskey	Rangel	Taylor
McCollister	Reid, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
McDonald,	Reuss	Thomson, Wis.
Mich.	Rhodes	Thone
McKevitt	Riegle	Tiernan
McKinney	Robison, N.Y.	Udall
Macdonald,	Rodino	Vander Jagt
Mass.	Rogers	Vanik
Madden	Roncalio	Vigorito
Matsunaga	Rooney, Pa.	Waldie
Mazzoli	Rosenthal	Wampler
Melcher	Rostenkowski	Widnall
Metcalfe	Roush	Wolf
Mikva	Roy	Wyllie
Miller, Ohio	Roybal	Yates
Minish	Ryan	Yatron
Mink	St Germain	Zwach
Mitchell	Sarbanes	
Monagan	Saylor	
Moorhead	Scherie	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Davis, Wis. Michel

NOT VOTING—35

Ashley	Dent	Fisher
Barrett	Dingell	Frelinghuysen
Bevill	Edmondson	Green, Pa.
Collier	Edwards, La.	Griffin

Halpern	Lujan	Schneebell
Hébert	McCulloch	Shoup
Hunt	Mayne	Steiger, Ariz.
Johnson, Pa.	Minshall	Waggonner
Jones, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.	Watts
Kee	Poff	Wilson, Bob
King	Rees	Wylder
Long, La.	Runnels	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MICHEL and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin voted "present."

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I vote "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that his vote comes too late. The Chair has announced the vote by tellers with clerks.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I was here before, and I had my hand up before the Chair announced the vote. I was trying to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman cannot be recorded as voting "no." The gentleman can vote "present."

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I would ask if there are any amendments at the desk to title II, starting at page 23, which ends on page 55.

The CHAIRMAN. There are no amendments at the desk.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read and open to amendment and subject to points of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, where does this title end?

The CHAIRMAN. It ends at page 55, line 17.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, all of this has to do with pay for employees.

Mr. GROSS. Title II ends on page 55, and all in between from page 23 to 55 has to do with pay?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be made against any provision under title II?

Are there any amendments to title II? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RONCALIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RONCALIO: Page 56, line 18, after the period insert new paragraph:

"Sec. 305. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for plans or studies for the construction of any public building within the District of Columbia or a 75-mile radius therefrom."

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, the greatest failure of our times is the failure of the central cities. They have become the conspicuous failures in American life. The greatest failure of all is the Washington-Northern Virginia-Maryland area, where every day we read of tragedy in this congested, sprawling, abyss; of yet another national shrine, now Antietam, soon to be leveled by the bulldozer. Washington, where the growth rate is exceeded only by Greater Los Angeles, where the air we breathe is befouled by the exhaust of smoking buses, a million cars, and 32 tons of fuel ash being spewed out from airplanes each day as they take off and land at our busy airports, National, Dulles, and Friendship—imagine that, 32 tons of fuel ash that you and I and our families must breathe. Washington, where we now have a new vista from the hill, a new super-highway, all 14 lanes of it running in the very shadow of the U.S. Capitol.

It is Congress that ought to rebel against Washington becoming a choked mass of office buildings, of congested highways, acres of pavement and concrete, and this horrid environment for carrying on Government, replacing the parks and landscape of a civilized community once envisioned by L'Enfant.

Although five consecutive Presidents have received from Congress a plan for reorganizing the executive department, decentralization or dispersal has never received consideration. The Congress must now take the lead in doing this if Washington is to be protected from itself.

Last week my colleague from Iowa, Mr. SMITH, stressed this point in referring to the disturbances that bothered all of us right here on Capitol Hill. HENRY REUSS, the eminent Congressman from Wisconsin, pushed legislation 10 years ago calling for an orderly program of decen-

tralization and said it was needed then. If it was needed then, it is a crying tragedy now.

JOHN BLATNIK, BOB JONES, ED GARMATZ, and JOHN MOSS, to name just a few, have labored long and fruitlessly in this field for many years.

Because of runaway centralization of Government facilities in the Greater Washington area, the physical and social environment of the National Capital is being destroyed, and with it, the capacity for good government.

We need dispersal of physical plant and redistribution of government employees to safeguard the environment of Washington, make agencies more responsive to the people and contribute to the revitalization of small- and middle-sized communities in areas which have suffered from outmigration.

The wrong approach is locating the FBI building smack on Pennsylvania Avenue. The proposal to locate the Secret Service Academy in Beltsville, Md.

The right approach—the U.S. Air Force Academy located in Colorado Springs, Colo.

Beginning in 1937, with the Browlow Commission's report, the Federal Government has been continually studying reorganization proposals. Despite this concern, no coherent policy on dispersal of Government facilities has ever been produced.

I will have a special order Monday next to ask for:

First. Resolution expressing sentiment of Congress that any reorganization plan must include dispersal and decentralization.

Second. Creation of a Special Joint Committee to formulate criteria to govern selection of sites for new installations.

Third. Ask for refusal to support any authorization or appropriation which carries with it the construction of additional Government offices or private buildings to be leased to GSA in the Greater Washington area.

Fourth. Ask that you prepare for the onslaught of the Washington Post, the Evening Star, the Board of Trade, and local institutions who will wrongfully conclude that the plan will do them economic damage.

I ask my fellow Members to give some consideration to this simple amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RONCALIO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I support the gentleman's amendment.

This metropolitan area is filled with agencies which do not need to be here and which could just as well be somewhere else in the United States. They communicate by air and by telephone and would be better off somewhere else rather than here.

As long as we leave it to the discretion of the agencies, they will continue to pile office upon office upon office in this area. It is time we started doing something about keeping this from becoming the most densely populated and most polluted area of the United States.

I support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I, too, want to support the gentleman's amendment.

There was a time when a movement was started in Congress to halt the construction of Federal buildings in the District of Columbia for reasons of national security, in other words that the functions of Government ought to be dispersed because of what could happen in the event of a nuclear attack upon this country.

The gentleman's amendment is timely, and I support it.

Mr. RONCALIO. I thank the gentleman very much.

I have a special order on this same subject, but I urge the adoption of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I reluctantly oppose this amendment, because I know the dedication and the sincerity of my distinguished friend from Wyoming in offering the amendment. But this is the Nation's Capital. We have many safeguards provided in our laws in the District of Columbia against the fears of the gentleman from Wyoming.

The National Capital Planning Commission must approve any new building in the Nation's Capital. The agency that will use the building must make what is known as a space needs survey. The General Services Administration then must determine whether they believe the building is needed. It goes from there to the Office of Budget and Management. It is put into the President's overall program. Then it is submitted to the Congress, from the Speaker down to the Committee on Public Works and to the subcommittee I have the honor of chairing, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The gentleman serves with great distinction on the Committee on Public Works. I know I can say without fear of contradiction that he, myself, and other members of the committee will scrutinize very carefully any request made by any agency to further put concrete and congestion here in the great Nation's Capital.

But to forgo the opportunity of building additional facilities which are needed, such as for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, now under construction at 8th and Pennsylvania Avenue, or for any other agency that is going to serve the needs of the 205 million people in this country would be to provide a disservice to the American people.

This is a dangerous amendment. It says simply that no new buildings can be built within the environs of the Nation's Capital, for a radius of 75 miles. Are we going to ask Federal workers to go out 75 or 100 miles in order to serve the needs of our constituents? I think not.

I know the gentleman is well intentioned, but this is a dangerous amendment. As chairman of the subcommittee, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call this to the attention of Members and ask for a no vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. With respect to the FBI building, I know of 50 sites in the United States of America, in any one of the 50 States, where the FBI building, as a laboratory for those experts to work in to fight crime, would be more advantageous to the fulfillment of fighting crime, than it would to have it on Pennsylvania Avenue in this town. That is the least acceptable place to put that laboratory.

The job of these agents is to help the district attorneys of all the 50 States to effectively prosecute, to return indictments and get convictions. They do that by working with the FBI people whose efforts utilize the laboratory.

They do not have to be in the shadow of the Capitol or one-half mile from the White House to do it. In fact, that is largely what is wrong with the Capitol today. Too many people want to be around the White House and the Capitol, where they are simply not needed.

Mr. GRAY. Let me say that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is across the street from the Department of Justice. The Attorney General is in administrative control of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Attorney General and the FBI both testified before our committee that

the present location is where they wanted it and where it should be, so I do not think we ought to be legislating the needs of the departments on the floor with this kind of an amendment which has not been considered by either the subcommittee or the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues for a no vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I realize the utter sincerity of the gentleman from Wyoming in offering this amendment. He has talked to me, and I expressed some sympathy for his amendment, but I think it would be most unwise to write this legislation on an appropriation bill at this time without any hearings and without any regard for the appropriate legislative committee which handles the matters involved here. The provision is potentially far reaching in its effects.

The amendment provides that no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for plans or studies for the construction of any public building within the District of Columbia or a 75-mile radius therefrom. Of course, there could be leasing of buildings. I do think we may have too much concentration of Government in Washington. I think the gentleman has presented a very provocative idea which has been considered in the past, but I believe might well be reconsidered. As a basis for reconsideration, perhaps this amendment should be presented to the appropriate committee as a major policy question.

So, with a great deal of regret, I am compelled to say I do not believe the House will want to adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming.

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

Mr. Chairman, I feel the gentleman from Wyoming, while well meaning, is reacting from an emotional posture rather than a factual one.

There are a number of States which have far more Federal employees than the States of Maryland and Virginia or the District of Columbia. I will insert in the RECORD a list of them at this point if I receive permission later from the Speaker.

The material follows:

TABLE 13.—PAID CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BY AREA, STATE, AND SELECTED AGENCY, JUNE 1970

State	Total employment <sup>1</sup>	Selected agencies						
		Legislative branch	Judicial branch	Executive branch	Department of Defense	Post Office <sup>1</sup>	Veterans' Administration	Other <sup>1</sup>
Total <sup>2</sup> .....	2,921,909	30,715	6,887	2,884,307	1,193,784	726,472	168,719	795,332
Outside United States.....	21,758	122	60	211,576	149,132	2,524	1,364	58,556
United States.....	2,710,151	30,593	6,827	2,672,731	1,044,652	723,948	167,355	736,776
Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.....	320,970	28,639	963	291,368	91,737	19,443	5,728	174,460
50 States.....	2,389,181	1,954	5,864	2,381,363	952,915	704,505	161,627	562,316
Alabama.....	55,672	9	162	55,501	23,947	7,977	3,745	19,832
Alaska.....	14,808	2	27	14,779	6,346	903	34	7,496
Arizona.....	27,504	.....	75	27,429	9,281	4,842	1,586	11,720
Arkansas.....	16,908	.....	54	16,854	4,845	4,974	2,642	4,393
California.....	308,395	255	623	307,517	160,794	78,177	15,654	52,892
Colorado.....	42,359	207	83	42,069	17,021	7,699	2,024	15,325
Connecticut.....	19,688	4	67	19,617	4,592	10,665	1,887	2,473
Delaware.....	4,732	.....	36	4,696	1,888	1,622	501	685
Florida.....	69,486	6	177	69,303	30,001	19,162	4,655	15,485
Georgia.....	76,467	106	167	76,194	40,104	14,061	3,522	18,507
Hawaii.....	26,974	42	24	26,908	22,070	1,959	79	2,800
Idaho.....	8,582	.....	24	8,558	1,071	1,950	377	5,160
Illinois.....	112,320	188	308	111,824	29,380	50,166	9,871	22,407
Indiana.....	42,539	48	108	42,383	17,197	15,037	2,914	7,235
Iowa.....	18,264	.....	58	18,206	1,377	9,611	2,600	4,618

Footnotes at end of table.

State	Total employment <sup>1</sup>	Selected agencies						
		Legislative branch	Judicial branch	Executive branch	Department of Defense	Post Office <sup>†</sup>	Veterans' Administration	Other <sup>‡</sup>
Kansas	22,625		74	22,551	5,981	8,370	2,602	5,598
Kentucky	35,863		97	35,766	15,982	8,614	1,936	9,234
Louisiana	28,597	59	175	28,363	7,808	8,783	2,520	9,252
Maine	15,926		31	15,895	9,468	3,845	956	1,626
Maryland*	63,958		71	63,887	27,924	8,887	2,403	24,673
Massachusetts	65,622	98	96	65,468	20,688	25,893	6,159	12,728
Michigan	53,329	70	188	53,071	12,539	26,270	4,623	9,639
Minnesota	29,818	24	77	29,717	3,079	14,689	3,914	8,035
Mississippi	21,100		79	21,021	8,287	4,780	2,130	5,824
Missouri	66,182	115	133	65,934	22,285	20,235	3,606	19,808
Montana	10,668		38	10,630	1,415	2,240	463	6,512
Nebraska	15,093		39	15,054	3,597	6,085	1,443	3,929
Nevada	8,521		38	8,483	2,898	1,536	337	3,712
New Hampshire	5,226		14	5,212	1,224	2,265	364	1,359
New Jersey	67,384		109	67,275	28,839	26,212	3,748	8,476
New Mexico	25,717	4	37	25,676	10,544	2,526	1,027	11,579
New York	178,647	122	700	177,825	27,825	96,045	15,715	38,182
North Carolina	37,866		132	37,734	13,537	11,613	3,622	8,962
North Dakota	8,055		31	8,024	1,747	2,615	443	3,216
Ohio	99,146	134	240	98,772	37,670	35,862	7,139	18,101
Oklahoma	55,293	18	103	55,172	33,216	8,566	1,716	11,674
Oregon	24,868	34	65	24,769	3,781	6,191	1,788	13,009
Pennsylvania	139,837	145	318	139,374	65,592	42,713	9,443	21,626
Rhode Island	14,626		28	14,598	9,716	3,202	753	227
South Carolina	29,345		69	29,276	18,664	5,590	1,456	3,566
South Dakota	9,614		16	9,598	1,282	2,646	1,380	4,290
Tennessee	41,923	2	142	41,779	7,598	10,985	2,913	20,283
Texas	149,743	106	264	149,373	72,314	32,709	10,062	34,288
Utah	39,992	9	39	39,944	27,033	2,849	1,130	8,932
Vermont	3,720		23	3,697	483	1,807	392	1,015
Virginia*	76,710	63	141	76,506	49,762	10,153	3,839	12,752
Washington	54,640	84	104	54,452	24,388	11,175	2,777	16,112
West Virginia	13,287		60	13,227	1,506	5,080	2,074	4,567
Wisconsin	26,150		78	26,072	3,402	13,619	3,916	5,135
Wyoming	5,352		22	5,330	869	1,050	747	2,664

<sup>1</sup> Distribution by State is partially estimated.  
<sup>2</sup> Excludes summer youth program employees; includes decennial census enumerators.  
<sup>3</sup> Excludes Maryland and Virginia portions of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, which

consists of the District of Columbia; Alexandria, Fairfax, and Falls Church cities, Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun and Prince William counties, Va.; and Montgomery and Prince Georges counties, Md.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I do believe there is another factor that ought to be considered. Every organization in the world strives to make itself more efficient by bringing its various divisions together rather than dispersing them.

The gentleman from Iowa alluded to a prior tendency to separate Government agencies from Washington for the purposes of security. That is no longer a factor. We cannot now really escape the kind of nuclear bombs that have been devised by dispersing Federal agencies.

We need to have the efficiency which having supervisory activities of all Government agencies in one locale gives us.

Another factor which I think is germane to this discussion is that at this point in time a number of Government agencies are discharging personnel because of a cut-back in military expenditures. The fact that there are a number of Government agencies in this locale frequently enables these people to find jobs in other agencies in the Washington area without disrupting their family lives.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman and hope it is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it needs to be brought to the attention of this House the very inadequate drug abuse treatment program that has been initiated by the Veterans' Administration. I am not going to introduce an amendment to this bill as I had originally planned because I have talked to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations who was kind enough to hear me before his sub-

committee this morning. They indicated, and I would like to get assurances on the floor in just a minute, that they will give adequate consideration to proper funding of an effective program.

Mr. Chairman, let me just capsule this by saying it is estimated that we have 250,000 heroin addicts in this Nation, one-fourth of whom it is estimated are veterans or about 50,000.

We have just had our own colleagues come back and make a report from Vietnam saying it is estimated that there is another 30,000 potential addicts there.

Do you know what our existing VA treatment program consists of—five small clinics and they were started only in January of this year?

The entire program is funded at \$330,000. Five little clinics, with a total of 130 beds. And, do you know what the budget is for this coming year? Two million dollars to permit them to open an additional 12 clinics.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked to those who run the program and they tell me that with \$10 million, which is a very small sum, considering the problem involved, that they could open a total of 30 clinics by the end of 1971 that would treat 6,000 addicts, and that is only a beginning. They envision a need for 60 clinics costing a total of \$30 million.

But, Mr. Chairman, if we provide no treatment of addicts in this country in the veteran population or continue at our present level and make no adequate arrangements so that the young men who are coming back from Vietnam and are released in this Nation to communities all over it, you will see an epidemic of addictions that none of us can conceive of now.

I have already talked to the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee. He is

receptive to legislation which I am going to introduce in order to see that these young men who are addicts in the service must be identified, treated and rehabilitated before they are discharged.

Now, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee if he would give me some assurance that he does feel this situation warrants the committees looking into it and taking positive action?

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. First of all, I would like to commend the gentleman for the part he is playing in this very important program and which he has played for many years. He has been a very staunch advocate for additional facilities in the carrying out of the drug abuse program. I do not think anyone would quarrel with the gentleman on that.

As the gentleman has indicated, the program now being handled by the Veterans' Administration must be expanded extensively. I cannot, of course, commit the subcommittee and the other Members to this program, but as I indicated to the gentleman from Florida when he appeared before our subcommittee this morning, our subcommittee will give a good look at it and this Member is concerned about the problem and I would hope we could build more than just 12 centers during fiscal year 1972. The gentleman has indicated that the Veterans' Administration could go ahead with 30 by the end of this calendar year. So far as I am concerned I will give the gentleman every assurance that we will try to do this but, of course, I cannot commit the other members of the committee; however, I know they are interested in it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Florida and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. This is a very real problem. Of course, it is a problem where a veteran does not receive a dishonorable discharge, but that has to be considered under this program.

This matter is receiving serious study in the Congress and I think something can be worked out.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

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

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my colleague for his deep interest and thoughtful concern in this area. If we do not take massive action to assure treatment for everyone of these servicemen-addicts, we are not only going to have an explosion of addiction but we are going to have an explosion of addict-related crime.

The Department of Defense is experiencing an increase in drug abuse which appears to parallel, if not exceed, the current epidemic now experienced by civilian society throughout the Nation.

While accurate, scientific studies do not appear to be available, we do have some indication of the magnitude of the problem. In 1969, 3,766 men received some form of discharge for drug abuse from all four branches of the Armed Forces. In 1970, the number increased to 5,621. These figures do not reflect discharges of men who were drug abusers before entering military service and were subsequently discovered and discharged. Thus, the figures reflect only those men who became addicted while serving in the military.

Until comparatively recently, the VA was not called upon to deal with drug abuse. VA benefits are available as a matter of right only to veterans who meet certain conditions and who receive certain types of discharges. Many of the men discharged from the armed services from drug abuse related reasons were given the type of discharge which may have made them ineligible for VA benefits. For example, of the 5,621 men discharged for drug abuse related reasons in 1970, 2,218 or nearly half, received less than honorable discharges.

As a result of this policy, many men severed from the armed services for drug abuse were discharged into a life of crime or into already overburdened and inadequate civilian treatment programs. Thus, about 25 percent of the estimated 10,000 addicts in Washington, D.C. are believed to be veterans and about 25 percent of the patients admitted to the Lexington and Fort Worth hospitals in 1970 were veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this situation is now in the process of changing. On October 23, 1970, the Department of Defense

announced a change in policy for drug abuse separations. The regulations on drug related discharges have been liberalized so that few drug abusers in the military will receive dishonorable or undesirable discharges solely for drug abuse. Thus, it can be expected that more discharged servicemen will seek help in VA drug treatment programs.

Moreover, bills have been introduced to authorize treatment by the VA of personnel administratively separated from the Armed Forces for drug abuse, including those separated under less than honorable conditions. Should these bills be enacted, the number of veterans seeking treatment from the VA will increase over and above the increase which can be expected from the change in DOD regulations.

While the Department of Defense is also taking steps to increase its drug abuse prevention programs and to treat addicted servicemen while they remain in the armed services, it is fair to expect an enormous increase in the demand placed upon the VA.

To date, the VA response to the current situation and the problems that can be expected in the future has been grossly inadequate.

The VA currently operates five drug treatment units in New York, Washington, D.C., Houston, Battle Creek, and Los Angeles—Sepulveda. These units consist of an average of 15 beds each. In addition to these five units, only four of which are currently authorized by the Food and Drug Administration to use methadone—Battle Creek is not—six other VA hospitals have been authorized to use methadone for some form of treatment. Reportedly, the VA plans to expand the number of drug treatment units by 13 in fiscal year 1972 and 12 in fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when changes are occurring in the Department of Defense and changes are being proposed in Congress, at a time when, according to one study, 17.4 percent of the soldiers leaving Vietnam reported having used opium—5.8 percent of these referred to themselves as heavy users—it is clear that the VA must prepare to deal with the problem of tens of thousands of hard drug addicts efficiently and effectively—even if this means a great increase in the number of treatment facilities.

Perhaps more important than the number of treatment facilities is the quality of treatment. The VA's own preliminary studies indicate that the most marked increase in drug abuse among veterans seeking hospitalization is showing up in the 34 and younger age groups.

Clearly, this fact, plus everyday news broadcasts, tells us that the VA will be dealing with a new generation of veterans—far different from the veterans of the Korean war. These men not only are addicted to drugs rather than alcohol, but also they possess entirely different perceptions, beliefs, goals, and needs. They are men who have come to age in a new world, who have fought in a new kind of war, who have received a different kind of reception upon their return home.

The VA will be required to change its methods in order to deal in a relevant, responsive way with these new facts of life about the new breed of returning veterans. New ways of reaching veterans to inform them of the benefits to which they are entitled—and, in some cases, of even persuading them to take advantage of these benefits—will be required.

The VA should develop new drug-abuse treatment models similar to those now used by civilian rehabilitation centers. Such procedures will no doubt involve, at a minimum, a number of residential therapy centers which utilize little or no drug therapy for veterans without a long history of addiction, and for other addicts who are amenable to this form of treatment.

For other long-term addicts or for those not amenable to drug-free treatment, methadone maintenance may very well be the only form of treatment which will prevent addicted veterans from destroying themselves and from turning to a life of crime. Effective VA methadone treatment will involve procedures which will no doubt be very much different from anything the VA has experienced before.

First, methadone maintenance treatment should be nonresidential in nature. Dr. Joyce Lowinson, the director of the methadone maintenance program conducted by Albert Einstein College of Medicine through the Bronx State Hospital, has found that addicts treated with methadone do very much better if they are allowed to remain in society at large rather than if they are confined in a particular institution often located in a geographical area far from the place they call home. This nonresidential form of treatment permits the patient to find employment and to attempt a normal life in surroundings to which he is accustomed.

Second, many of today's veterans, particularly those who are susceptible to drug abuse, exhibit an aversion to anything connected with the military and they view the VA as a military type of institution. Thus, an effective methadone treatment program will involve the use of community facilities—including storefront centers where appropriate.

Third, an effective treatment program will no doubt involve extensive use of paraprofessionals, including ex-drug addicts. As one study noted:

Addicts are more apt to trust and confide in the ex-addicts because he can readily identify with them. As one patient remarked, "An ex-addict knows where I'm coming from because, after all, he's been there too."

At any point of contact between an addict and a drug program, the ex-addict is able to minimize the emotional and communicative barriers between addicts and non-addicts in a program. Thus the ex-addict plays a crucial role in client-staff therapeutic relationships.

The essence of what I have attempted to say today can be summed up in the word "change." The Veterans' Administration is today faced with a new problem and a new type of veteran. The Veterans' Administration must be prepared to respond with new and innovative methods of treatment and adequate funding to do the job. Any other course



of action, would be a disaster for the Nation and a disservice to the men who have fought in a difficult and dirty war.

My able colleague from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) has done us and the Nation service by his leadership in bringing the problem of the GI addict so effectively to our attention.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the second supplemental appropriations bill, there is no more important single item than the moneys appropriated for summer youth jobs.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for including \$100 million for summer youth programs, an increase of \$37,700,000 over the budget request. Together with the funds already appropriated for fiscal year 1971, the recommended amount will provide \$252,900,000 for support of 601,400 summer job opportunities for high school age youth.

The importance of this appropriation is emphasized by the recent National Urban Coalition report which stated that our cities are as tense as during the riot era of 1966-68. More specifically, the report said:

There is continuing, all-year-around, frightening evidence that the conditions which precipitated the death and destruction in American cities in 1967 and 1968 have been exacerbated and become even more dangerously explosive.

I would like to call the attention of our colleagues to a program in the Miami, Fla., area, the success of which should encourage us in making these funds available. The program is called Teen Kleen and its objective is to provide summer work for youngsters, who, under normal employment circumstances, cannot get jobs because of their age. The program was aimed at 14- and 15-year-olds, and it operated in metropolitan Dade County, Fla., during last summer.

The young people were organized in teams of 12 with older youth serving as supervisors. Every morning teams assembled at prearranged locations and then were bused to a cleanup site. After they finished cleaning an area, city and county waste disposal crews removed the refuse.

Teen Kleen provided 807 jobs for young people last summer. Many areas benefited from the cleanup work, and we had a productive summer throughout the metropolitan Dade County, Fla., area.

Also encouraging was the input of the private sector into the funding and operation of the program; \$45,000 was raised by local businessmen and that amount was matched by the U.S. Department of Labor. In addition, \$200,000 for the operation of the program in the model city area was provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Four community organizations joined forces in an operational structure: The Greater Miami Progress Foundation, the Model City Division of Housing and Urban Development of Dade County, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Opportunities Industrialization Center.

Other cooperating agencies included: the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Miami Coalition, the

National Alliance of Businessmen, Youth Opportunity, the Urban Corps, the Dade County School Administration, the Florida State Unemployment Service, the City of Miami Sanitation Department, the Dade County Waste Division, and the Equal Opportunity Programs, Incorporated.

The volunteer in charge of the project and representing the National Alliance of Businessmen was Ted Hanes, an executive of the Chase Federal Savings and Loan Association of Miami and Miami Beach. Sam Moncur of the Opportunities Industrialization Center was in charge of field operations; and Jane Chapman headed the Neighborhood Youth Corps sector, which furnished counseling, personnel services, and payroll administration.

An advisory board to oversee the project included Msgr. Bryan O. Walsh, Mrs. Athalie Range—former Miami City Commissioner and now Florida's Secretary of Community Affairs—Will Wynn, A. D. Moore, C. B. Potter, Dr. William Stokes, Peter Pere, Steve Hudson, Steve Waters, Gaddy Rawls, Essie Silva, and Lester Freeman, executive vice president of the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce. These civic-minded citizens met every week throughout the summer, and much of the credit for the success of the program must go to them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this example of what can be done by concerned people by their own initiative and with the help of their Government will serve as a model for similar programs throughout the country this summer. By joining in support of the recommended appropriation for summer youth programs, we can increase the chances for a peaceful and purposeful summer for the youth in our troubled cities.

And more importantly, we can provide a worthwhile experience for these young people. The important elements of leadership training, a sense of involvement, and the feeling of accomplishment, are all present in this program. The youth of our cities will be involved in making their environment cleaner and better, and this is the kind of experience which benefits them and their Nation.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, the city of Caruthers in my district in California is facing the same problem in the health care crisis as many other small, rural communities in this country. Caruthers is without a doctor and has been for some time.

The problem is not unique to our area. One thousand midwestern towns reported recently they are without resident physicians.

Public-spirited citizens in Caruthers have gone to some lengths to locate a doctor who is willing to settle in their town. They have written to various agencies, so far to little avail. They are offering an established medical practice and facilities, a practice which grossed, I am told, some \$100,000 the last year.

I am sure that the labors of Caruthers citizens will pay off and they will locate a doctor willing to live and serve the people in their delightful little community. But whether or not they do, the same problem, but in a greater scale, faces the

country. Many small communities will be without doctors in the future as older physicians retire or die. Medical schools, I am informed, are graduating only some 7,400 doctors a year, too few to make up the existing shortage. And with increased specialization, medical education takes longer, further heightening the problem.

Last year the Congress passed the Family Practice of Medicine Act of 1970. It was then pocket-vetoed by the President. While this act would have been of little immediate help to small communities throughout the country, such as Caruthers, it would have provided a start toward the eventual solution to the problem of too few physicians.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would have cast my vote for the supplemental appropriation amendment of \$25 million offered by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRED B. ROONEY, and would have urged other Members of Congress to do the same had it not been knocked out on a point of order.

I also support Mr. ROONEY's amendment because, as he says, by requiring the money to be spent it would provide a court test on this particular pocket veto.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, exception has been taken to an item in this bill which would provide \$15,077,000 to pay for helium deliveries to the Federal Government through March 28, 1971. I would like to explain the committee's position in this connection.

The budget estimate which was presented for the consideration of the committee included a total request of \$57,200,000. Of this amount, \$42,000,000 was the estimated amount for making close-out payments under the termination provisions of the four contracts under which the United States purchases helium for conservation. The remaining \$15.2 million was for helium delivered under the contracts to the date of termination. This amount included accrued interest through June 30, 1971.

The committee held extensive hearings on this request and gave the matter its thorough consideration.

The last two paragraphs on page 21 of House report 92-187 in connection with this appropriation item describe the action recommended by the committee. They provide the following:

In view of the foregoing, the Committee is recommending an appropriation of \$15,077,000, which is the amount required to pay for helium delivered through March 28, 1971, with attendant interest charges that have accrued through that same date.

Until action by the Department of the Interior to terminate the helium purchase contracts has been legally resolved, the Committee is of the opinion that no appropriation request related to termination of the contracts is proper for consideration.

The committee has recommended that payment be made for helium purchases which were delivered under the contracts through March 28, 1971, and the interest that has accrued in connection therewith through the same date. Regardless of the outcome of the termination proceeding on the contracts, this amount represents a legitimate debt of the U.S. Government. It makes sense to pay it at

this time and thus avoid additional interest costs.

The bill includes no funds whatsoever in connection with any costs that might be incurred in connection with the proposed termination of the contracts. As the report states, the committee is holding this item in abeyance until a legal decision is rendered.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support continued funding for existing nutritional programs for the elderly for another year.

I have joined 117 of our colleagues in sponsoring legislation to establish a broad, permanent program which would give every senior citizen an opportunity to enjoy a low-cost, nourishing, and well-balanced meal in a setting that provides social contacts as well.

Such a program, administered by the Department of Agriculture with 90-percent Federal funds and 10-percent State funds, gets to the heart of the needs of our senior citizens by providing the two things they most commonly lack: proper nutrition and social contacts.

I am hopeful that favorable action on the legislation to establish this national nutritional program will be taken in the near future. In the meantime, I am hopeful that provisions will be made to keep 22 demonstration projects, which now serve 16,900 meals per week, alive for an additional year while the broader national program is being considered by the Congress. One of the demonstration projects which has been most successful has been carried out in Dade County, Fla. My firsthand knowledge of the beneficial aspects of the program for senior citizens make my commitment to its continuation and extension even stronger.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, much valuable time has been lost since Congress unanimously approved the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 because of our failure to appropriate the necessary funds.

As our vote indicated last December, we have recognized the need for immediate Federal assistance in fighting this disease. Alcoholism is a more significant problem than all the other forms of drug abuse combined. Affecting more than 18 million Americans, this disease ranks as our fourth major killing illness. Now is the time that we take the necessary action to formalize our commitment.

The allocation of money to the States as provided by this amendment is necessary in order to combat the rise in deaths and crimes which are directly attributable to the use of alcohol. More than 50 percent of the highway fatalities each year involve problem drinkers. Fifty percent of the people in our prisons today on charges of burglary, rape, and murder committed those crimes after an excessive consumption of alcohol. This appropriation is an investment in the future well-being of our entire Nation.

The need is clear. I hope that today appropriate support is given to insure that the fight against alcoholism is begun. I urge my colleagues to vote for Mr. Conte's amendment to appropriate \$10 million to fund the act so that the

States can develop comprehensive plans and support direct services to people suffering from alcoholism. Each State will receive \$200,000 provided as the minimum allocation in the authorizing legislation.

It is imperative that the States be given the financial capability of providing comprehensive services to alcoholism. Our job today is to appropriate the first funds for these services.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill, H.R. 3190, we are discussing the needs of the Department of Transportation, among other agencies. That is quite appropriate because of a situation which is developing almost hourly off the coast of Massachusetts which certainly requires stringent actions, some of them from the Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, the House is aware of the flagrant activities of Soviet vessels in the fishing waters off Nantucket which has resulted in damage to the equipment of American lobster boats plying their trade in the area.

There have been a number of incidents, the latest one today in which the Soviet vessels cut across American lines and nets, rendering them useless and disrupting the normal, peaceful functions of the U.S. ships. The *Wiley Fox*, the lobster vessel owned by Prelude Corp. of Westport, in my congressional district, estimated the damage to its equipment at \$40,000.

Mr. Chairman, this is intolerable and, if it continues, amounts to a criminal act upon the high seas. This same *Wiley Fox*, in another incident some weeks ago was nearly rammed by a Russian ship. And that, Mr. Chairman, could amount to a great deal more than criminal harassment and vandalism.

This cannot be allowed to continue. We have protested to the State Department which is on the verge of taking steps to relieve the situation. But that may be only a temporary solution. I think we need to take more positive action to insure that it never happens again.

And the way to do that, Mr. Chairman, is, in effect, to see that there is a watchman of the seas all the time. After past incidents, Coast Guard cutters have been sent to the scene for several days and their presence has put a halt to the Russian actions. But then the cutters have been called to other duties, leaving the lobster boats prey to the Russian harassment.

I would like to urge this body, Mr. Chairman, to consider adding funds to the regular Department of Transportation appropriation for the Coast Guard for fiscal 1972 which would insure the constant presence of cutters in the international fishing waters of the east coast to put a final halt to this business.

Only round-the-clock surveillance by American cutters is going to guarantee our fishing boats free and untroubled use of the waters for their legitimate business.

In this case, I think showing the flag in this way is going to be more effective than diplomatic protests. I exhort this body to provide the funds.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and re-

port the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ASPINALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3190) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Boland amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 17, strike out lines 6 through 10 and insert in lieu thereof:

"CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT  
"For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including the construction of two prototype aircraft of the same design, \$85,330,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 201, nays 197, answered "present" 6, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—201

Abbt	Chamberlain	Garmatz
Abernethy	Chappell	Gettys
Adams	Clancy	Ghalmo
Anderson,	Clark	Goldwater
Calif.	Clausen,	Gonzalez
Anderson, III.	Don H.	Gray
Annunzio	Clawson, Del.	Grover
Archer	Collins, Tex.	Gubser
Arends	Colmer	Hagan
Ashbrook	Corman	Hall
Aspinall	Cotter	Hammer-
Baker	Daniel, Va.	schmidt
Baring	Daniels, N.J.	Hanna
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Hansen, Idaho
Bell	Davis, S.C.	Hansen, Wash.
Betts	Delaney	Harsha
Blackburn	Derwinski	Hawkins
Blanton	Devine	Hays
Boggs	Dickinson	Henderson
Boland	Dorn	Hicks, Wash.
Bow	Dowdy	Hillis
Bray	Downing	Hogan
Brinkley	Edwards, Ala.	Hollifield
Brown, Ohio	Ellberg	Hosmer
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Hull
Burleson, Tex.	Fascell	Ichord
Byrne, Pa.	Flood	Jarman
Byron	Flowers	Johnson, Calif.
Cabell	Flynt	Jonas
Camp	Foley	Jones, Ala.
Carney	Ford, Gerald R.	Jones, N.C.
Carter	Fountain	Kazen
Casey, Tex.	Frey	Keating
Cederberg	Fulton, Pa.	Keith

Kemp  
Kluczynski  
Kuykendall  
Landgrebe  
Landrum  
Latta  
Leggett  
Lennon  
Lloyd  
McClory  
McClure  
McCormack  
McDade  
McEwen  
McFall  
McKay  
McMillan  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Mann  
Martin  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mathis, Ga.  
Meeds  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills  
Mizell  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Morgan  
Myers  
Natcher  
Nelsen  
Nichols  
Nix

O'Konski  
Passman  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Peyster  
Pickle  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Powell  
Price, Ill.  
Price, Tex.  
Purcell  
Randall  
Rarick  
Reid, Ill.  
Roberts  
Robinson, Va.  
Roe  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rousselot  
Ruppe  
Ruth  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Schmitz  
Scott  
Sebelius  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Skubitz  
Slack

NAYS—197

Abourezk  
Abzug  
Addabbo  
Alexander  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Aspin  
Badillo  
Begich  
Bennett  
Bergland  
Biaggi  
Biestler  
Bingham  
Blatnik  
Bolling  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brotzman  
Brown, Mich.  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Burke, Fla.  
Burke, Mass.  
Burlison, Mo.  
Burton  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Caffery  
Carey, N.Y.  
Celler  
Chisholm  
Clay  
Cleveland  
Collins, Ill.  
Conable  
Conte  
Conyers  
Coughlin  
Culver  
Danielson  
de la Garza  
Dellenback  
Dellums  
Denholm  
Dennis  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dow  
Drinan  
Dulski  
Duncan  
du Pont  
Dwyer  
Eckhardt  
Edwards, Calif.  
Esch  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Evins, Tenn.  
Findley  
Fish  
Ford,  
William D.

Forsythe  
Fraser  
Frenzel  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Galifianakis  
Gallagher  
Gaydos  
Gibbons  
Goodling  
Grasso  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffiths  
Gross  
Gude  
Haley  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hanley  
Harrington  
Harvey  
Hastings  
Hathaway  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Heckler, Mass.  
Helstoski  
Hicks, Mass.  
Horton  
Howard  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Jacobs  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Koch  
Kyl  
Kyros  
Lent  
Link  
Long, Md.  
McCloskey  
McCollister  
McDonald,  
Mich.  
McKevitt  
McKinney  
Maconald,  
Mass.  
Madden  
Matsunaga  
Mazzoli  
Melcher  
Metcalfe  
Mikva  
Miller, Ohio  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall  
Mitchell  
Monagan  
Moorhead  
Morse  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, Ill.  
Nedzi  
Obey

Snyder  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stuckey  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Terry  
Thompson, Ga.  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Veysey  
Ware  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Winn  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wyman  
Young, Fla.  
Young, Tex.  
Zablocki  
Zion

O'Hara  
O'Neill  
Patman  
Patten  
Pike  
Podell  
Preyer, N.C.  
Pryor, Ark.  
Pucinski  
Qule  
Rangel  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Riegle  
Robison, N.Y.  
Rodino  
Rogers  
Roncallo  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Roy  
Roybal  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sarbanes  
Saylor  
Scherle  
Scheuer  
Schwengel  
Seiberling  
Sisk  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Stafford  
Stanton,  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Steele  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thone  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waldie  
Wampler  
Widnall  
Wolff  
Wydler  
Wyllie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Zwachs

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Crane  
Davis, Wis.  
  
Ashley  
Barrett  
Bevill  
Collier  
Dent  
Edmondson  
Edwards, La.  
Fisher  
Griffin  
Hébert  
  
Frelinghuysen  
King  
  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kee  
Long, La.  
Lujan  
McCulloch  
Mayne  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Poff  
Rees  
  
Michel  
Rallsback  
  
Runnels  
Schneebeil  
Shoup  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stokes  
Waggonner  
Watts  
Wilson, Bob

NOT VOTING—28

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

On this vote:  
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. King against.  
Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Michel against.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.  
Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.  
Mr. Lujan for, with Mr. Rallsback against.  
Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Crane against.  
Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Stokes against.  
Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Dent against.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Runnels against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Reese against.  
Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Jones of Tennessee against.  
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Collier against.  
Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Steiger of Arizona against.  
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Bevill against.  
Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Until further notice:  
Mr. Poff with Mr. Schneebeil.  
Mr. Shoup with Mr. Mayne.

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

Mr. QUIE and Mr. MILLER of Ohio changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. HÉBERT. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LONG. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. GRIFFIN. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further state that my vote of "present" on the teller vote is also explained by my live pair with the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. WAGGONNER. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. Speaker, I further state that the same applies to my vote on the teller vote.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. LUJAN. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I

voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McCULLOCH. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:  
Mr. CONTE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 8190, to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.  
The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.  
The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were refused.  
So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer a joint resolution (House Joint Resolution 633) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I assume that the distinguished chairman will take some time to explain the necessity for and the purport of the joint resolution?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.  
Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.  
The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 633

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America

in Congress assembled, That there are hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government such amounts as (1) may be necessary to cover salaries, compensation, and pay (including pensions and retired pay) or for other programs and activities (including the food stamp program, fees and expenses of witnesses, and other programs) apportioned on a deficiency basis under authority of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 665(e)), and for which provision would be made in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1971, as passed by the House of Representatives, and (2) may be necessary for the activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and by the Architect of the Capitol for Senate items, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the supplemental estimates therof submitted to the first session of the Ninety-second Congress (House Document Numbered 92-73).

Sec. 2. Except as otherwise provided in clause (2) of section 1 of this joint resolution, appropriations made by this joint resolution shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1971, as passed by the House of Representatives, and all expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever such Act is enacted into law.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Appropriations last week reported out the second supplemental appropriations bill, 1971, it also approved a resolution authorizing the chairman of the committee to present a continuing resolution to the House, if it should become necessary, in order to prevent payless pay days in the Government or to prevent disruption to certain programs that have been running on a deficiency basis under authority of the Antideficiency Act and for which provision is made in the second supplemental bill just passed.

As a contingency move, I have submitted this joint resolution. It is not known at this moment whether the resolution will need to be enacted into law. I hope it will not need to be enacted. But whether it needs to be enacted will depend upon how rapidly we dispose of the second supplemental bill which has just passed the House, and which now goes to the other body. That bill is scheduled for very early consideration in the other body. We are not certain about just how quickly it can clear the other body, clear conference, and be signed into law.

This resolution does not provide any additional appropriations beyond what are provided in the second supplemental. It merely authorizes departments and agencies of the Government, if necessary, and only within the limits of the second supplemental, to pay personnel and meet other expenditures provided they have been operating on an authorized deficiency basis.

For example, we are advised that the

Post Office Department will lack authority to obligate sometime during this week. The Post Office Department, we are advised, would have a payless payday on the 20th of May unless additional funds are available by then.

The food stamp program will be out of funds on the 21st of May, we are advised.

There are various other agencies which are nearing the end of the rope, so to speak, because of the pay raises which were approved by Congress.

As a contingency, I offer this resolution. It can be passed by the other body if it should appear clear that the second supplemental bill will not be finalized in a timely enough fashion.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is one other point I believe the distinguished gentleman would want to call attention to, and that is that should the continuing resolution become effective, any money spent thereunder will be charged back to the second supplemental just passed. So it will not be in addition to, but can be used instead of, if circumstances so require.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Reference was just made to a question I wanted to establish for the record. I appreciate the gentleman from Mississippi asking the question.

This resolution does go beyond pay and compensation for employees; it goes to retirement pay as well; does it not?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; it does.

Mr. GROSS. It goes also to the food stamp program, to meet expenses of witnesses, and other programs, so it is rather broad. Or, is it limited exclusively to pay with those exceptions?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct, it is rather broad.

This is a resolution which is almost identical to the resolution we passed about this time last year and quite similar to the one passed the prior year when we found ourselves near the end of the fiscal year and the supplemental bill was not enacted in a timely enough fashion.

What we have done is to insist that the departments and agencies absorb as much of the pay increase as possible in order that the new appropriations can be held to the lowest possible figure. The longer we hold the bill the more we can usually hold down the new appropriations.

We are approaching the end of the fiscal year and have delayed as long as we can. Perhaps we should have passed the second supplemental a couple or 3 weeks before this. We have been trying to hold it down as much as possible. That is the reason why we find ourselves in this position today.

Mr. GROSS. It is limited strictly to the second supplemental appropriation

bill and expenditures; it does not extend to the regular oncoming appropriations?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. It is limited exclusively to the second supplemental passed today, and only to those items in it which have been apportioned by the executive branch under authority of the antideficiency law.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman anticipate a day when we will not get stupendous supplemental appropriation bills such as the one just passed by the House, to augment the expenditures of the fiscal year, and does he anticipate the day when we will not have to go to continuing resolutions such as this?

Mr. MAHON. It would be very desirable if we could eliminate these heavy supplementals, but we cannot eliminate them until we quit passing legislation which requires the expenditure of these additional funds. For example, there is over \$4 billion in the second supplemental for pay increases authorized by laws in the last session.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering if the Expenditures Control Act has any meaning these days. Is it a dead letter? If so, why do we not repeal it and quit winking at it?

Mr. MAHON. The funds in this bill are within the overall budget requests for fiscal 1971. The expenditure limitation accommodated for items within the budget, so I would say the expenditure limitation is not too pertinent to this resolution or to the bill which we have just passed.

I would say, of course, that the current overall expenditure limitation expires on June 30, next month.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I simply rise to say we on the minority side agree with this resolution. I am quite sure that after the action taken by the House today we will not have any quick conference on the supplemental bill that we just passed, for a while at least. I think it is necessary to pass this joint resolution in order that we do not have any payless paydays for the various branches of Government.

Again I reiterate what has been said by my distinguished chairman that any funds paid out under this bill will be paid out of the second supplemental. It is not new money. No additional appropriation is here approved. It will be paid from the bill we just passed. I suggest, therefore, it should be passed at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the joint resolution.

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

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the second supplemental appropriation bill and on the Boland amendment and to include pertinent extraneous excerpts.

I ask for the same privilege, that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in connection with the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND FURTHER OPERATIONS OF SST'S

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, in the debate which just took place on the SST many of us were on the horns of a very serious dilemma. We recognized the implications attacking the environment on both sides. I feel it is time that our country took the leadership in trying to get out of this dilemma, particularly the one presented by the threat of competition from foreign SST's. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill today that would authorize the President of the United States to call an international conference to consider these questions and in the meantime to work out an international agreement to suspend further operation of SST's until these questions can be resolved and a consensus obtained.

I urge all of my colleagues to give serious consideration to this resolution and give it their support.

Thank you.

## INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SPECULATION

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation has been deeply concerned by the reports of international monetary speculation and the effects of this activity on the American dollar.

These international manipulations have raised many questions and we have had a series of conflicting statements about the cause and effects behind these unsettled conditions in the European money markets. The Congress does not have sufficient information on these problems and I think this situation should be corrected immediately.

Therefore, I am calling for a full-scale investigation and study by the Banking and Currency Committee of international monetary affairs as they affect the American dollar and the domestic economy. It is my intention to have the committee undertake this just as soon as a schedule can be arranged.

Just such an investigation was endorsed by the executive council of the

AFL-CIO meeting in Atlanta, Ga., this morning. The executive council stated:

We call for an early and thorough Congressional investigation of the recent international speculation against the American dollar, including the activities of American-owned international companies and banks, and the profits they made from undercutting their nation's currency.

In calling for this investigation, the AFL-CIO warned against a further increase of interest rates as a solution to unsettled world monetary conditions. The AFL-CIO urged that:

The administration and the Congress reject without equivocation the advice of bankers—American and foreign—to raise interest rates and adopt restrictive policies.

The AFL-CIO's statement on the international monetary problems was contained in a detailed analysis of the national economy. The executive council stated:

Most of the American economy is in a state of stagnation, as a result of the administration's engineered recession. Decisive government stimulus is needed to lift sales production and employment.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the statement released in Atlanta, Ga., by the AFL-CIO this morning:

## STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

ATLANTA, GA.,  
May 12, 1971.

Most of the American economy is in a state of stagnation, as a result of the Administration's engineered recession. Decisive government stimulus is needed to lift sales production and employment.

This is the dismal economic record:

Unemployment moved up to 5.1 million in April after accounting for seasonal changes—up 1.2 million in the past year and 2.4 million from January 1969, when the Administration took office.

Substantial unemployment has increased from 6 major industrial areas in January 1969 to 52 today and to 687 smaller areas.

Unemployment rates, in April, were 17.2% for teenagers, 10% for Negroes and 9.6% for construction workers. Among young men 20 to 24 years old—including GIs returning from Vietnam—joblessness has shot up to 10.5%, more than double the level of two years ago.

Inflation continues to wipe out much of the buying power of wage gains. The cost-of-living in the January-March quarter was 4.9% above a year ago.

In early 1971, buying power of weekly after-tax earnings of the average nonsupervisory worker in private employment—over half the total labor force—is only fractionally greater than a year ago, less than in the same period of 1969 and even below 1965.

Except for the rebound of auto production in January-March and the accumulation of steel inventories, the only parts of the economy moving up at a significant rate in recent months are home-building and state and local government activities. Other parts of the economy are increasing slowly, like consumer goods, or are declining, like machinery and business equipment.

Despite the Administration's glowing talk of a substantial pick-up, industrial production is still below the levels of last summer and about 5% less than at the peak reached in July 1969. Industry's operating rate is down to only 73% of productive capacity, the lowest since 1958, which was definitely a recession year.

In the face of these conditions, profits of non-financial corporations, in the first quarter, moved up 8% from a year ago, according to estimates of the First National City Bank of New York. Dividend payments increased. Bank profits continued to skyrocket—up 61% for J.P. Morgan, 60% for Cleveland Trust, 48% for First National City and 46% for Crocker National.

Poverty increased in 1970, according to the Census Bureau report. The 10-year trend of a continuing decline in the number of poor was reversed—up 1.2 million to 25.5 million.

Immediate government action is needed to create jobs and boost economic activities—to turn the economy around from stagnation to full employment.

We urge the Administration and the Congress to reject, without equivocation, the advice of bankers—American and foreign—to raise interest rates and adopt restrictive policies, which would increase unemployment to even more disastrous heights.

In fact, interest rates should be further reduced and maintained at a stable level well below that now prevailing.

We call for an early and thorough Congressional investigation of the recent international speculation against the American dollar, including the activities of American-owned international companies and banks, and the profits they made from undercutting their nation's currency.

## THE COTTER HEALTH PLAN: A PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP TO INCREASE THE QUALITY AND LESSEN THE COSTS OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, during my campaign and after the election, I made the problem of health care one of my primary interests.

Today I am introducing legislation that reflects my considered judgement on how best to handle what has been called the "health care crisis."

These facts are well known but bear repeating. The costs of health care are astronomical. During the last 10 years, the costs of health care have increased 17 percent per year. It is reasonably estimated that the cost of health care will be \$200 billion by the 1980's. The total cost in 1960 was \$26 billion.

Current insurance plans do not cover out-patient care, much less dental and vision care.

Medical manpower is a constant source of concern. By 1980, there will be a shortage of 26,000 doctors, 56,000 dentists, 210,000 nurses, and 432,000 paramedical personnel.

I do not have to recite before this House the areas of the country that have little or no medical capability. The problems are especially acute in our inner cities and in our rural areas.

Before I outline my proposals, I want to inform my colleagues about my general assumption and values.

First, I represent the city of Hartford, the insurance capital of the Nation. It is estimated that thousands of my constituents are involved in health insurance. I am not willing to see those jobs shipped to Baltimore, the home of the

Social Security Administration, until such time as it is shown that the insurance industry—scrupulously controlled as I will recommend—is unable to do the job.

Second, from my position as the Insurance Commissioner for the State of Connecticut for 6 years, I have become familiar with the problems of both quality health care and public-private health insurance coverage. Thus, I have studied in detail the strength and weakness of our health delivery system.

The proposal I am placing before the House today reflects this experienced study. I believe that there must be a partnership between private industry and government to assure the highest quality health care at the most reasonable cost.

The Cotter health plan is not cheap—medical care is not cheap, but my plan represents a distinct departure from the "business as usual" attitude that permeates the medical industry and the Government in the face of overwhelming evidence that this Nation now faces a health crisis. This crisis will worsen unless there is a new direction charted—and charted soon. That is what I am proposing today.

Briefly, my plan would establish minimal benefits that, when fully phased in, will provide better health coverage than is presently available. Under the terms of my bill all citizens will be covered.

Medical and dental insurance coverage for all citizens provided by expansion and upgrading of medicare, required employee health plans, individual health plans for the self-employed and State health plan pools for the poor and near poor.

Creation of Federal and State health planning councils which will control allocation of health resources, set hospital rates and doctors fees, control profits of health insurance carriers, set uniform medical and paramedical licensing standards and continually review the state of health care in the Nation.

Increase the supply of medical manpower by creating three new medical-dental schools associated with existing Army, Navy, and Air Force hospitals and by expanding student loans for budding doctors, nurses and paramedicals. Graduates of military medical schools and recipients of loans could serve several years in medically disadvantaged areas of the country to repay their obligations.

The bill is complicated because the subject matter is complicated. Complex problems do not yield to simple answers. Therefore, I want to take this opportunity to explain my proposal in detail.

#### HOW TO INCREASE COVERAGE

There are many suggestions about how to secure adequate health insurance coverage. One plan suggests that the best way to assure complete coverage is for the Federal Government to assume full and complete control of the health care of all citizens. Cost estimates for a fully Federal program of health care are between \$50 and \$80 billion. Other plans leave many citizens with inadequate coverage or coverage at high costs. I know from my experience as insurance commissioner of the State of Connecticut

for 6 years that health care is increasingly expensive and the health care system is plagued by inadequate planning and lack of resources. However, I do not believe that a complete Federal takeover is feasible or is, in the long run, cost-effective.

There remains the very practical need to provide adequate health coverage at a reasonable cost. Yet, such a basic health plan must be understood by the layman so that he can choose intelligently the type of coverage he requires. The best means to accomplish these goals is to establish a set of minimal, yet adequate, Federal standards for health care benefits that will be required of both governmental and private health insurance programs. This is what I am suggesting.

#### COTTER HEALTH PLAN

Under the Cotter plan, these minimal health standards will be increased in three phases and, when fully effective, December 31, 1978, each basic health insurance plan will be required to have these features:

##### COTTER HEALTH PLAN: MINIMAL BENEFITS

Cotter plan has minimal benefits phased in at three separate time periods so that the medical infrastructure can be "beefed up" to handle them. These minimal benefits will be fully phased in by December 31, 1978; however, the State health plan for the poor and near poor will be fully phased in by December 31, 1976.

The requirement of minimal benefits, which exceed most health insurance coverage today, allows the individual citizen to know exactly what coverage he is getting. Currently it takes a very skilled legal technician to understand the various insurance plans.

Other major provisions of the minimal benefits:

(a) Tax relief—There is a straight Federal tax deduction of up to \$700 for health insurance premiums.

(b) Catastrophic coverage—There is a limitation on the amount of copayments, coinsurance and deductibles, if any, an insured citizen will have to pay. The total cost of these payments will be a small percentage of his income.

Examples of benefits and copayments when minimal benefits are fully phased in by December 31, 1978. N.B.—All yearly copayments and deductibles, if any, are limited to a small percentage of yearly income.

##### NONCONSTITUTIONAL CARE

Each doctor's visit—insured pays \$2— for mental illness, insured pays 50 percent for all visits after initial six visits. Home visits—insured pay \$5.

Diagnostic tests, X-rays, laboratory analysis, electrocardiograms—insured pays nothing.

Family planning services and supplies—insured pays nothing.

Health checkups—  
For babies: 15 visits up to 6 years old—insured pays nothing;

For citizens 6-39: complete examination every 5 years—insured pays nothing;

For citizens 39 on: one complete examination every 2 years—insured pays nothing.

Dental care—

Annual oral examination including X-rays and cleaning—insured pays nothing;

Amalgam fillings, extractions, dentures—insured pays 20 percent.

Drugs approved by Secretary of HEW as life-sustaining—insured pays \$1 per prescription.

Rehabilitation—prosthetic devices, physical therapy, speech therapy—insured pays 20 percent.

Vision care—

Children under 19—annual examination and one set of glasses—insured pays nothing;

Citizens over 19—annual examination and one set of glasses—insured pays 50 percent.

#### INSTITUTIONAL CARE

Semiprivate or psychiatric care—per illness—insured pays \$10 the first day and \$5 per day thereafter—300 days maximum;

Skilled nursing home—insured pays \$2.50 per day—100 days maximum;

Approved home care—insured pays \$2 per day—270 days maximum;

Physician's services when institutionalized—insured pays \$2 per visit;

Maternity care, including prenatal and post-natal care—insured pays 20 percent.

#### CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE

In my bill, I specifically provide for catastrophic coverage by placing a limitation on the amount of copayments and deductibles. The aggregate amount of payments above the premium could not exceed \$800 for a family whose adjusted gross income is \$10,000, even though he may require treatment costing up to \$50,000.

The formula which is applied to all minimal benefits insurance is a limitation of 4 percent of adjusted gross income for all persons with an adjusted gross income of \$5,000, a limitation of 6 percent for persons with an adjusted gross income of from \$5,000 to \$7,500, and a limitation of 8 percent for those with an adjusted gross income of \$7,500 or more.

This is a major feature of the Cotter health plan. For the first time all citizens will have adequate medical coverage without courting bankruptcy.

#### WHO WILL BE COVERED?

Under my plan the minimal benefits will be included for medicare, all private health insurance plans, and all Federal and State health plans. Let me discuss each in turn.

#### THE ELDERLY

The coverage for medicare will be upgraded until it meets these minimal benefits. Where medicare exceeds this coverage, the higher medicare benefits will still be in effect.

In addition, my bill would open medicare to all persons not currently eligible for part A by requiring a \$27 per month payment. I have been informed that there are approximately 300,000 citizens over 65 who can take advantage of such a provision. In addition, I would extend medicare coverage to include widows and/or widowers with or without dependent children, the blind, and disabled, and early retirees who are now receiving

social security benefits. Other programs of medical insurance for citizens over 65 will have to provide these upgraded benefits as well as retirement health insurance provisions. The cost estimate for medicare is approximately \$7 billion over current medicare costs. The costs, while heavy, do extend and provide more comprehensive coverage to our elderly citizens. This is a just and necessary cost.

Since I have studied the problems of the aged, I realize that even small payments strike very deeply into the fixed incomes of our elderly citizens. Thus, under my plan, elderly citizens who cannot afford to meet their payments will be covered by the State insurance pool which I will describe shortly.

#### PRIVATE INSURANCE PLANS

Private health insurance plans cover most citizens under 65. Of the approximately 164,000,000 citizens under age 65, 103,000,000 are covered by some form of health insurance. Benefits and costs vary widely. Most citizens do not understand the nature of their medical coverage. Under the Cotter plan all the minimal benefits will be clearly defined by law. All supplemental benefits packages cannot have features already in the minimal package. Therefore, no double payments for the same benefits.

The establishment of minimal benefits will be accomplished by several means: First by tax deduction of \$700 to all citizens securing insurance with minimal benefits; second, insurance packages containing minimal benefits will be eligible for employers to use as tax deductions; third, and most important, requiring that each provider of health insurance meet these minimal standards as a condition for being licensed in each State.

Further, under my plan the employer as a condition for continuing employee health insurance as a tax break must not only provide the minimal benefits, but must pay 65 percent of cost immediately and 75 percent by 1975. Of course, collective bargaining can be used to increase the percentage or extend coverage.

I want to return to one point for a minute. Under my plan there would be a straight deduction with a \$700 maximum for each family's Federal income tax. The estimated revenue loss is \$3 billion. In doing this, my plan not only gives better coverage but allows higher tax deductions for the individual taxpayer while producing increased health coverage.

#### POOR OR NEAR POOR

One major problem with any comprehensive proposal is how to care for the poor and near poor. By applying the minimal benefits fully phased in by 1976, a State health care plan can meet the needs of our less fortunate citizens.

The State health care plan will be a State pool funded by State and Federal subsidies and by private insurers. It would have all the minimal benefits by 1976. These benefits stress preventive care and are, therefore, able to replace the discredited Medicaid program. Each citizen would be required to pay according to his financial ability, but he would receive better and more comprehensive

health care. For example, a family of four with an income of \$4,000 or less would contribute nothing to the premiums. A family of four with an income of \$5,000 would contribute \$15 monthly which would be a deduction from their Federal taxes.

In addition, the State health pool would be available to the "uninsurable" person although he would be required to pay the full premium charged by the State for covering a single individual. If the uninsurable person were a member of a family, the other members could secure whatever coverage they desired at the most reasonable cost.

Those poor citizens eligible for medicare under the old law or under the new provisions of this bill can have the State health care plan pay their premiums to medicare.

#### NEW ORGANIZATION FOR HEALTH CARE

Many of our current problems in health care are directly attributable to inadequate planning and a lack of effective and responsible administration.

The time is long past when we can afford to have people who have vested material interest in the health delivery system dominate and control that system. The State and Federal Governments must act constructively and forcefully in this area. Therefore, I am proposing to create in each State, a State health care planning council—SHPC.

#### STATE HEALTH PLANNING COUNCIL

Under my plan, each State will be required, within 1 year of enactment, to create a State health planning council. If it does not do this, it will not receive any Federal assistance related to health, including medicare, Hill-Burton, or any other Federal medical funds.

This SHPC will be composed of 15 members. It will be dominated by nine consumer-oriented members who have not had any prior connection for 5 years preceding their appointment with any organization which deals with any aspect of the medical delivery system. These nine members will be joined by two doctors, two hospital representatives, and two private insurers. They will be given great authority to determine the course of the health system within their State.

For example, the SHPC will be required, within the first 2 years, to establish a comprehensive State health plan that will serve as a guide to all State health efforts. And they will be given the power to implement this plan. They will, for example, be required to approve, or disapprove, the use of all Federal or State funds for any construction or any service related to health care. Secondly, they will be required on a periodic basis, to certify all health care facilities. Those health care facilities that are not certified cannot receive State or Federal funds and cannot be utilized in fulfillment of the minimal health benefits that I have already described.

This power will give the council the ability to rationalize the health delivery system. No longer will there be four or five acute cardiac wings within one city that go unused. No longer will there be duplication of costly equipment: For example, three cobalt treatment facilities

within close proximity. "Prestige" items will be subordinated to items of demonstrable and immediate long term value.

This State council will establish rates of reimbursement to hospitals and doctors. They will arrive at the figures for hospitals and health care costs by requiring each institution to submit a detailed budget which the council must approve. This approved budget will be the basis for allowable charges.

The council, as I have mentioned, will also set rates for doctor's fees that can be paid under the State health plan and the minimum benefits under approved employees' programs and qualified individual health care insurance plans.

Furthermore, this State council will have the power and the responsibility for overseeing the private health insurance industry. It is required to establish that all initial insurance packages by each insurer meet the minimal benefits as a condition for licensing with the State. Furthermore, the State planning council is to require that all supplemental insurance policies, those over the minimal benefits, do not include any element covered in the minimal benefits plan.

In addition, the council is required to secure from licensed health insurers, detailed audits based on the audit form prepared by the executive council of health advisers which I will describe below.

These audits are to be studied by the State policy council to insure that the profits are within the parameters established by the executive council; if the profits exceed this parameter, the State council is required to have the insurers reduce their premiums as a condition for the retention of their licenses.

The State council is further allowed to enter into intra- or inter-State health agreements to further the attainment of quality health care and is required to provide a yearly report to the executive council within the guidelines established by the executive council on the conditions of health care within the State.

The State health planning council will also have the authority to establish regional groups to meet the local problems although the council must retain the final authority over these local decisions.

#### THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF HEALTH ADVISERS

To assure nationwide coordination of the various means to attack the problems in our health care system, I am recommending the establishment of an Executive Council of Health Advisers.

This 12-member council will be comprised of six consumer representatives who have not had any connection with the health industry for 5 years preceding their appointment. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be a member of this Council.

The Executive Council is to report annually to the President and the Congress on the nationwide aspect of the health delivery system after detailed study of the annual reports of each State health planning council. The Executive Council then is required to make an early evaluation of this information and report directly to the relevant bureaucracy and legislative branch with recommendations for either regulations or legislation,

whichever is appropriate. It is necessary to have the Council report directly to the responsible agency or legislature because in all too many instances, commission reports, panels, and other similar recommendations are not effectively translated into bureaucratic regulations or legislative proposals.

As I mentioned before, the Executive Council is required to create uniform audit forms for private and public insurers that will be given to the State planning council. This uniform audit is to include costs and profits and the definition of profit will be exacting, so that no excess profits will be made by either public or private insurers. Excess profits must be used to reduce premiums.

The Executive Council is also required to produce, within 5 years, national certification and license procedures for all medical personnel, from doctors to paramedical personnel. These procedures will be enforced through the mechanisms established by the State planning council. It is necessary to define what each person is allowed to do within his sphere of competence. This problem has been graphically brought home by the sight of many qualified paramedics returning from Vietnam and not being allowed to perform even the most elementary functions in a hospital or outpatient care center. There must be professional licensing of these people so that all critical manpower needs in the health care area can be alleviated.

Finally, the Executive Council is required to prepare legislation to establish what will be an "FDIC" for all public and private health insurers within 2 years. This legislation must be mandatory for all private insurers.

#### HEALTH MANPOWER

The problems of the health delivery system will not be solved by new effective administration alone, although that is a crucial component of the Cotter plan.

We need more personnel and better distribution of resources and personnel.

First the personnel: This Nation needs more qualified personnel in health. Existing programs, while beneficial, must be supplemented, expanded and even, in places, radically changed.

I believe that loan programs should be expanded, not only in the size of the loan, but in what the loan can be used for. Medical students, nurses, and allied health personnel should be allowed to secure loans to cover tuition fees, and in addition, reasonable amounts for room and board, and supplies and other related costs. These will be long-term, low-interest loans, and there is a forgiveness feature that allows the loan to be significantly reduced if the individual serves in an area determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the State health planning council to be in need of these skills—the inner city and rural areas.

My bill also provides for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to contract with individuals or teams of health professionals to serve in areas of critical need. Thus, the bill provides the capability to channel more than ade-

quate medical resources into areas that now have little or no health capability.

My bill authorizes over \$300 million for these programs.

Federal health manpower programs will come under the purview of both the executive health planning council and the State health planning councils. They will study and determine both curriculum and certification of institutions and licensing of medical personnel. They could investigate the intriguing idea of "Capitation" whereby schools receive funds based on the number of qualified graduates they produce.

#### AMBULATORY HEALTH CARE CENTERS

During my recent campaign, I stressed the need to concentrate on more outpatient diagnosis and treatment. As I have already explained, the minimal health benefits specifically include and encourage outpatient care.

In title IV of my bill, I establish a new Federal governmental program to create ambulatory health care centers. The goals of these ambulatory centers are not solely restricted to diagnosis and treatment, but as well, to the detection and prevention of illness before it becomes serious.

High quality medical care must be available to all our citizens. This is one means to achieve this goal.

The exact nature of ambulatory health care centers should be determined by medical experts. Therefore, I have left the specifications for the contents of ambulatory health care centers to the experts. However, I have specified in my bill that the highest priority is to be given to those areas that are medically deficient.

This novel approach should be tested. Over-crowded, high-cost hospitals are not the place to perform routine examinations or tests and treatment. They should be used only by those who really need them. With this new outpatient capability, I believe we can have more effective utilization of our hospitals.

Incidentally, ambulatory health care centers can be attached to existing medical institutions or can be mobile units. A new medical delivery system should be aggressive in searching out disease and illness—not passive.

The ambulatory health care center concept, I submit, is a reasonable and necessary means to achieve this goal.

#### THE NEW MEDICAL-DENTAL MILITARY ACADEMIES

As I contemplated the lack of medical manpower, I was struck by the underutilization of military hospitals for teaching purposes. Since the end of World War II, there have been only six new fully operating medical schools and 10 new fully operating dental schools. I believe that we can supplement our doctor and dentist manpower needs in a very cost-effective way by establishing combination medical and dental academies for the Army, Air Force, and Navy.

Therefore, I have proposed in my bill that these medical-dental academies for each service be established. To save costs, these academies will utilize existing U.S. military hospitals.

The appointment procedure will be similar to those now used for the Service Academies, although the Secretary of Defense will work with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish the criteria for admittance. After completion of his academy training, the doctor or dentist must serve 3 years in the Armed Forces or in an alternative 3-year service approved by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I believe that this novel idea, coupled with the manpower programs I have suggested, will lessen the projected medical manpower shortage.

#### THE COTTER HEALTH PLAN—A BOONDOGGLE TO THE PRIVATE INSURANCE COMPANIES?

I specifically want to raise the question whether my plan is a large and costly gift to the private insurance industry? Given the nature of my constituency, this is a legitimate question.

Admittedly, my plan does continue the role of private health insurance. But more importantly, for the first time, it establishes control and direction over the entire health insurance industry.

How is this accomplished?

First, health insurance companies will have to provide minimal benefits so that each individual purchaser understands what he is getting.

Second, all supplemental benefits, those over and above the minimal benefits, cannot include parts of the minimal benefits package. Therefore, no double payment for the same benefit.

Third, again for the first time, public and private insurers will have limits set on profits. Excess profits must be returned to the consumer in the form of lower premium payments. I have carefully drawn the section on profits required in the universal audit so that there will be no leeway given to companies to hide profits.

Fourth, the State health planning council and the executive health planning council are dominated by consumer representatives. These members can have no prior connection with the health industries including insurance for 5 years preceding their appointment. This means that the regulations of the insurance industry will be under the jurisdiction of people who are most concerned about the effect of health insurance on the consumer.

Finally, I have required that all private health insurers join an FDIC-type of institution so that citizens will not be faced with companies going out of business and having no coverage.

These steps I feel will insure the highest professional competency of both public and private health insurers and still retain those incentives that are directly related to the retention of the private nature.

It should be noted in conclusion that the executive health planning council and the State health planning council will retain jurisdiction over the health industry and any loopholes in the bill can be rectified by either regulation or, if necessary, submission of stronger Federal legislation.



For the benefit of my colleagues and the readers of this RECORD, I am enclosing five appendixes that will give an overview of the Cotter health plan:

## APPENDIX A

## COTTER HEALTH PLAN: COVERAGE OF ALL CITIZENS

1. Aged—Aged and all citizens on Social Security except AFDC (welfare). Cotter plan expands and extends service of Medicare. Over 300,000 older citizens are not eligible for Medicare "A" and my plan allows them to join for \$27 per month. If Medicare or any other retirement health plan has benefits that exceed the minimum benefits, the better benefits are to remain in force. The elderly poor will have their Medicare premiums paid for by the State Health Plan: Part A, if necessary, and Part B, the supplementary benefits that are currently available to all elderly citizens.

2. Employee Health Plans—Most citizens will be covered under these plans. All employers must provide health insurance that meets the minimal benefits or not receive any tax breaks for providing health insurance. Furthermore, to receive this tax break, employers must pay for 65% of the plan and 75% by July 1, 1974.

3. Individual Health Plans—Covers self-employed or those not wishing to utilize one of the other plans. All insurers must provide an initial insurance policy that meets the minimal benefits. Any supplementary insurance must be clearly identified and not have the features included in the basic minimal benefits policy.

4. State Health Plans—Poor and near poor can join a state health insurance plan. It is funded by a combination of state, Federal and private insurance funds and stresses preventative care. Cost for purchase of this coverage is pro-rated on the ability to pay basis.

## APPENDIX B

## COTTER HEALTH PLAN: MINIMAL BENEFITS

Cotter Plan has minimal benefits phased in at three separate time periods so that the medical infrastructure can be "beefed up" to handle them. These minimal benefits will be fully phased in by December 31, 1978; however the State Health Plan for the poor and near poor will be fully phased in by December 31, 1976.

The requirement of minimal benefits, which exceed most health insurance coverage today, allows the individual citizen to know exactly what coverage he is getting. Currently it takes a very skilled legal technician to understand the various insurance plans.

Other major provisions of the Minimal Benefits:

(a) *Tax Relief*—There is a straight federal tax deduction of up to \$700 for health insurance premiums.

(b) *Catastrophic Coverage*—There is a limitation on the amount of co-payments, co-insurance and deductibles, if any, an insured citizen will have to pay. The total cost of these payments will be a small percentage of his income.

Examples of benefits and co-payments when minimal benefits are fully phased in by December 31, 1978 (N.B. All yearly co-payments and deductibles, if any, are limited to a small percentage of yearly income.):

## NON-INSTITUTIONAL CARE

Each doctors visit—insured pays \$2. For mental illness, insured pays 50% for all visits after initial six visits.

Home visits—insured pays \$5.

Diagnostic tests, x-rays, laboratory analysis, electrocardiograms—insured pays nothing.

Family planning services and supplies—insured pays nothing.

## Health check-up:

For babies: 15 visits up to 3 years old—insured pays nothing.

For citizens 6-39: complete examination every 5 years—insured pays nothing.

For citizens 39 on: one complete examination every 2 years—insured pays nothing.

## Dental care:

Annual oral examination including x-rays and cleaning—insured pays nothing.

Amalgam fillings, extractions, dentures—insured pays 20 percent.

Drugs approved by Secretary of HEW as life-sustaining—insured pays \$1 per prescription.

Rehabilitation—prosthetic devices, physical therapy, speech therapy—insured pays 20 percent.

## Vision care:

Children under 19—annual examination and one set of glasses—insured pays nothing.

Citizens over 19—annual examination and one set of glasses—insured pays 50 percent.

## INSTITUTIONAL CARE

Semi-private or psychiatric care—per illness—insured pays \$10 the first day and \$5 per day thereafter—300 days maximum.

Skilled nursing home—insured pays \$2.50 per day—100 days maximum.

Approved home care—insured pays \$2 per day—270 days maximum.

Physician's services when institutionalized—insured pays \$2 per visit.

Maternity care, including prenatal and post-natal care—insured pays 20 percent.

## APPENDIX C

## COTTER HEALTH PLAN: NEW HEALTH DELIVERY SYSTEM

## STATE HEALTH PLANNING COUNCILS

Each State is required to have a 15 member council (9 of whom are consumer representatives).

## State Councils the required to:

Develop a comprehensive State Health Plan within two years which eliminates medically deprived areas within the State.

Approve the use of all federal and state medical funds to avoid duplication and to proceed according to the comprehensive State Health Plan.

Certify all health institutions including hospitals, outpatient clinics, nursing homes, etc.

Establish rates for health care institutions by prior approval of the health care institutions' budgets.

Establish rates for medical services including doctors' fees.

Control public and private insurers by requiring stringent audit procedures, regulating the rate of profit, requiring excess profits be used for the reduction of premiums, and by requiring all insurers to have minimal benefits in order to be licensed in the State.

## EXECUTIVE HEALTH PLANNING COUNCIL

White House Agency composed of 12 advisors (6 of whom are consumer representatives).

## Executive Council is required to:

Conduct a continuing review of the national health delivery system, and to submit regulations and legislation to eliminate the deficiencies as identified.

Prepare a detailed audit to be used by the State Health Planning Councils to determine profits of insurers and require that excessive profits be used to reduce premiums.

Set uniform medical licensing standards for all medical personnel from doctors to paramedics, thus allowing paramedics to perform certain functions for which they qualify.

Submit legislation to the Congress within 2 years to establish an FDIC-type of government agency that would guarantee the finan-

cial solvency of insurers so, should they fail, the customers would be protected.

## APPENDIX D

## COTTER HEALTH PLAN: NEW CHANGES IN THE MEDICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

## New Army, Navy, Air Force Medical-Dental Academies:

Use the existing major military hospitals e.g., Walter Reed-Army, Bethesda-Navy, Wilford Hall, Texas-Air Force, to train new doctors and dentists.

Require these doctors and dentists to serve either in the Armed Services for three years or for this same period of time in medically-deprived areas determined by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

## More Medical Manpower:

Expanded the size of student loans to aspiring doctors, dentists, nurses and paramedics and allow the loans to include living expenses. Do this by providing almost \$300 million additional loan capacity. Encourage service in medically-deprived areas by forgiving loans at the rate of 1/3 a year for service in these areas.

The Executive Council is required to establish certification and license standards so that paramedics can perform services for which they are qualified, thus relieving the doctors from many routine chores.

The Secretary of HEW is allowed to contract directly with medical personnel to serve in medically-deprived areas.

Discourage the over-utilization of hospitals by the provision of new ambulatory Health Care Centers to encourage out-patient care. My plan provides over \$200 million per year for this necessary program.

Discourage the construction of "prestige" items that are duplicated within the same region. The State Health Planning Council will have to approve all construction within its established Comprehensive state-wide health plan.

## Require strict control over medical costs.

All health institutions, including hospitals, outpatient clinics, and nursing homes, in the state must submit a budget to the State Health Planning Council. The budget, as approved by the State Council, will be the basis for fees that the institutions will charge.

In addition, the State Health Planning Council is to set up a schedule for fees for all services prescribed under minimal benefits, including medical services.

## APPENDIX E

## COTTER HEALTH PLAN: IS IT A BOONDOGGLE FOR THE PRIVATE INSUROR?

Cotter Plan does continue a role for the private health insurance industry but the industry must submit to new and more stringent controls.

1. The insurer will be required to report his profits. I have carefully drawn the section on profits to include various funds that are conveniently described as operating expenses but, in effect, produce profits. Excessive profits must be turned into lower premiums.

2. Each insurer in the state must provide minimal benefits. The customers then have the capacity to shop around for the least costly program.

3. All supplementary benefits will have to be identified as such and cannot have coverage identical to minimal benefits. Therefore, citizens will not pay double for the same coverage.

4. The State Health Planning Council and Executive Health Planning Council responsible for controlling the insurance industry, both public and private, are dominated by consumer representatives—9 of the 15 members of the State Health Planning Council and 6 of the 12 members of the Executive

Council are to be consumer representatives who have had no prior connection with the health industry for the preceding 5 years.

5. Finally, the consumer is protected by the requirement that the public and private insurer must join a FDIC type of agency that will protect the consumer from an insurer blandly announcing he is going out of business.

#### WRIGHT PATMAN, A LEGISLATURE'S LEGISLATOR

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make a few remarks about a Member of this body who, in my opinion, is one of the greatest public servants this country has ever known, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, from the First District of Texas, Chairman, of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. WRIGHT PATMAN has not only passed many milestones in his congressional career, but, to my mind, from my own personal experience of having served on the Banking and Currency Committee with him, and having worked with him over the years, he is one of the most unselfish Members of Congress I have ever met, and one who is consummately dedicated to legislating in the public interest. He is, in my opinion, a legislature's legislator. I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to observe that on May 4, a statement appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD announcing the resignation of the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN as the ranking majority member of the permanent Select Committee on Small Business. Mr. Speaker, few people know the reason why Mr. PATMAN resigned from this committee, which he originally chaired and which was created as a result of a resolution passed in this body, which he introduced in 1941. I do not think that it would be violating a confidence to indicate that WRIGHT PATMAN resigned from the committee at the request of the Speaker in order to provide another position on a major committee to which a more junior Member could be appointed. This one instance, out of many more I could mention, is a superb indication of the unselfishness of this great man.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk for hours about the great accomplishments of the Congressman from the First District of Texas, but at this point I will limit my remarks to just some of his accomplishments within the area of small business since the Committee on Small Business was created in 1941.

The Select Committee on Small Business was first created in 1941 as a result of House approval of a resolution which was introduced by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas. Mr. PATMAN was appointed by Speaker Rayburn to head this committee and did so from 1941 to 1963—with two exceptions when the minority party was in control of the Congress. In 1963, upon assuming the chairmanship of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. PATMAN resigned as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business.

Among some of the important earlier acts which emanated from the studies

and planning of the Select Committee on Small Business was the action taken on May 11, 1942, when President Roosevelt signed into law a bill which Chairman PATMAN introduced for the relief of dealers in rationed articles. This law provided relief to dealers in automobiles, tires, and gasoline.

Also, during this time, Chairman PATMAN introduced a bill in 1942 which became law that mobilized the productive facilities of small businesses for World War II. This act—the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act of 1942—provided for the creation of a Smaller War Plants Corporation, under the War Production Board, to handle procurement for small businesses, authorized a revolving fund of \$100 million for loans to finance conversion to war production or essential civilian production, and authorized purchases of production facilities for lease to small business. President Roosevelt signed the bill on June 11, 1942.

In 1951, legislation introduced by Chairman PATMAN was enacted into law by President Truman providing for the creation of a Small Defense Plants Corporation to take prime contracts and subdivide them among small business enterprises. A small Defense Plants Administration was set up as a separate agency as an amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 and this law was signed by President Truman on July 31, 1951.

Among some of the more important and extensive hearings conducted by the House Select Committee on Small Business were those conducted under the chairmanship of Mr. PATMAN in 1952 which inquired into the problems of small business at the time. This was one of the most extensive hearings conducted by any committee of Congress. The committee traveled to 43 different States and held days of hearings to hear from representatives of small business on their pressing problems and needs of the day.

In 1958, again as the result of findings of the House Select Committee on Small Business, Public Law 85-866 was enacted, which repealed sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which had imposed unnecessary hardships on small business concerns. Also in the 85th Congress, as a result of the work of this committee, amendments were enacted into law to the Packers and Stockyards Act, which closed a loophole being used by national chains to claim exemption from anti-trust enforcement. In addition, in this same Congress, Public Law 85-800 was enacted which revised the law governing Federal procurement and contracting methods, which, among other things, eliminated the redtape and expense of the competitive bid procedure with regard to contracts which small business concerns might be expected to fulfill.

In the 85th Congress, legislation was enacted assisting small business which repealed the 3-percent tax on freight shipped by common carrier, thereby removing a competitive advantage enjoyed by large corporations having company-owned trucking systems.

Finally in the 85th Congress, the Small Business Investment Company Act, introduced by Chairman PATMAN, was en-

acted into law which set up small business investment companies and authorized investment financing through appropriated funds, rather than through public debt transactions. This law, as we all know, is most important because it provided for the first time for the greatest needs of small business—equity capital and long-term capital.

In the 87th Congress, legislation emanating, again from studies done within the Select Committee on Small Business, was enacted to amend the Small Business Investment Act to facilitate the formation and growth of small business investment companies by increasing the amount of investment company debentures that could be purchased by SBA.

Most recently, in the last Congress, 91st, legislation was enacted from studies done by the Foundations Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business to provide necessary controls over private foundations. This was much-needed legislation and will go a long way toward correcting many of the abuses which private nontaxpaying foundations have engaged in over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Congressman PATMAN, the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

#### A MISSION TO PARIS

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1971, I was privileged to participate in a special order on American POW/MIA servicemen. At that time, I informed my distinguished colleagues of a campaign underway in Rochester, N.Y., to acquire expressions of support in the form of letters and signatures on petitions, to be sent to the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris.

In late April, a delegation chosen by the Rochester POW/MIA Committee departed for Paris with over 117,000 expressions of support. Upon their arrival, these determined individuals immediately sought to arrange a meeting with the North Vietnamese. The situation was certainly discouraging. They were private citizens, on their own, in a foreign land. They had no assistance from our Embassy, nor did they seek such assistance. They were on their own. The North Vietnamese refused to see them, despite the delegation's persistent theme that it was a group of private citizens, on a mission of love. Heaped upon these depressing factors was the knowledge that only a handful of the 281 groups which preceded them had been able to see the North Vietnamese. It would have been easy to throw in the towel and return home unsuccessful. But they did not; they started making telephone calls to the North Vietnamese delegation. Call back later, they were told. And they did. Call back tomorrow, said the North Vietnamese and they did. It took over 70 telephone calls, but the North Vietnamese finally agreed to see them.

It is with a deep sense of pride that I point out the diligence, the commitment, and the stick-to-it-iveness of these

Rochesterians. But their impressive performance did not end there. During their meeting, with the North Vietnamese, they handed themselves very well indeed. Because of their professional approach to discussions with the North Vietnamese representatives, the meeting was a long one—lasting over an hour—and a detailed one, characterized by a frank exchange of views on many aspects of the POW question.

Their account of the meeting, entitled "A Mission to Paris," is fascinating reading, and I include it for the benefit of my distinguished colleagues:

#### A MISSION TO PARIS

Report on a meeting on April 28, 1971 between North Vietnamese delegates to the Paris Peace Talks and five members of the Rochester, N.Y., POW/MIA delegation: Mr. Warren Doremus, Mrs. Carol Bushart, Mrs. Josephine Christiano, Mrs. Florence DeWispelaere, Mr. Michael Demma.

On Wednesday afternoon, April 21, 1971, a five-member delegation of citizens from the Rochester, New York, area left the Monroe County airport on a flight to Paris, France, in behalf of American prisoners of war and men missing in action in Indochina. This mission climaxed a three month campaign to secure signatures on petitions and letters calling upon the Vietnamese Communists to live up to the articles of the Geneva Convention and provide humane treatment for the war prisoners they hold.

The delegation consisted of Mrs. Carol Bushart, housewife and mother from Greece, Mr. Michael Demma, Eastman Kodak chemist, from Chili, Mrs. Josephine Christiano, mother and housewife, from Irondequoit, Mrs. Florence DeWispelaere, housewife, mother, private secretary, from Penfield, and Mr. Warren Doremus, husband, father, and television newsman, from East Rochester.

Mrs. Christiano's husband, Lt. Colonel Joseph Christiano, was shot down over South Vietnam December 24, 1965, while flying with the U.S. Air Force. He has been missing ever since. Mrs. Bushart's brother-in-law, Major Lawrence Perrine, U.S.A.F., was shot down over Hanoi in May of 1967, and is MIA. Mrs. DeWispelaere's oldest son, M/Sgt. Rexford DeWispelaere, U.S.A.F., disappeared after his plane was knocked out of the skies over Laos, November 24, 1969, and he, too, is MIA. Mr. Doremus's youngest brother, Commander Robert B. Doremus, was shot down while flying over Thanh Hoa, North Vietnam, August 24, 1965, and is acknowledged by the North Vietnamese to be a prisoner of war. Mr. Demma is not, as far as he knows, related to anyone on the POW or MIA lists, but is a much concerned citizen who interested himself in the campaign through his association with the Rochester Jaycees (Junior Chamber of Commerce), which organization helped launch the campaign. Mr. Demma and Mrs. Bushart were co-chairmen of the campaign which used the title, Remember our POW's-MIA's.

More than one hundred seventeen thousand people in the Rochester area contributed their names to expressions of concern about the welfare of American war prisoners. Many took pains to write their own letters, some of which touchingly told of deep concern for the lives of men who had long been separated from their families, and possibly would never see freedom again. These one hundred seventeen thousand letters and petition signatures were bundled into three large canvass sacks for transport to France, and accompanied the Rochester delegation on their mission to Paris.

Many others participated in the campaign which led up to the journey of April 21st, including relatives of the other local men who are either POW or MIA in Indochina: Spec/5 Frances George Graziose, Army man lost in action in Northern South Vietnam,

near Da Nang, January 10, 1970; Lt. Commander James R. Dennison, shot down over the South China Sea, January 1, 1968, while flying with the U.S. Navy; and Captain Bruce R. Archer, U.S.M.C., shot down over the Au Shau Valley, South Vietnam, March 29, 1968, and known to be a prisoner.

Our farewell to loved ones and friends at the airport terminal followed many wishes of good luck given us by those who came to say goodbye, and by countless others who helped in the long campaign, including those many generous fund contributors without whom the journey would not have been possible.

We were about twenty thousand feet over the Southern tier of New York when the next good luck wish was expressed to us. The public address system of our American airliner snapped on and the ship's captain acknowledged the presence of the delegation, saying a couple of the men flying this aircraft were former military pilots, and that their hearts went out to us.

That evening, in Pan American's Clipper Club room at New York's Kennedy International Airport, we were interviewed by reporters from the Associated Press and Agence France Press, both of whom no doubt were rather skeptical of the prospects for a successful trip, but who wished us the best. We would need all these good wishes, because there was to be nothing easy about this mission to Paris.

At nine-thirty, A.M., Paris time, our 747 jet had landed at Orly field. Less than thirty minutes later, we made our first contact with the Vietnamese Communist delegation to the Peace Talks. Nearly a hundred calls later, on Tuesday, April 27, the North Vietnamese agreed to give us an audience.

The six days intervening were filled with frustration and worry over the possibility of an unsuccessful mission. We had been prepared to use alternate means of getting the attention of the Vietnamese Communists, realizing these would not have nearly the impact of a face-to-face meeting.

One of the major reasons for our success was the tireless effort of a young Frenchman who we will identify here as Jean, and of his friend, Christian. He and she, both fluent in English as in their native tongue, made all the contacts with the Vietnamese Communists, whose official language in Paris is French. Without the help of these very special people—who worked with and for us without pay—we probably would not have arrived at our goal. Their's was a labor of love.

And that is what really describes this mission to Paris. We had said, in cablegrams the week before to the Vietnamese Communist Peace Talk delegates, that we were coming to France not to carry on the war, but to deal with part of the tragedy of war. Our purpose was to ease the plight of Americans who had become prisoners of that war, and, hopefully, to end the anxiety experienced by so many of their families. We went on this mission, we said, in a spirit of goodwill. And, we had something new to propose that might be acceptable to the Vietnamese Communists, something which would give them a chance to prove their claim that P-O-W's are being treated humanely.

At exactly eleven o'clock, Paris time, Wednesday, April 28, we met with representatives of the government of North Vietnam.

#### THE MEETING

Number 2, rue Le Verrier, is the address of the Delegation General of North Vietnam. It is a typical large and old French home in the Montparnesse section of Paris. It is three stories tall, and is made of a reddish-brown stone. The structure is located on a corner, and all around it are security forces of the French government. We saw several uniformed police officers, and at least one grey-

suited detective who winced as we told him he was rather obvious.

A woman we presumed to be French answered our ring at the door. "Cinq personnes?", she asked "Oui", said our interpreter, as he identified the Rochester delegation. In this case, he was referring to four of the upstate New Yorkers and himself. In those dozens of calls earlier he had been talking about the full Rochester group, of course. What had happened was that, in agreeing to the audience, the North Vietnamese, for reasons best known to them, said they would allow just five people, and our interpreter had to be one of them.

Mrs. DeWispelaere volunteered to relinquish her opportunity to be a participant, and later was to say that it didn't really matter, "as long as we were represented". Her unselfish act earned her the gratitude and admiration of all concerned. Each of us was deeply sorry she could not be present, and our hearts were heavy as we walked through the large wood door to the entranceway of this usually inaccessible place, and she had to remain outside.

We were ushered into a first-floor room about fifteen-by-twenty feet. It had a drawing room character. The walls were painted in light grey, there was a brown plush scatter rug on the floor, and U-shaped green velvet chairs were placed on either side in the center of the room toward the fireplace end. A couch of the same material and color was backed toward the hearth above which was a large mirror, framed in gold. There was a vase of artificial red roses by the mirror, and a grouping of white and grey marble-top cocktail tables between the chairs and couch. A big picture of Ho Chi Minh, founder of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, as North Vietnam is officially called, looked down upon us. Sunlight came through a large curtained window.

Our group was introduced to two North Vietnamese men, the first and second secretaries of the Delegation General, Mr. Vo Van Sung. They were asked for their names, but they did not give them. These men were small in stature, one about forty, the other perhaps forty-five-ish, both dressed in dark grey or charcoal colored suits. They were diplomatically cordial, and business-like. They never once raised their voices for emphasis, nor did we. One of the North Vietnamese did virtually all the talking for his side. The other took some notes. Although Mr. Doremus sat next to this man, he was not able to ascertain what the notes were about.

The First Secretary, the man who was to do all the talking for the North Vietnamese, launched into a diatribe on the policies of President Nixon regarding the war, emphasizing the necessity of having these policies changed. He went on to say that nothing could be done about prisoners of war until all U-S troops are withdrawn from Indochina. He indicated prisoners would be released when such withdrawal takes place. We said that if this were true, Vietnamese Communist policy had not been made altogether clear in the United States, and we pursued the subject by asking the First Secretary if he meant by what he said that American prisoners would automatically gain their freedom upon total U-S troop withdrawal, or whether he meant that only discussion of prisoner release would follow such withdrawal. The First Secretary said Vietnamese Communist policy had been made public last year, apparently referring to the points contained in Madame Nguyen Thi Binh's statement of last fall. He thus confirmed our suspicion that what he meant by what he said was that only discussion was guaranteed by a full withdrawal of U-S forces.

The First Secretary said that, traditionally, the question of prisoners of war is settled only after a war has been concluded. He went to criticize the President again, de-

claring that Mr. Nixon has misled the American people and tried to deceive the Vietnamese Communists by insisting that he won't pull out all U-S troops until every American P-O-W has been released, "knowing he can always say there are still some prisoners being held."

The Rochester delegation asked about the treatment of prisoners of war, and the First Secretary responded by saying our men are being treated well. He produced printed folders showing pictures of some U-S servicemen captured, and containing other pictures and copy designed to show that while Americans are being treated well the reminders of American bombing and devastation from the air are all about North Vietnam. The folders were contained in a white envelope, and each of us received the package.

We questioned the First Secretary further about U-S prisoner of War conditions, mentioning, among other things, the availability of mail privileges. We were told that communication does exist, that packages and letters from P-O-W families are being received by the prisoners, and that they are allowed to write.

The First Secretary produced a book in which was outlined the dimensions of the infamous "Tiger cage" of South Vietnam, examined by some persistent U-S Congressmen last year on a trip to South Vietnam. He used this to illustrate his contention that there is reason for worry on the part of South Vietnamese Communists about the ways their prisoners are being treated. We suggested we were very much concerned about any inhumane treatment prisoners might receive at the hands of our allies, but that we thought except in rare cases—the "Tiger cages" being such an exception—treatment was in accordance with international standards. We pointed to the fact that we allow inspection of our camps for prisoners, and we asked why, if such worry exists on the part of his people, would this not be a commanding reason for prisoner exchange, thus relieving both sides of mutual anxiety?

The answer was evasive. We heard a repetition of the stand that only when the war had concluded could there be a release of prisoners.

Letters and petitions, such as the one hundred-seventeen thousand we had brought to Paris with us were unacceptable, said the First Secretary, because they were inspired by President Nixon. In other words, it was the President who was responsible for all this mail not the people who wrote.

We advised the North Vietnamese we were here not as representatives of President Nixon's policies, nor of those opposed to the President, but as free citizens concerned about the treatment of helpless prisoners of war, and concerned, too, about the families of these men. We did not come to discuss the politics of the war, but rather the humanity of Americans taken prisoner. The First Secretary said the issues are inseparable, that one depends upon the other.

Our delegation brought up the question of men missing in action. The First Secretary reached to the cocktail table in front of him for a printed list of the men the North Vietnamese claim to hold prisoners. He said the list is complete, these men whose names are written on it are all they know anything about. Was it possible, we asked, that men are being held prisoner in the jungles of South Vietnam but that poor communications and record keeping made the list less than complete? The answer was "No".

Couldn't there be published a list of the U.S. servicemen the Vietnamese Communists know to be dead? The First Secretary said that when planes go down in thick jungle or into deep bodies of water there is no trace of personnel. How about pilots and other crewmen who crash in urban or suburban areas, easily accessible? The answer was evasive,

something about the fact, as the First Secretary put it, that this rarely happened and when it did explosion and fire made identification impossible. Even to the extent that dog tags were lost? Well, we don't have any such information. "Ask President Nixon about these men", said the First Secretary, "He sent them on their missions. He should know where they are."

Would these two, we inquired, accept a list of the five Rochester area men missing in action, to make one more check with their records in Hanoi, to be sure? The First Secretary said the list is complete, there was no reason to accept our list.

We asked if we might be permitted to leave with the North Vietnamese three sample letters from the thousands we brought to Paris. They said no, but we could, if we wished, have our interpreter quote from them. (The letters quoted were written by 12 year old Ronald Doescher, a sixth grade student at Klem Road School, Webster; Mrs. Malcolm D. Strong, wife of a farmer on Benson Road in Victor, and William Nicht-hauser, a postal worker who lives on South Goodman Street in Rochester.) The reaction was no more than acknowledgment by the First and Second Secretaries that they understood what had been read to them.

The Rochester delegation asked about reports from some of the nine servicemen released by the North Vietnamese that U.S. prisoners of war are mistreated, abused, sometimes tortured, placed in solitary confinement. The First Secretary replied by alleging that these former prisoners who made such statements were told by our government to make them—for propaganda purposes. He said it "would be stupid for us to have released men who had been tortured or mistreated when their stories would reflect adversely on their captors." The First Secretary admitted there may have been some minor cases of mistreatment, but he said that in times of war such things are unavoidable. Inferring that at least some former P-O-W's were grateful for the treatment received, he tried to tell us that a released prisoner had visited the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris. Pressed on this point by several of us, the First Secretary guessed the man's name was Douglas. We were not able to secure any more information on this.

We asked why the nine men released by North Vietnam had been chosen. The answer was they were selected at random as a goodwill gesture, and there was no special reason for having picked those particular individuals.

Were the prisoners living in scattered sites or in a central location? The First and Second Secretaries said they didn't know. (Since this information was top secret, we of course would never be told about it even if these officials knew the answer. The question was not planned in advance, by the way.)

Would there likely be more goodwill prisoner releases before the war ends? "It is entirely up to President Nixon, and his policy on the war", was the reply.

We could sense that the time allocated by the North Vietnamese for this conference was about up, so we made our proposal for a new approach to relieving some of the anxiety of American families of P-O-W's. We proposed that, as a gesture of goodwill, and, more importantly, as a means of reassuring Americans, especially families of prisoners, that what the Vietnamese Communists say is true, that P-O-W's are being humanely treated, that a picture of each man they hold be taken and sent to their families in the United States. We would supply a camera and all the film necessary for that purpose.

The First Secretary said that there was no need for us to supply photo equipment, they had these things. But, he said, the proposal will be taken under consideration. He gave us reason to believe the idea would be communicated to his government for study.

The meeting concluded with mutual expressions of hope that the war would soon end, and that all prisoners could be returned to their homes. The First Secretary said he hoped the people of North Vietnam and Rochester could one day be friends.

Exactly one hour had passed. We had been offered cups of oriental tea, jasmine, we thought, and copies of the Vietnam Courier, a newspaper printed in English, and the little pamphlets mentioned earlier in this report.

Those with coats took them from an old fashioned rack on the stairway and we departed as we had come, through the front door. The sun was shining brightly for the first time in four days in Paris, and we somehow felt as we stood outside the Delegate General's quarters that this meeting, this whole campaign, just might have done some good.

We had done our best.

Mr. Speaker, the five members of this delegation—Mr. Warren Doremus, Mrs. Carol Bushart, Mrs. Josephine Christiano, Mrs. Florence DeWispelaere, and Mr. Mike Demma—will be in Washington on May 13, to discuss their experiences in closed session with interested Representatives and Senators, at 9:30 a.m., in room EF 100 of the Capitol. They will also hold a press conference at 11 a.m. in room 135 of the Cannon Building. I urge all interested Members to attend, as the group will discuss not only the meeting with the North Vietnamese but also the tedious process of arranging it.

#### AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

(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, as of today American men have been held as prisoners of war in Southeast Asia for 7 years and 40 days. Since Capt. Floyd Thompson was captured in South Vietnam on March 26, 1964, to become the first POW in Southeast Asia, more than 1,550 other American servicemen have joined the ranks of those listed as prisoners or missing in action.

During this time the North Vietnamese have consistently failed, or refused as the case may be, to abide by the Geneva Convention agreements signed by their Government, South Vietnam, the United States, and 123 other nations. The Convention requires participating nations to: First, permit inspections of prison facilities by impartial bodies like the Red Cross; second, immediately identify all prisoners; third, release the sick and wounded; fourth, provide adequate diet and medical care; fifth, refrain from subjugating prisoners to mental and physical duress or torture; and, sixth, allow free flow of mail between the prisoners and their families. None of these have been adhered to by the enemy in spite of repeated efforts by official and unofficial groups.

This charge of noncompliance was confirmed by Dr. Dang Tan, a former Communist Party official in North Vietnam, who defected 20 months ago and who was quoted in the May 11 edition of the Washington Post as saying the Communists usually put the prisoners on parade through the streets of Hanoi and

other cities. In the same article Dr. Tan said:

American POWs are subjected to all brutal interrogation methods which the North Vietnamese skillfully employ to extract information from them. This includes brainwashing and political indoctrination. It is the objective of the Central Committee policies to win over the minds of the American POWs.

Dr. Dang Tan further charged that:

The Central Committee of North Vietnam considers that American POW's must be intensively exploited, both for strategic, intelligence, and propaganda purposes. The Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of National Defense of North Vietnam compete with each other for the exploitation of American POW's.

North Vietnam—

According to this defector—

blatantly violates the International Geneva Convention of 1949 for the humane treatment of POW's by permitting other communist bloc countries, including the Soviet Union, Communist China, Cuba and others, to exploit the American POW's. This includes trying to take advantage of the families and friends of these POW's in the United States.

The President has announced, and rightly so, that there can be no total withdrawal from Vietnam until the release of these American POW's is assured. He has agreed to cooperate in an effort to enlist a neutral country to supervise the repatriation of the prisoners, but the Communists have rejected such a plan. A similar arrangement was made in World War II with Sweden.

Those who believe that North Vietnam would immediately release all POW's once the United States accomplishes total withdrawal should read and reread the words of Dr. Dang Tan, referred to previously, who said in Saigon that Hanoi will not release all the American prisoners "now or in the future" because:

The Communists believe the POW's are very competent and will be useful to them in the future. They are trying to use their talents now . . . Those POW's will not have a chance to go home.

As I have said previously, the Congress must do everything within its power to assist the families of our prisoners of war and men missing in action as well as continue to explore every route to obtain just treatment and release for the servicemen themselves.

If those who demonstrated here in recent days want an honorable cause, let them call on Hanoi—since they seem to be on such intimate terms as evidenced by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese flags they carried—to release their fellow-countrymen who have languished in prison for 7 years and 40 days to guarantee and perpetuate human freedom and dignity around the world. But so long as those men remain enslaved, no one knows total freedom.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S NEW PROPOSALS TO BRING FISCAL RELIEF TO OUR STATES AND CITIES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message more than 3 months ago, President Nixon outlined his new proposals to bring fiscal relief to our States and cities. Included in that message was the recommendation for a program of \$5 billion in general revenue sharing with the States, a proposal which has evoked much discussion both here in the Congress and across the land.

Along with many of my colleagues, I have had certain reservations about this innovative legislation, and, for that matter, I am still not completely satisfied with this proposal. But after giving considerable thought to this problem, including numerous discussions with governors, mayors, and other municipal and local officials, I am satisfied that we have a very real fiscal crisis in our States and municipalities that is sweeping across this Nation—and that we must face up to it.

And while we here in the Congress grope about for solutions and alternatives, the financial crunch of the States grows progressively worse. I am convinced we cannot afford much further delay, and am, therefore, today joining as a cosponsor of the administration's revenue sharing bill because something must be done, and because I believe this to be a sound and workable approach.

We here in Washington have for years been compounding the burdens and responsibilities of our States and municipalities—now it is time for us to act and make accessible to those levels of government the resources commensurate with their responsibilities. I believe the President's revenue sharing proposal to be the best alternative available to achieve that urgent goal.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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 1846 Elias Howe received a patent for the sewing machine that he had invented. At first he could not interest American manufacturers, but his machine eventually revolutionized the clothing industry in the United States.

#### MEET ARCHIE DAVIS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to formally announce to my distinguished colleagues the election of Mr. Archie K. Davis, chairman of the board of the Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., in Winston-Salem, N.C., to the office of president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

This is, of course, a very great honor for Mr. Davis, and it is also an honor for the people of the Fifth District of

North Carolina, which Mr. Davis calls home.

As chairman of the board of the largest bank in the South Mr. Davis has ample experience and expertise to lead the national chamber of commerce through what promises to be one of its most exciting and progressive years.

In his new office as president of the chamber of commerce, Mr. Davis will come into increasingly greater contact with the Members of this House, giving them the benefit of the business community's position on the great issues facing the Nation, and also adding his own wisdom and leadership to those efforts.

To afford my colleagues the opportunity of getting better acquainted with Mr. Davis, I ask at this time permission to enter into today's RECORD an article entitled "Meet Archie Davis," which appeared in the May 3, 1971, edition of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Washington Report.

#### MEET ARCHIE DAVIS, 44TH PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL CHAMBER

The 44th President of the National Chamber is a Southern gentleman of the old school. But underneath his courtly demeanor there lies an imaginative, aggressive executive fully attuned to today's world.

As chairman of the board of the South's largest bank, Wachovia Bank and Trust in Winston-Salem, N. C., he is one of the prime movers of the New South . . . the modern, industrial, Twentieth Century South.

He joined Wachovia as a management trainee in 1932, after graduation from the University of North Carolina. At the time the bank had assets of about \$47 million. Today, the parent company, Wachovia Corp., has assets of \$2.3 billion. It is known throughout the United States for its innovative, competitive marketing techniques.

Mr. Davis is well equipped by experience to assume the heavy responsibilities of Chamber leadership.

He has been president of the American Bankers Association, has served two terms in the North Carolina Senate, has been a director of the Charlotte Branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, and has been a vice president and member of the board of directors of both the National and Winston-Salem Chambers.

Mr. Davis also finds time to serve as president of the foundation which established the fabulous Research Triangle, connecting three of North Carolina's great universities, as chairman of the North Carolina Foundation of Church Related Colleges, and as a director of American Telephone and Telegraph Co., Southern Railway Co., Chatham Manufacturing Co., Sellers Dyeing Co., Jordan Spinning Co. and Royal Cotton Mills.

In addition to his banking prowess, Mr. Davis is known as one of the country's leading amateur experts on the Civil War. The walls of his office in the gleaming Wachovia tower are lined with mementoes of that conflict—many of them relating to banking and finance. There is a fascinating story connected with most of them, which Mr. Davis gladly relates with the hypnotic style of a born raconteur.

He is a dedicated member of the Moravian Church, and plays a baritone horn for the church band—a hobby he took up at the tender age of 45. He is also one of the best par-3 golfers in the country.

Mr. Davis traces his ancestry to a hardy band of Moravian pioneers, who originated in the area of present-day Czechoslovakia and in 1800 were driven from their homeland, eventually settling the Winston-Salem area in 1753.

Mr. Davis considers inflation the Number

One problem faced by the United States. He also strongly feels that "there needs to be more leadership at the local level. And there must be a rather dramatic step-up of activity in terms of our responsibility to the community we live in."

He intends to carry that message from one end of the country to the other in an extensive series of meetings, probably next fall. They will focus attention on the problems of the nation and how the business community believes they can be attacked.

Mr. Davis and his wife, Mary Louise, have four children:

Archie H. Davis is a vice president of rival Citizens and Southern National Bank in Savannah, Ga.

Haywood Davis is a reserve officer in the U.S. Marine Corps, now in graduate school at Columbia.

Thomas W. Davis IV is a junior at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Louise Bahuson (Bonnie) Davis is also a graduate of North Carolina and lives in Atlanta.

#### PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS BY ED WIMMER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I will not take all the time I requested, but I do want to make available for the Members some very pertinent observations by Ed Wimmer of the National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., relative to our trade position and other areas of importance.

#### PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS BY ED WIMMER

This week, ladies and gentlemen, we are going to discuss the winning of World War II presently being won by our former military antagonists, and how, by winning, the entire world could suffer the worst ideological and economic disaster in the history of modern civilizations.

We make such a contention on the grounds that Japan dropped bombs on China in 1937 in order to more quickly expand her bulging need for markets; causing me to call for an embargo on U.S. shipment of war materials to Japan, and a boycott of Japanese goods, in a broadcast the following week. The appeal fell on deaf ears until the Roosevelt Administration halted the movement of war materials in 1939, bringing on a hue and cry from those commercial interests who were affected, that F.D.R. was a "warmonger".

Madame Chiang Kaishek addressed Congress urging embargoes, and her appeals for aid to China met with widespread public favor, as Chinese girls stood on the corners with tin cups seeking money for medicine and bandages to care for the victims of our scrap iron being dropped from planes operating on U.S. high test gasoline.

We brought this out in broadcast after broadcast, and from platforms all over the nation, and we pointed to the trade expansionist programs of Hitler and Mussolini, in Europe, believing what we felt at the time was a dangerous program oriented to capturing markets through a frenzied support of ideologies which could lead only to a worldwide catastrophe.

The emblems of the Axis countries were buried by the Allies in World War II, but a new emblem—"FREE TRADE"—has emerged in their place, challenging American leadership and free enterprise wherever men and markets meet in open conflict, and we are not winning this TRADE WAR.

Let me read you what I said in a broad-

cast in March 1948 devoted to the early rise of Adolph Hitler, and I urge that you think of everything discussed at that time in relation to what is happening in the United States today:

Depression created the soil in which Nazism was spawned, for it had reduced more than 6,000,000 Germans, most of the middle class sector of German society, to abject poverty and hunger. Hitler made their condition his own, and he was able to appeal to the rich and to those who still clung to livelihood, convincing them they too would be the victims of even greater suffering if they failed to follow him, and he pointed to the economic breakdown that was taking place all over the world.

To succeed, the Nazis brought to the surface every means of terror, suspicion and racial prejudice that insecurity breeds, and which can be brought to bear on the disintegration of a whole society, while those who look on convince themselves such means would never succeed.

It did succeed because Hitler, like others before him, knew how to use the defects in a failing system, belaboring his cause by blasting capitalists and communists alike, each day consolidating his power through mass hysteria unparalleled in recorded history. He made the worker a serf, and the capitalist owner a manager ready to carry out whatever orders he might receive.

At this point let us depart from the ideological backdrop of Nazism to its planned takeover of markets by whatever methods found expedient, and, I repeat, Germany, Italy, and Japan in particular, are now capturing the markets they lost without firing a shot, and often with our own money.

The last line of that broadcast in 1948, read: The Nazis had to sell what they produced, and on their own terms, and their terms were domination. On no other basis could Nazism survive.

My friends, what will happen in this country if we breed enough insecurity through inability to consume and sell what we produce? If unemployment, inflation, taxes and welfare rolls swell to the bursting point because we have a domestic and foreign trade policy as ideologically unsound, and as economically and politically devoid of fundamentals as Japan's was in 1937? As Mussolini's was when he invaded Ethiopia? As Hitler's when he drove his tanks into Poland?

Japan had to have new markets for the goods her giant industrial combines were producing, and she refused to wait for peaceful development. She flooded our dime stores with junk that provided needed dollars to buy our scrap iron, which she poured on China. After that it was Pearl Harbor—matching the holocausts of Europe, and now they use different weapons as do the Germans and Italians to overcome us, as do the British, French and some 40 other peoples. Yet the only goods we can sell them are goods they cannot produce, or goods we subsidize . . . as we increase our unemployment rolls, close our factories, destroy hundreds of thousands of family farms, and as we watch one American company after another move from our shores to foreign shores, there to hire child labor (which we have outlawed), and operate under tax burdens and wage overheads so far below our own—against which corporations located in America cannot compete.

Congressman John Dent (Pa.), with head bloody from butting it against the iron walls of a tariff policy stacked against every man, woman, and child in this nation, recently reiterated his charge that the real war going on today is a trade war containing the most dire consequences. The fiery advocate of trade that is both fair and free to all, told his colleagues:

"I was in a foreign country a few weeks

ago where baseballs were being made to sell in America for about \$3.75. I could buy them in a shop in that country for 26¢. The workers in the factory received \$1 a day for men, 75¢ for women. These people were the descendants of the slaves bought from Southern plantations in America and shipped to that country, which they have populated. In other words, we finally abolished slavery in America, but now we support it in slave-wage countries.

"More than 140,000 steel workers in the U.S. have lost their jobs, and for every job lost, three others in other fields are lost. I know of three more prominent steel companies that will be forced to close their doors if tariff relief isn't forthcoming in the steel industry. In 1958, 3/10 of 1% of steel consumption in the U.S. was imported. In 1970 it had jumped to 70%. In Japan, steel is a joint effort of huge Japanese industries and the government, which industry we subsidized and are still paying taxes to cover those subsidies.

"Specialty steel products represented 1.1% of American consumption in 1969, jumping to nearly 71% this year."

He blasted a policy that has allowed "36 out of 41 glass plants in the U.S. to close" before the Tariff Commission recognized the need of relief for both. He told about his experience in New Hampshire where a ball bearing plant was closed, letting out a hundred workers permanently. He said:

"The day is coming when this nation will be incapable of having any kind of prosperity industrially, and in time of war, we would have no way of staving off defeat."

Congressman Joseph Gaydos, a fellow Pennsylvanian, interrupted Mr. Dent to interject figures showing indisputable loss of 50,000 jobs in the specialty tool industry, and like many of his fellow members of the House, and a number on the Senate side, he backed the continuous flow of arguments we have made over this microphone, that American dollars pouring into low wage countries are not raising the living standards of the people, are not providing them with enough purchasing power to buy any of our high-cost production, agricultural products—nothing, unless they are subsidized by American tax dollars.

When I was in New Hampshire recently, I found the state broke, and I reminded audiences of what their Congressman, James Cleveland, had told them in 1966, that shoes, textiles—every kind of business New Hampshire depended upon—would go to foreign countries. He had agreed with our position, as Mr. Dent has sounded off so often; that the State Department and not the President or the Congress or the Tariff Commission, is in control of the foreign trade policy of this country, and that it is a policy of disaster.

In 1967, I quoted Charles Jonas, Congressman from North Carolina, who predicted "bankruptcy for textile mills whatever their size, on a wholesale scale," and it has happened. Close-downs of dish, plastic, machine tool, toy, camera, watch, plywood, shoe and other companies, are necessitating a vast relief program which is all we are now hearing about as an answer to our staggering unemployment and welfare problems.

During the debate on the floor of the House from which I have been quoting, Congressman James Burke (Mass.) recited a fruitless search for an American made baseball glove. He spoke of six-year-old children standing on boxes packing transistors for 6¢ an hour. I had listened earlier to Senator Edward Kennedy (Mass.) plead for \$200 million to retrain some of the 110,000 scientists and engineers who are out of work, and I read in a Boston paper that the city has something like 13% of its population drawing some kind of welfare.

This story could go on and on, but re-

maining time this week permits me to add only this from Mr. Dent:

"The worker who makes \$5.20 an hour, and who wants to buy a shirt made in Hong Kong by a worker paid 17¢, is dishonest, because the shirt worker in this country, making \$2.40 an hour, is entitled to his living. When Herbert Hoover was President, I nailed him to the cross, but now I apologize to Mr. Hoover. He didn't have 13 million drawing relief, 11 million being fed through military services, 26 million drawing social security, and 10 million fully secured in various governments. He was a great manager in comparison to what we are getting today. . . . Maybe my father was right when he told me that too much free education gives you people who are pretty darn dumb."

The charge was made in the beginning of this broadcast that the people who were our military enemies in World War II are now their worst enemies, and our enemies today in a death struggle of what could be a life struggle for a free and fair exchange of goods and services between all nations, on a fair wage, fair price, fair profit basis, which is the only basis upon which domestic prosperity with freedom can exist anywhere in the world.

No country can pay farmers 67% of parity and keep families on the farm, but this we are trying to do. We can't buy 30 million pairs of shoes from low wage foreign factories and not put American shoe workers and factory owners on relief, but this we are doing, and doing ourselves in in the process. The story is the same whatever the product, whatever the state.

It is such a big subject that the surface cannot be scratched in such limited time as that at my disposal, but if you haven't thought about depression and trade expansion as basic to World War II, or how both Allies and former Axis powers are dependent upon a healthy U.S. market, maybe what has been said will make you see that no trade is good trade that isn't fair trade.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a letter sent to me from R. S. Ahlbrandt, president, Allegheny Ludlum:

While Japanese specialty steel imports keep pouring in, in violation of the limitation arrangement, American industry erodes—in profit, jobs, and planning for the future. You and your colleagues in the Pennsylvania delegation and those from other steel community centers throughout the nation are urged to organize in support of ebbing the flow of specialty steel imports, which are seriously damaging your constituencies—as we have discussed.

According to the Wall Street Journal, Allegheny Ludlum's earnings dropped, in the first quarter of this year, to 38 percent less than the corresponding quarter last year. The same article points out Allegheny Ludlum's profit was \$3.9 million as compared to a profit of \$6.4 million a year earlier. Mr. Ahlbrandt attributed this loss to a decline in sales resulting from the slow recovery of the general economy, as well as:

The continued adverse effect caused by excessive foreign imports of specialty steel.

Latrobe Steel, Latrobe, Pa., reported a first quarter loss, also. Their sales were down to \$9,957,000 from \$12,855,000 for a like period in 1970. The firm had a first quarter loss of \$542,000, compared to earnings of \$48,000 for the initial quarter last year. Marcus W. Saxman III, presi-

dent of Latrobe Steel, told the shareholders meeting the disappointing earnings were the result of continued influx of specialty steel imports.

Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members of Congress would be interested in the following excerpts from a letter Mr. Ahlbrandt sent to the President, a copy of which was sent to me:

I refer, Mr. President, to the rapidly rising imports of stainless and tool steels which accounted for approximately 22% of apparent U.S. consumption in 1970, and which continue to increase in 1971 from 1970 levels. Our industry is in the unenviable position of having experienced the worst raw materials cost inflation in two decades, while at the same time losing almost one quarter of our domestic market to foreign specialty steel producers. In certain of our most important product lines, imports now account for a disastrous share of our domestic market, i.e., 34% in stainless cold rolled sheets; 60% to 65% in stainless wire rod and cold drawn wire; and 16% in tool steel. Because of their labor cost advantages and government incentives to export, foreign producers are selling these products in our markets at discounts of 18% to more than 50% of our published prices.

As a result, Mr. President, the stainless and tool steel producers of this country are currently operating many of their most important plant facilities at a loss. If relief from current levels of import penetration are not forthcoming almost immediately, some of these plants may be closed. The consequent loss of jobs in areas where these plants are located will severely impair economic recovery in those areas, already adversely impacted by imports.

The combined impact of excessive imports of specialty steels and government policies affecting certain critical materials vital to our industry already has placed the security and defense of the United States in a precarious position.

We very much appreciate the decision you made, Mr. President, to press for the extension and improvement of the export restraints announced in January 1969 by European and Japanese steel producers. Through the efforts of our Government, a Voluntary Limitation Arrangement was negotiated with the Japanese and Western European Steel Community and became effective in January 1969. This Arrangement included a rollback of the 1968 rate of steel imports from those nations amounting to a 22% reduction as a base for the year 1969. It further provided for a 5% growth factor for the subsequent two years, through 1971.

Research conducted by specialty steel companies and paid for out of company funds, not by Government grants, has been responsible for the development of materials for the jet engine and gas turbine; for hardware for the aerospace industry; commercial wrought uranium and zirconium for the nuclear age; titanium; exotic electronic materials and many other lightweight, high strength, corrosion resistant materials.

"Unless we can hold our ability to maintain up-to-date production and research facilities, we believe irreparable damage will occur to the specialty steel industry, essential as it is to our economy, national defense, and security. Our nation must maintain an adequate level of self-sufficiency in specialty metals, not only in production and supply capability, but also in a contemporary reserve of research technology, skilled management, and a skilled and experienced labor force.

"Accordingly, Mr. President, we urgently request an opportunity to meet with you

to discuss steps which may be taken to effect an improvement in the specialty steel import situation. We are most grateful to the highly competent officials of the Department of State for their appreciation of this problem and for the considerable efforts they have undertaken to obtain improvement in the specialty steel situation while negotiating for an extension of the arrangement.

"We are concerned, however, that unless foreign steel producers know that this Administration at the highest level expects a successful outcome of these negotiations, only token measures of improvement will occur.

I respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that serious consideration be given to my proposal to protect the base of minimum wage and hour laws, when it appears on the floor by giving the President and Secretary of Labor direct action on any import product that eliminates American jobs. This could be accomplished by using as a base for wage equality the minimum wage standards of the United States.

#### PERSONAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am placing in the RECORD a statement of my personal financial condition covering calendar year 1970. This follows a practice I first adopted in 1963 and repeated in each succeeding year. In doing this, I would like to reiterate briefly the comments I made in the past to the House and in reports to constituents of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District which I represent.

Members of Congress and holders of high elective office in general should make periodic public disclosures of personal finances as a matter of course. Such reports of outside income and interests are needed to provide the public with information that will enable them to assess whether their elected representatives' personal holdings have affected, in any way, the performance of their public trust.

Presently, House Members are required to make a limited financial disclosure report. While part of the report is made available for public inspection, a more detailed section remains confidential in a sealed envelope to be held from public scrutiny and can be opened only by a majority vote of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

If conflicts of interest by elected officials are to be avoided, however, and the integrity of Congress upheld, both Houses of the Congress must adopt a standing rule providing for a public disclosure, made periodically, of all outside financial interests and income for all Members. Thus, I introduced, today, legislation requiring a complete public disclosure annually of all sources of income for Members of Congress. In addition, this measure would require the same of members of the federal judiciary and certain employees of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, a report of my personal financial condition follows:

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION,	
DEC. 31, 1970	
Cash on account with the Sergeant at Arms Bank, House of Representatives	\$1,502.40
Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C. checking account	7.10
Securities:	
Cash proceeds	4,711.81
Banister Continental—100 shares, 8 $\frac{3}{8}$	837.50
Solitron Devices—100 shares	1,237.50
<b>Real estate:</b>	
House, Arlington, Va. (assessed value)	69,650.00
Less mortgage	44,134.29
Equity	25,515.71
Household goods and miscellaneous personality	4,800.00
Miscellaneous assets: Deposits with U.S. civil service retirement fund through Dec. 31, 1971, available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations	26,543.40
Cash surrender value of life insurance policies:	
On the life of Robert W. Kastenmeier	None
On the life of Dorothy C. Kastenmeier	544.00
Automobiles:	
1963 Oldsmobile	550.00
1965 Chevrolet	550.00
Total assets	66,799.42
Liabilities	None
Net	66,799.42
Income for calendar year 1970, excluding congressional salary and expenses:	
Gain, sale of stocks (2)	350.68
Reynolds Metals	(199.32)
Horizon Corp	550.00
Speaking honorariums	160.00
Stock dividends (2):	
Reynolds Metals	55.00
Solitron Devices	6.00
	571.68
Gain, on sale of old residence—deferred—applied to new residence	(8,260.20)

#### THE ARMY'S RACIST PROGRAM TO COMBAT RACISM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Army is now committed to a mission of self-destruction by shadowboxing against nature—the elimination of racism—as a military objective. Obviously trying to adhere to liberal directives which are already responsible for the breakdown in discipline, the Army is now a training arm to attain its "goal of equality" instead of fulfilling its mission to constitute a fighting force.

The same potential soldiers who are forbidden to have the enemy identified, and who are refused the right of being taught the horrors of communism—many former military men will recall the action taken to forbid the Operation Pro-Blue program of Gen. Edwin Walker,

U.S. Army, resigned—are now to be indoctrinated in brotherhood and race relations. In fact, one of the Army's training films; that is, MF 16-5608, is entitled "Brotherhood of Man."

A review of the Army's race relations program as contained in "Commanders Call—Support Materials," DA PAM 360-805, for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1971, indicates that the thrust of the program is not equality or to better race relations but rather to promote white inferiority. For example, the concept outlined for the Army film, "The Black Soldier" contains these seven points:

#### CONCEPTS

1. Black soldiers have been fighting in defense of their country from the Revolutionary War to the present day.
2. Nearly one-sixth of the total colonial army was black.
3. The Civil War concerned itself with slavery, and many black men—186,000 according to some authorities—fought on the side of the Union Army.
4. When the Civil War ended, nearly 12,000 black veterans went to the western frontiers to fight the Indians and to advance the settlement of the West.
5. One of the outstanding regiments of World War I was the all-black 369th Regiment of the 93d Division.
6. In Vietnam there are many thousands of black fighting men.
7. While the black man as a soldier is given little space in the history books of our country, his valor is well documented.

Many experienced military men will immediately recognize that this hardsell is black supremacy since the trainee soldier is not told the truth about the Revolutionary War nor even about all Negro military units from previous wars which were retired from the frontlines in disgrace.

If the Army were committed to equality, it should be as interested in informing our fighting men of the failures as well as the achievements of black soldiers.

Further, from the "Commanders Call" under the race relations program structure is found a list of subjects to be most often discussed in race relations seminars. Judging from the context, it is easy to see that the white soldier will be brainwashed to think that he is of an inferior group. The ultimate effect on the white soldier will be to destroy his aggressiveness and initiative as an individual soldier.

The "Commanders Call" contains this passage in its preface:

The Command Information Program is based on the plan that a soldier performs best when he understands why he is required to serve and believes firmly in the importance of the cause.

From the same preface is the remarks of a former chief of information who said that he would "rather lead into battle 10 men who knew why they were fighting than 10,000 who did not."

While the preface to the "Commanders Call" sets forth a basic code for any competent military commander, it contradicts the race relations myth which at best lurks as a subterfuge to hamper the training and discipline of an effective fighting force or an excuse to cover up the shortcoming of the new breed of military commanders.

Apparently the new Army will not be training fighting men because the officers will be too committed to solving race problems to train troops for the mission to defend the United States.

In striving to overcome man's natural differences through programs which emphasize the black man, the Army in actuality is promoting racism.

#### BETTER COMMUNICATIONS—BETTER RACE RELATIONS

##### COMMUNICATIONS AND RACE RELATIONS

Many commanders are concerned with finding ways to improve race relations in their commands. Many innovations are being tried, some successfully and others not so successfully, as commanders seek to fulfill their responsibilities in insuring that all soldiers receive equal treatment.

Those programs that have most successfully eased racial tensions in various commands have had one common feature: each sought first to improve communications between black and white soldiers.

Communication is the first step toward establishing understanding between soldiers of different races—and it must be a continuing process.

The purpose of this Officers' Call is to discuss several race relations programs that have been effective. The examples may serve as a basis for evaluating your programs and may furnish ideas for improvement.

##### RACE RELATIONS AND YOUR MISSION

As an Army leader, your primary concern must be to prepare your unit to carry out its combat mission.

A key ingredient of combat effectiveness is a spirit of unity and trust among men of a unit. Racially induced friction and tensions are factors which can adversely affect the unity and trust and thus the combat effectiveness of your unit.

There is a racial problem within the Army. To some extent it is a reflection of the racial problems which confront our society. You as a leader must come to grips with this problem just as you must deal with other leadership problems which might detract from the combat effectiveness of your unit. To meet this responsibility, you must understand the nature of the racial problem, its causes and effects and how to deal with it.

##### THE CHIEF OF STAFF ON RACE RELATIONS

The following remarks are excerpted from an address delivered by General William C. Westmoreland, Chief of Staff, US Army, at the Army-wide Race Relations Conference at Fort Monroe, Virginia, 17-20 November 1970. His remarks define the Army's race relations problem, outline responsibilities and suggest actions that may be taken to improve communications and race relations.

The Army can ill afford to be complacent—we cannot rest on past accomplishments no matter how good our record is.

In a message to all Army personnel in October of 1969, I reaffirmed the Army's commitment to the goal of equality and outlined the leadership aspects of good race relations. Additionally, necessary steps were taken to put new life into the equal opportunity program with specific and practical plans of action. One of the major projects was the equal opportunity seminar program conducted by CONARC. This was conducted during the period December 1969 to February 1970.

I was impressed with the results of this project and pleased to see that commanders throughout the Army at their own initiative had conducted similar seminars.

In a seminar atmosphere much can be learned of the rights, beliefs and aspirations of others. These seminars have served as an effective tool to provide us a feedback on what the pulse of race relations really is. . . . Our goal is to eliminate every vestige



of discrimination that affects the American soldier and his dependents.

Acts of discrimination or discourtesy to men whom we ask to accept the full burden and risk of military service are a tragedy. They cannot and they will not be tolerated.

I am convinced that problems of this nature can only be solved through sustained interest and action at all levels within the chain of command.

All commanders have a continuing responsibility to foster equal treatment for all soldiers. All soldiers have a responsibility to conduct themselves in accordance with accepted military standards. Special treatment is not sought but equal treatment without prejudice is mandatory.

My review of reports and my own personal observations indicate that problems often result not so much from what the stated policies are but what the soldiers believe them to be. The simple truth is that no two people see things exactly alike. If a person believes that discrimination exists, then the consequences are of concern to us.

Communications between commanders and their soldiers must be improved—and this most certainly is a command responsibility. Commanders must take advantage of conferences, seminars, councils, Command Information, personal contact and every other means at their disposal.

In this regard, an announced open door policy is worthless if some insensitive subordinate never allows the soldier to get to the door much less in the door.

I firmly believe that the best open door policy is one where the commander walks through the barracks, visits the place frequented by the troops off-duty and sees for himself firsthand what is going on among his troops and talks to them informally.

Commanders must become more sensitive to the many forms that prejudice takes to become aware of those things that are offensive to soldiers. A commander who boasts that prejudice does not exist in his unit may be ignoring the problem or unaware of reality—and recognizing the problem is a forward step toward its solution.

It is difficult to solve a problem if you do not clearly understand what it is.

In addition to removing discriminatory practices within the command, I expect commanders to use all of their resources to promote equal treatment of military personnel and their dependents. Attitudes of citizens in the local community have significant impact on racial tensions on the military reservation. When discrimination is directed against minority group soldiers, bitter resentment is likely to be magnified and this resentment can adversely affect morale and discipline.

Every soldier must know and believe that Army leadership is dedicated to insuring that all personnel are treated without bias.

Leaders, especially at lower levels, must not attempt to hide the presence of racial problems. Instead they should be encouraged to surface their problems and seek assistance in preventing disorders before they occur. The old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," is most appropriate in their regard.

We must prevent overt disorders and the only way I know to do this is to correct any policies or procedures that may lead to unnecessary friction between elements within our ranks.

Everyone in the Army in a position of leadership must work harder, address his energies and his wisdom and his intelligence to recognition of the problem and toward building the soldier's dignity and self-esteem.

At the same time, the soldier must be developed as a member of the team—as a member of an efficient military unit.

The Army's traditional standards of discipline and performance cannot and will not be compromised.

I am confident that the leadership of the Army is up to the challenge but awareness and fairness are required as never before: With the attitude of the youths who are our soldiers, the burden of proof that the Army is aware and that the Army is fair is on the backs of the leadership.

How well we solve the problems . . . will in large measure determine the quality of our Army in the foreseeable future.

#### HOW SOME COMMANDS HAVE IMPROVED RACE RELATIONS

Seminars are an effective tool for learning what soldiers think about race relations in their units. Most commanders who have an active race relations program have used the seminar or a variation of it. One such commander is Major General Orwin Talbott, Commanding General, US Army Infantry Center, Fort Benning, Georgia.

#### THE FORT BENNING RACE RELATIONS PROGRAM

Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor referred to the Fort Benning race relations program in a recent address at the Infantry School:

"To deal with one of the problems [race relations] I mentioned, in the past year General Talbott set up a Race Relations Coordinating Group with a full-time staff, and an 18-member Race Relations Advisory Council. Young officers and enlisted men have very responsible roles in these programs. Racial seminars have been established on a continuing basis for all units, and monitored to make sure they are given full attention and support."

The Fort Benning program encompasses not only all of the on-post units and activities but groups and activities in nearby civilian communities as well. The program is organized around two basic groups—the Race Relations Council and the Race Relations Coordinating Group.

#### RACE RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

This group of 18 persons was appointed by the commanding general to review the command's race relations effort and to suggest ways to increase its effectiveness. Each unit on-post is represented by members ranging from private (draftee) to colonel. The race relations council meets at least once quarterly and is chaired by the Fort Benning Director of Personnel. The commanding general often attends council meetings.

The Advisory Council evaluates ideas and concepts that have been recommended and judges the effectiveness of existing race relations projects. Because members represent a cross section of the post population, the commander can listen to what his troops have to say about race relations at Fort Benning. It also serves as a check and balance for the Race Relations Coordinating Group.

#### RACE RELATIONS COORDINATING GROUP (RRCG)

This 5-member group is the only full-time working unit of the Fort Benning program, and is supervised by the installation Equal Opportunity Officer.

There are several prerequisites to appointment to the RRCG. Each member must have had training or professional experience in dealing with human relations problems. He also must demonstrate a sensitivity to race relations problems, be compatible with the other members of the RRCG and he must volunteer for membership. Of the five members of the RRCG, all are college graduates, one has a master's degree in race relations, three were in civil rights activist groups as students, three are commissioned officers and two enlisted. Three of the members are black and two are white.

The purpose of the RRCG is to help plan and conduct race relations seminars. This includes training unit moderators, recommending films, slides or other audio-visual aids and arranging the appearances of semi-

nar speakers. The RRCG also conducts special studies and surveys of race relations problems. For instance, the RRCG determined by survey which additional black oriented items black soldiers wanted stocked in PXs and commissaries and reported on black soldiers' perceptions of military justice at Fort Benning.

The RRCG works under the supervision of the Equal Opportunity Officer in the Office of the Director of Personnel and Community Activities, but has direct access to the commanding general. It meets with the commanding general on an average of once a month to discuss the racial situation at Fort Benning.

The RRCG members range in grade from PFC to captain and each member is stabilized in the assignment for up to 18 months.

The Fort Benning commanding general knows personally each member of the RRCG. He regards each of them as his personal representative and listens to them.

The primary focus of the Fort Benning race relations program is the seminar, the purposes of which are to: establish and improve communications between soldiers of different races; identify causes of racial tension; and elicit recommendations for improving race relations.

There is no way of forecasting whether or not a seminar will be productive; however, it was found at Fort Benning and at other installations that they are the best means of airing complaints and encouraging discussions between black and white soldiers. Seminars are not considered to be the answer to problems, but rather as the first step in improving relations.

Race relations seminars must be integrated into an overall plan if they are to be productive. It may be harmful to the command to deliberately exacerbate fears, myths and frustrations if no action follows to make changes where necessary and explain the reasons for policies and practices that cannot be changed.

The follow-up phase, during which action is taken in response to the knowledge and understanding gained in the seminars, is the key step toward reducing tensions.

#### RACE RELATIONS AND PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Fort Benning units down to but not including companies are required to conduct periodic race relations seminars. Although not mandatory, several companies also conduct seminars. Brigades are required to conduct at least one seminar each quarter and battalions must conduct two each month. Generally, at least 20 persons participate in each large unit seminar. This is considered the minimum number for a valid cross section of views and attitudes within the unit and for the greatest benefits from the exchange of ideas.

#### RACE RELATIONS SEMINARS

Race relations seminars are conducted at three command levels at Fort Benning:

##### Small unit seminars

These seminars, conducted by company or smaller units, usually are attended by from 15 to 60 persons. A RRCG member attends most small unit seminars to assist the moderator and answer questions on the installation's race relations policy and programs.

##### Battalion seminars

The entire battalion may attend battalion seminars. They usually are conducted by battalion commanders. Discussion is started by a panel of 4-6 persons making introductory comments on the situation in the Army, at Fort Benning, and in society in general, or by special material such as films, slides, or recordings. Then the audience is invited to enter the discussion. Questions may be directed to the battalion commander, or opinions and beliefs may be voiced. If a seminar is productive it may be continued during an afternoon or evening session. Better feed-

back has resulted from battalion seminars than from those at any other level.

#### Command and staff seminar

This third type of seminar was started as a means of insuring that all commanders understand race relations policies. It is attended by battalion and brigade commanders and either the commanding general or his staff representative. Discussions at command and staff seminars cover the same topics as those discussed at unit seminars. The important difference, however, is that those commanders attending the command and staff seminar can establish or make changes in policies as recommended at unit seminars. Others who regularly attend these seminars are RRCG members, the Equal Opportunity Officer, and selected persons from the Office of the Director of Personnel and Community Activities (DPCA) and the Mental Health Clinic. Command and Staff Seminars have been highly successful in sensitizing commanders to racial issues and sharpening their perceptions of the racial situation in the Army.

#### THE RRCG AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The Race Relations Coordinating Group also serves as contact for civilian groups in the Fort Benning area that are devoted to improving race relations. The RRCG cooperated with the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the National Alliance of Businessmen to organize and conduct an equal opportunity seminar for more than 100 local businessmen.

A human relations board, organized by a local church, worked closely with the RRCG to investigate and seek solutions to race relations problems in adjoining areas. Members of the RRCG, along with persons from the on-post Mental Health Clinic, do volunteer work at the Open Door Community Service, a social service facility in the local community.

#### THE POINT IS—COMMUNICATE

The Fort Benning Race Relations Program is described here because it is well organized, flexible and imaginative—and it works. It was deliberately structured to be highly visible in the hope that soldiers will believe that their commander is committed to improving race relations at Fort Benning and in surrounding communities.

It is not, however, the only on-going race relations program. For example, the US Army Materiel Command, Europe has "Sound Off," through which soldiers, civilians, employees and dependents may communicate with the commanding general via preaddressed forms that are available throughout the command. All correspondence is answered by the commanding general.

Other commands, such as US Army Europe and Seventh Army, provide broad guidance and permit local commanders to choose the method best suited to their needs.

#### SUBJECTS MOST OFTEN DISCUSSED IN RACE RELATIONS SEMINARS

The following is a list of situations, problems and beliefs that have been discussed frequently during Army race relations seminars.

Young black soldiers are angry, impatient, sensitive to discrimination, frustrated and proud of being black. They see the afro haircut and clenched fist black power salute as symbols of racial solidarity and pride, while white soldiers see them as symbols of revolt and militancy.

Minority group soldiers question the fairness of the promotion system and the administration of non-judicial punishment (Article 15). They feel that they are discriminated against in that white soldiers get better assignments and preference in promotion. They also believe that they receive more severe punishment under Article 15 than do white soldiers for similar offenses.

Discriminatory practices in off-post bars and entertainment centers foster polarization and contribute to racial tension.

Some PXs do not stock a complete line of black cosmetics and grooming aids. White barbers and beauticians at some installations claim not to know how to cut or style Negro hair. Black entertainers and soul music are almost never featured in some military clubs. Many black soldiers view these situations as proof that the Army condones racism and prejudice.

Racial epithets directed to minority group soldiers are fighting words. The term "boy," when used by a white, makes most blacks bristle. "Colored" will cause resentment more often than not. Such terms as "nigger," "spade," "shine," and "coon" will almost always trigger extreme reactions by young black soldiers. Most black people may not resent the term "Negro" except when it is slurred to "Nigra." However, "black" is the "in" term and is preferred by almost all young black soldiers. In the same way, persons of other races and nationalities usually resent such derogatory terms as "honky," "dago," "kike," "polack," and "greaser."

Senior officers and NCOs seldom believe that racial problems exist in their units. Junior officers and NCOs who are close to the problem find it difficult to communicate a sense of urgency about racial unrest and discontent to senior personnel in the chain of command. Many senior officers do not get out among the troops and talk to them and therefore lack sensitivity.

Leadership shortcomings (immaturity and inexperience) of junior officers and NCOs contribute to racial tension within units.

Many black soldiers express the opinion that white leaders lack understanding and sensitivity about the background and aspirations of black soldiers. In this respect, white leaders interpret some of the black soldiers' attitudes as disrespectful or insubordinate; black literature is considered subversive and finding this type of literature in wall lockers immediately labels the owner as a militant.

Prescribed ways of seeking redress of grievances are considered to be bureaucratic and outdated. The "Inspector General" and "Open Door Policy" are consistently criticized. "Abstentee-landlord syndrome" concerns the fact that NCOs in charge of barracks invariably live outside the unit area. Living arrangements in the barracks sometimes result in black and white privates letting off steam by provoking racial incidents.

Black soldiers seldom are depicted in training films, posters, Army newspapers or in military heritage presentations.

There are too few Negro officers at all levels. Young black soldiers view this as proof that the Army deliberately holds down Negroes.

Because many Spanish-speaking men have only limited knowledge of the English language, they often are accused of shirking and deliberately not carrying out orders when in fact they may not have understood what was required of them.

#### SOMETHING ABOUT COMMUNICATING

It has been said that listening is a lost art and most of us remain silent while the other person talks only because we are planning what to say next. Such intellectual jousting is a roadblock to real communication. It is doubtful that any communication results when the ostensible reason for conducting seminars is to advise, criticize, moralize, sympathize or accuse. Commanders must practice *active listening* if seminars, rap sessions, discussion groups or individual counseling sessions are to be productive. Active listening means hearing not only the words but the feelings behind them and feeding back responses that are both intellectually on target and emotionally in tune. Regardless of

which method is used, its success or failure should not be judged too hastily. Depending on the makeup of persons in a unit, current conditions and other factors, establishing good communication can be a most elusive goal.

#### CONDUCTING SEMINARS

Commanders and discussion leaders must enter each seminar prepared to encounter extremes of emotions, complaints, allegations and recommendations. The experiences of many commanders who have conducted successful seminars point to several guidelines for increasing the likelihood of their being productive.

Commanders must be knowledgeable. Not only must they be knowledgeable on the topic being discussed, commanders must also know their men. Personnel records, day-to-day contact, consulting supervisors—all will yield valuable information on the makeup of individual soldiers. Commanders should be familiar with: the backgrounds of slavery, segregation and discrimination in the United States, the history of black Americans, and our Nation's progress toward eliminating inequality of treatment because of race. They should be particularly familiar with the role of the military in eliminating segregation and discrimination. In addition to historical references, commanders should read those books that are popular with young minority group soldiers. For example, the books "Autobiography of Malcolm X" and "Soul on Ice" are familiar to most young black soldiers, and express many of their feelings and attitudes. All Army libraries have lists of contemporary books by and about black Americans.

Commanders must be sincere. Soldiers generally are reluctant to talk freely on race relations unless they believe their commander wishes to communicate rather than merely go through the motions. Soldiers will quickly detect any commander's lack of sincerity. Commanders must be familiar with and committed to implementing equal opportunity policies and communicate this to their soldiers. Soldiers must believe that the commander is trying to empathize rather than manipulate.

Seminar participants must feel free to express themselves. Ideas will be expressed freely only in atmospheres of mutual trust and candor. All points of view must be aired but no group should be allowed to monopolize discussions or "mount the soapbox."

Seminars must be planned and controlled. Commanders, moderators or discussion leaders must be able to guide the exchange of ideas subtly and unobtrusively. They must project the image of knowledgeable, fair, neutral and calm but firm mediators. They must avoid projecting arbitrary or dictatorial attitudes. The aim should be to encourage maximum expression and guide discussions toward consensus, conclusions or understandings. Seminars must not be allowed to deteriorate into open ended gripe sessions. Participants should be encouraged to recommend solutions to the problems they raise.

All participants must have the opportunity to be heard. An articulate few will dominate seminars unless other soldiers who are less willing to speak out are skillfully drawn into discussions. Leaders should always have several prepared questions for this purpose.

Keep the purpose in mind. There is an ever present danger that participants in race relations seminars may become so emotionally involved that the net effect is negative. This probability will be greatly reduced, however, if discussion leaders continuously guide the discussions toward establishing facts and solving problems.

Unit personnel assigned to plan and conduct seminars should be supported with funds, facilities and the full and visible cooperation of commanders. They should be permitted to prepare for seminars during duty hours.

**TWO NEW RACE RELATIONS FILMS: AFIF-203, BLACK AND WHITE—UPTIGHT, AFIF-204, THE BLACK SOLDIER**

Preview these films and study the discussion questions before showing them to troop audiences. Instructors should use black history references to prepare for discussion periods that should follow showings. A basic reference, available in Army libraries, is "The Employment of Negro Troops" by Ulysses Lee, one of a series of special studies of the United States Army in World War II. Three other references, issued as texts for United States Armed Forces Institute courses, are useful sources of background material: "Eyewitness: The Negro in American History," by William L. Katz, is the text for USAFI course A210. Two texts are issued with USAFI course A462: "From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans," by John Hope Franklin, and "The Black American: A Documentary History," by Leslie H. Fishel, Jr., and Benjamin Quarles. Check your local library for additional reference materials.

**INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE**

**AFIF-203, black and white—Uptight**

**Synopsis:** The myths that perpetuate prejudice against black people in our society and the subtle ways that hate is learned are explored in this film. The social and economic differences that exist between blacks and whites are caused by historical inequities in education and economic opportunity—and are in some cases even perpetuated by laws. The riots that have erupted in the cities throughout the United States have forced basic issues of injustice to the surface for all Americans to face. There are no easy ways to solve the problems caused by prejudice, but examples are given of areas in which government, business, and black and white people are working together to wipe out the hatred and misunderstanding between the races. This film acquaints the viewer with the subtle and sometimes unconscious manifestations of prejudice as well as the more obvious. It will also encourage the viewer to look more closely at his own attitudes. People often ask today, "What can I do to help?" This film provides some answers.

**QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**

There has been much sociological and psychological research on the nature of prejudice. It would be helpful to have such resource materials available for students reference during class discussion. The following questions will help students gain an understanding of what prejudice is and encourage them to look more closely at their attitudes and to speak out against the injustice of discrimination in their areas.

1. Define prejudice and discrimination. How are they different? Is prejudice always negative? Is discrimination always unjust? Is it possible to be prejudiced without discriminating? Is it possible for someone who is not prejudiced to discriminate against a group because of the mores of the area in which he lives?
2. How important is early training in developing prejudice?
3. Why do you think it is difficult for a prejudiced person to recognize that he is prejudiced?
4. Prejudice is not a problem unique to our country nor is it found only between black and white men. What other kinds of prejudice can you identify?
5. Do you believe it is possible for humans to be without prejudice? Explain your answer.
6. What is a ghetto?
7. What are some of the social handicaps of children growing up in a ghetto?
8. What are some of the economic problems of the people living in a ghetto?
9. What is meant by "Black Power"?
10. Discuss the following: There are many ways to manifest prejudice—by criticizing, avoiding contact, discriminating, threatening physical harm, and actually doing phys-

cal harm. While most people would do no more than demonstrate their hostility through words, by so doing, they make it easier for others to express their hostility through physical violence, i.e., lynchings, pogroms, genocide.

11. What has the Army done to eliminate prejudice and promote equal opportunity for all soldiers? What additional things should the Army do in this area? What is the impact of the Army's integration policy on American Society?

**AFIF-204, THE BLACK SOLDIER**

**Synopsis**

"The Black Soldier" surveys the history of the black American's participation in the Armed Forces of the United States, from the Revolutionary War to the war in Vietnam. Bill Cosby narrates, using prints, drawings, cartoons, and etchings of famous battles as well as films of wars in this century. The film clips include some rare silent footage of World War I. "The Black Soldier" puts into proper perspective the roles played by many black Americans in the defense of their country.

**Concepts**

1. Black soldiers have been fighting in defense of their country from the Revolutionary War to the present day.
2. Nearly one-sixth of the total colonial army was black.
3. The Civil War concerned itself with slavery, and many black men—186,000 according to some authorities—fought on the side of the Union Army.
4. When the Civil War ended, nearly 12,000 black veterans went to the western frontiers to fight the Indians and to advance the settlement of the West.
5. One of the outstanding regiments of World War I was the all-black 369th Regiment of the 93d Division.
6. In Vietnam there are many thousands of black fighting men.
7. While the black man as a soldier is given little space in the history books of our country, his valor is well documented.

**Questions for discussion**

1. This film asserts that the history of the black man in the military is not generally known or taught. What evidence does the film present to support this point of view?
2. What changes in attitude and policy affect the present-day black American military man?
3. What parallels or differences would you expect to find on the subject of racial discrimination in civilian life and military life?
4. Have any concrete steps been taken to erase discriminatory practices from the military? When was the military desegregated?
5. Discuss the possible findings—both positive and negative—of a black soldier as he goes into battle, carrying with him the memories of the discrimination he has experienced in civilian life.
6. Discuss the possible feelings of that same man when he is discharged from the military. What is he likely to find in the way of discrimination? In the way of help?
7. Review the efforts and contributions of black Americans in the military service to their nation, as presented in the film.

**ADDITIONAL FILM REFERENCES**

The following training films on race relations will be available at AVSCs on or about 1 April 1971. Each of them dramatizes some aspect of racial conflict and reconciliation.

MF 16-5607, Let the Rain Settle It.  
MF 16-5608, Brotherhood of Man.  
MF 16-5611, Some Talk About Poolrooms and Gin Mills.  
MF 16-5593, Charlie, You Made the Night Too Long.  
MF 16-5597, Consider the Zebra.  
MF 16-5610, Man in the Middle.  
MF 16-5609, Patterns of Prejudice.  
MF 16-5618, Joshua.

**ARMY EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN OFF-POST HOUSING**

(Initially issued as Command Information Fact Sheet No. 170, 27 August 1970.)

This Fact Sheet describes the Army program to insure Equal Opportunity in Off-Post Housing and how it can benefit soldiers who encounter discriminatory practices when seeking housing off-post. Two-thirds of all military families presently reside off-post in privately owned dwellings.

In 1967, the Department of Defense adopted an all Services program to insure equal treatment regardless of race, color, creed or national origin for all military personnel who must live off-post. Surveys were conducted of owners/managers of all types of housing and trailer parks within reasonable commuting distance of each installation to determine their policies with regard to renting or leasing to minority group personnel. Each owner/manager was informed that service personnel would be prohibited from renting or leasing housing from any whose rental or lease properties were not available to all servicemen on an equal basis. Since then, more than 98% of landlords surveyed have pledged to adhere to an open housing policy with regard to military personnel. However, the problems encountered by members of minority groups (particularly Negroes) in seeking to rent adequate housing are not as close to solution as the high percentage of pledges indicates.

Some housing developments and apartment buildings for which pledges were signed never have rented to minority group personnel. Others will accept only a token number of minority group occupants.

In a few instances, the open housing pledges were not made in good faith in that the signatories apparently had no intention of changing their discriminatory practices. Sometimes, however, the absence of minority group occupants in a housing development, apartment building or trailer court is explainable by the fact that none have ever applied for accommodations there.

Some minority group servicemen assume that they still are barred from living in those areas which traditionally have been closed to them.

The result is that members of minority groups continue to experience more difficulty in renting or leasing off-post accommodations than do other personnel.

The Department of the Army Equal Housing Opportunity Program is designed to identify and solve the problems faced by minority group soldiers seeking permanent off-post accommodations. These questions and answers discuss the details of the program and how you can get help when you believe you have been unlawfully discriminated against:

**Q. What is the Equal Opportunity in Off-Post Housing Program?**

**A.** The program is a means of providing a recourse for you whenever you encounter discrimination while looking for off-post housing. It will work for you but only if you initiate the action.

**Q. How does the program operate?**

**A.** The Equal Opportunity in Housing Program operates in conjunction with the Off-Post Housing Referral Service. The overall program is governed by the policy that all Army activities will be conducted without discrimination and in a manner which insure equal opportunity and treatment for all eligible persons regardless of their race, color, sex, religion or national origin.

The commander of each installation in the United States is required to either establish a Housing Referral Office (HRO) or secure this service for his personnel through an established HRO. Each HRO is responsible for the following:

Compiling and maintaining an up-to-date listing of suitable housing units within the commuting area that are available to all military personnel without segregation or

discrimination because of race, color, sex, religion or national origin. Each HRO, as applicable, maintains listings of housing that may not be rented or occupied by military personnel because of discriminatory practices by landlords.

Staying abreast of the housing situation in local communities and providing this information to interested personnel.

Counseling military personnel on the availability of assistance in resolving complaints between tenant and landlord.

Acting as point of contact for military personnel who encounter discrimination when seeking off-post housing.

Advising commanders on imposing sanctions against rental properties that are not made available to all personnel without discrimination.

Q. Are soldiers required to check with the HRO upon arrival at an installation?

A. Yes. Every soldier who is authorized to occupy and who requires off-post housing is requested to check with the HRO before renting private housing. All PCS orders include a paragraph or reference to this effect.

Q. Does the housing referral service advise prospective tenants on all aspects of the housing situation?

A. Yes. It advises on the types and costs of available private rental housing, schools, shopping facilities and other community services.

Q. What specific restrictions may be imposed by commanders regarding where military families may reside off-post?

A. Each military person retains his or her freedom of choice in the selection of private accommodations except that no member of the military may reside in any facility against which sanctions have been applied because of discriminatory practices.

Q. What action will be taken by the Army commander when a member of his command complains of being unlawfully discriminated against with regard to housing?

A. All Army installation commanders are required to conduct preliminary inquiries and attempt to secure appropriate relief for the complainant if the inquiry supports the charge of unlawful housing discrimination.

If the local commander cannot resolve the complaint locally, he will conduct a more detailed inquiry and forward the case to Department of the Army for further action. In all cases the complainant will be advised of the actions taken in his behalf.

Q. What other actions may military persons take when they believe they have been unlawfully discriminated against while trying to rent or lease housing?

A. The right of individuals to pursue remedies through civilian channels is unchanged. Each person alleging unlawful discrimination may:

Make a complaint direct to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). (Complaints to HUD must be submitted on HUD Form 903 which is available from the nearest regional office of HUD or by writing: Fair Housing, Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C. 20410.)

Address the complaint to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Bring a private civil action in the appropriate local, State or Federal court.

In every instance, complainants may seek military legal assistance in preparing and filing complaints from the local military legal assistance officer.

The policy of the United States is to provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing practices throughout the United States. Rights and remedies are provided military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of the Army by 42 U.S.C. 1982 and by Titles VIII and IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

Any soldier who believes that he or she has been unlawfully discriminated against in

seeking to rent, lease or purchase housing can air such complaints and seek redress in several ways. But the action *must* be initiated by you. The first step, regardless of what you choose to do, should be to report suspected discriminatory housing practices to the local Housing Referral Office.

#### TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, THE HONORABLE JOHN A. VOLPE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a recent honor paid to our efficient Secretary of Transportation, the Honorable John A. Volpe. On Loyalty Day, May 1, just passed, Secretary Volpe received the District of Columbia Department of the VFW Loyalty Day Award "in recognition of his unexcelled experience and creativity in illustrious constructive enterprises benefitting the people of our Nation." Anyone who has known the Secretary knows that the citation is deserved and that it describes a man who has been tireless in service to his Commonwealth and his country for many years. A man who could have been content to rest on his laurels and hard-earned income, he has instead been willing to devote his skills of administration and leadership to public service. I would like to include the writeup which appeared in the program in the Loyalty Day exercises of the VFW's District of Columbia Department:

Born on December 8, 1908 in Wakefield, Massachusetts, as one of six children of Italian immigrant parents, John Volpe's personal history reflects the Horatio Alger success story of the self-made man. At the age of 12, Volpe went to work for his father as a hod carrier and then as a plasterer's apprentice. After graduating from high school, he worked for his father full-time and attended Boston's Wentworth Institute evenings. Two years later, he gave up his work as a plasterer, returned to the Wentworth Institute full-time, and graduated in 1930. He majored in architectural construction. In 1933, he cashed a \$300 insurance policy, borrowed an additional \$200, and started his own construction business in Massachusetts. Secretary Volpe is married to the former Jennie Benedetto. They have a son, a daughter, and four grandchildren. During World War II, Volpe closed his construction firm and volunteered for duty with the Navy's Civil Engineer Corps (Seabees). He left the Navy with the rank of Lieutenant Commander and returned to building schools, hospitals and office buildings. The Volpe firm soon established a national reputation for construction excellence.

Volpe was elected Governor of Massachusetts in 1960 for a two-year term. Losing by a narrow margin in 1962, Volpe came back and was returned to office in 1964. In 1966, he was re-elected Governor for the first four-year term in the State's history by the largest margin ever accorded a Massachusetts gubernatorial candidate—over a half million votes.

John Anthony Volpe was appointed the Nation's second Secretary of Transportation by President Nixon and was sworn in on January 20, 1969. He was serving his third term as Governor of Massachusetts when the President asked him to be a member of his Cabinet.

Since Secretary Volpe took office, new channels of communication and cooperation between the operating administrations have

been created in response to his call for an overall balanced transportation system, which is essential to the basic fabric of the American economy.

Secretary Volpe is also an outspoken advocate of highway safety and personally revised the reporting procedures of the National Highway Safety Bureau to bring it under the direct supervision of the Office of the Secretary. He has also instituted a new alcohol countermeasures program; is establishing new safety standards for motor vehicles to protect the millions of Americans on our Nation's highway; and has demanded adequate replacement housing for those displaced in road construction.

Throughout his career, Secretary Volpe has been the recipient of many honors. He has received 21 honorary degrees from colleges and universities across the nation. He is a past chairman of the National Governors' Conference and past president of the Council of State Governments. Volpe is a past president of the Associated General Contractors of America and the Society of American Military Engineers and the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce.

The Secretary is the recipient of the highest honor of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic—the Knight of the Great Cross. He has been knighted by the Vatican both as a Knight of Malta and as a Knight Commander in the Order of the Holy Sepulcher.

It is with extreme pride that the District of Columbia Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States presents the 1971 Loyalty Day Award Plaque to The Honorable John Anthony Volpe "In recognition of his unexcelled experience and creativity in illustrious constructive enterprises benefitting the people of our nation."

I also include at this time the acceptance speech of Under Secretary Beggs of the Department of Transportation:

REMARKS OF UNDER SECRETARY JAMES M. BEGGS

It's an honor for me to appear here today in place of Secretary Volpe. Of course, any substitute has an instant disadvantage. And any man trying to speak for Secretary Volpe already has two and a half strikes against him. You know his fervent feelings about America and what it stands for.

But I am honored to be here. And I just wish he could convey in person his deep appreciation for your loyalty award. I bring you his thanks and best wishes.

He's helping this morning to inaugurate Amtrak—the new rail passenger service. Right now he's probably having lunch aboard the Metroliner somewhere between here and New York.

Speaking before this audience, I can't help but compare the Metroliners with the long and tiresome troop trains that most of us can remember. Today opens a new era in rail passenger service, and I know that only such an historic occasion could keep the Secretary from accepting your loyalty award here today.

This is a particularly appropriate time to renew one's loyalty—to pause and reflect on the virtues and strengths of our American heritage. Especially since there appears to be so much dissent and unrest throughout the land—much of it quite visible to us here in Washington.

In the last two weeks this city has seen an outpouring of concern about the war and the fate of this nation. Some of it has been responsible and legitimate—some not.

For example, there are some who have served their country who reject the honors their country has bestowed—but these are not the majority.

There are some who reject their responsibility to serve at all—

But the vast majority—the young men and women who conduct their lives without

the turmoil of protests and marches—study hard and work hard, and accept the responsibilities—and benefits—of being Americans.

We have watched all of these elements in our society—and have become concerned about what seems to be happening in America.

It is little wonder that many Americans—in the process of sorting out right from wrong, good motives from bad—have lost their sense of purpose. Too many of us have let the winds of vast impersonal forces weaken our sense of devotion, our sense of patriotism and loyalty.

President Nixon said in a speech two years ago, "Those great principles and those great desires and those great dreams that unite men are infinitely stronger than those that divide them."

And I submit that today—Loyalty Day 1971—is the time when we must renew those principles, those desires, those dreams that unite all Americans.

We have spent too much time on those elements that divide us. The lawless will be dealt with by the law. The deserters will suffer the agony of the deserted. And the unconscionable will forever wrestle with their conscience.

It is not our duty to condemn any of these groups. Rather we should reaffirm our belief in those elements of society that demonstrate greatness, and conviction, and loyalty. Let's underscore America's strengths. Let's raise our voice for liberty and freedom and justice.

These are the principles that allow protesters to protest. And these are the principles for which they are ostensibly shouting. Let me say only that these are also the principles for which we are fighting. These are the principles which can unite us—the Administration, the VFW, students, soldiers, businessmen, and all other Americans. We must not desert them—even temporarily.

The war in Viet Nam has exacted a tragic toll of the American people. It has weakened our confidence in ourselves. It has distracted our thinking from the larger goals and accomplishments and problems in this country.

But President Nixon is winding this war down on a regular schedule—and he is doing it in a way that will protect our fighting men, our freedom and our principles. And more than that he has given us a vision of what this nation must become—and how it must get there.

He has proposed a top-to-bottom reform of the federal government structure to make it functionally effective in modern conditions. He wants to share federal revenues with state and local governments to restore their viability as instruments of the popular will.

President Nixon has developed a fundamental reform of welfare that would guarantee opportunity for work and self-reliance.

He is pressing for basic adjustments in social security. He has asked Congress to upgrade the quality of medical care so that every family would get the treatment it needs at reasonable costs. And the President has sent to Congress a revolutionary package of environmental proposals that is aimed at bringing us—once again—clean air and water.

Some of these proposals may seem to be too sweeping or even untimely. But government must look to the future and plan boldly. Abe Lincoln saw this clearly.

In his second annual message to Congress in 1862, he said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must think anew and act anew."

That is what the President is doing. And he is doing it with absolute loyalty to the American heritage—the heritage that says we can solve our problems, and we're not afraid to try.

I ask those demonstrators in Washington this week—and everyone in this country—to

take a close look at these proposals. Too often we fail to see the democratic solutions that are right before our eyes.

Let me quote the words of Janina Atkins, a recent emigrant to this country from Poland. She wrote the following in a *New York Times* article entitled, "God Bless America."

"Among some of our American-born friends," she writes, "it is not fashionable to be enthusiastic about America. There is Vietnam, drugs, urban and racial conflicts, poverty and pollution. Undoubtedly, this country faces urgent and serious problems. But what we, the newcomers, see are not only the problems, but also democratic solutions being sought and applied."

Each of us should take a look at America through her eyes. There is a lot here to be proud of—a lot to which we can give our loyalty. America needs it and we as a people need it.

Thank you.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE STATE COURT ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, during March 11 through 17, 1971, a National Conference on the Judiciary was held in Williamsburg, Va. This meeting brought together 600 State and Federal judges, lawyers, attorneys general, prosecutors, legislators, court administrators, law professors, and civic leaders. The theme of the conference was established by Chief Justice Warren Burger who criticized delays and backlogs in State courts, and urged conferees to concentrate on achieving speedy trials, effective settlement procedures, and better use of improved management techniques. He especially referred to the administration of civil courts:

This unhappily is becoming the stepchild of the law as criminal justice once was. . . . Americans will totally lose patience with the cumbersome system that makes people wait two, three, four or more years to dispose of an ordinary civil claim. . . . The court must be enabled to take care of both the civil and criminal litigants without prejudice or neglect of either. This is why we are here today.

Indeed the problem of lagging justice severely plagues our civil courts and because many more of our citizens are involved in civil than in criminal actions, the courts' management deficiencies are especially critical and in need of tremendous attention with an eye toward comprehensive rehabilitation.

The average waiting period for personal injury suits in the civil courts of our major metropolitan areas is about 21 months. In counties with populations over 750,000 the average wait is 22 months. In Boston, the average time between the filing of such cases and actual trial is for 44 months, and in the Circuit Court of Chicago the figure is 59.6 months.

As recently as 1969, the time from service of answer to trial in civil cases was 64.6 months in the Supreme Court of Rockland County, N.Y., 60.7 months in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Ill., 47.7 months in the Court of Common Pleas in Philadelphia, Pa., and 34.4 months in the Circuit Court of Wayne County, Mich. In fiscal year 1970 the

backlog of civil cases in the Los Angeles County Superior Court was 62,000. The actual time from filing to trial averages about 2 years.

These figures are alarming but impersonal. I would like to quote from John Frank's book, "American Law: The Case for Radical Reform." In this book Mr. Frank describes the havoc that this situation can create for an average family.

Let me put the problem in terms of a routine human experience. In December, 1967, John and Mary Jones drive downtown together to do a little Christmas shopping. John has taken the afternoon off from his position as an associate professor at the local university, where he earns about \$12,000. The family car is four years old. John and Mary have the group health insurance program of the university, and, in this respect a little abnormally, they also have collision insurance on their car. At the corner of Vine and Elm, they stop for a red light. As they are stopped, the light itself goes completely out and a moment later, before they can decide what to do, they are rear-ended by a truck whose driver, seeing no light, failed to stop in time. There is something to be said for the driver because the light was out, but on the other hand, he probably should have been able to stop in time to avoid a standing car. Perhaps John, who was driving, should have been a little more alert in getting out of the way when the light went out.

Mary has had some real discomfort, but is out of the hospital by Christmas. John has had a somewhat rougher time, having some injury both to the muscles of his back and neck and to two of the neck vertebrae. He will have some stiffness and discomfort from it. Their health insurance has covered the hospital and doctor bills, and their collision insurance has enabled them to get the car back on the road. But they have a legitimate claim for real damages to themselves. The trucking company will pay nothing, and John and Mary would like that traditional American right, a jury trial, to determine their recovery of damages.

The Christmas in question was in 1967, and they were ready to bring their suit by late summer, 1968. To determine when they can expect results, we look to one of the excellent publications of the Institute of Judicial Administration, which tells us the condition of court calendars in various parts of the country. If John and Mary live in Detroit, their case on their 1967 accident will probably come to trial in early 1971. If they are at the University of Hawaii, they can wait until the middle of 1971. If they live in New York, on the Manhattan side of the East River, they will wait until the end of 1971, whereas if they live in the Bronx or Brooklyn, they can look forward to a trial in the middle of 1972. If the university is Pennsylvania, they will have a date with the judge for early 1973. If the medical report for which their lawyer was waiting comes in so that he files the action on September 1, 1968, in Chicago, and if the other side answers with reasonable promptness, the case of John and Mary against the trucker will be heard just in time for Christmas, 1973; although if the case is in the Chicago Municipal Court it will come up well into 1974.

This, of course, assumes that conditions get no worse between 1967 and 1974. This would be an overly optimistic prediction. In Chicago between 1966 and 1967, because of good work in the circuit court, time was cut by five months, but it rose seven months in the municipal court at the same time. Philadelphia slid about three and a half months farther behind between 1966 and 1967. Manhattan bogged a full ten months farther in arrears in that one year, and lost three months more in the year following. Last year

in Los Angeles, lawsuit time got four months worse than the year before. If both John and Mary are sixty at the time of the accident, the chance that two of them will be alive to attend that trial in 1974 is 79 per cent. Should it turn out that their nice little accident happens to involve a nice little law point, so that the case is appealed by one side or the other, and if there should then have to be a new trial, the course of the matter will take five to ten years in any of these cities; if it lasts ten years, the couple's survival chance is 57 per cent. (Computed by A. W. Saffert, Actuary, National Producers Life Insurance Company, from 1958 Commissioner's Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality.) But, to be hideously callous, John and Mary might as well die so far as this litigation is concerned. A good recovery before fees and costs would only be \$6,000 or \$7,000.

The worst of the delay is the strain on people. The John and Mary case is deliberately chosen as one in which the world won't come to an end whether they get the money or not; the car and the doctor bills were taken care of by their own insurance. The worst feature of the accident is that the pig has been put in their parlor. If they are the tough-fibered type, they may be able to shove the whole episode to the rear shelf of the mind and forget it; but person after person cannot forget and for them, the matter is a constant source of worry and concern. If John and Mary are the ones sued, and if their insurance is on the thin side, they will spend all those years worrying about the impact of the lawsuit on their retirement plans. All too often, John may fail to recover as rapidly as otherwise he might because of a kind of lawsuit morbidity.

If a savage tormentor were attempting to devise an instrument for mental cruelty, he could scarcely improve on the device of leaving simple human beings in severe doubt, for years on end, as to the practical consequences of the normal affairs of life.

From this tale we can see that the problem is not confined to one area or limited section of the country. It is truly a national problem demanding national attention and the need for positive action is immediate.

The bill I introduced yesterday, H.R. 8247, The State Court Assistance Act, addresses itself to the problems of our civil courts. It is designed to stimulate criminal and civil judicial reform at the local level by encouraging State and local courts: First, to reevaluate the procedural methods of dealing with the judicial problems and second, to find and implement up to date solutions to these problems.

The State Court Assistance Act has two main features: First, it establishes a grant-in-aid program to encourage and financially assist the modernization of judicial machinery in our State and local courts. Second, it serves to create a national reservoir of up-to-date information about court management and organization. To direct these activities the proposal creates an Institute for Judicial Studies and Assistance.

Under the grant-in-aid program, our State and local courts could obtain financial aid to study and evaluate their judicial systems in order to determine the organizational and administrative changes necessary to maximize utilization of existing manpower and minimize expenditures of time and money. Part of this process of self evaluation can be achieved through the use of management-consultants and other experts.

Judges and other personnel rarely have administrative training, but our courts have been hesitant to make use of outside expertise in meeting problems of judicial administration. Federal funding would help overcome this hesitancy. Grants would be made to help implement the recommendations of these studies and evaluations.

The bill which I have introduced is identical to a proposal introduced by Senator Tydings in the 91st Congress. Extensive hearings on similar bills introduced by Senator Tydings were held in April, June, and July of 1967, and February 27 and March 11, 1970. The bill has never even been introduced in the House.

Since the initial conception of the bill by Senator Tydings, a complex of public and private groups have entered the field of State judicial reform. In introducing a bill identical to the last Tyding's proposal my hope is not merely to call attention to the crisis in our civil courts. It is my further hope that these hearings will provide a forum for those who have new recommendations in this area. For this reason I recognize that hearings in the House may establish the need to amend this legislation in order to take account of continuing developments in the efforts to reform the State judiciary.

Such developments include the passage of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Street Act and the establishment of the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency. The LEAA has funded constructive projects in the area of criminal court reform, but is prohibited by law from performing in depth analyses of courts which are primarily civil in nature.

Another development has been the establishment, by the Williamsburg Conference, of an ad hoc committee to assist in the planning of a National Center for State Courts. The exact function and funding mechanism of this center has not yet been established, but surely this ad hoc committee should be given the opportunity to make an assessment of the State Court Assistance Act to determine how this act's efforts to solve the State court crisis compare to its own.

Yet another development is the establishment in 1968 of the Federal Judicial Center. This Center conducts research studies for the purpose of improving the administration of Federal courts. It is possible that it might be mutually advantageous for the Center to share its facilities, in a limited manner, with the proposed Institute. Testimony on this point could be most helpful.

Finally it should be noted that many studies have already been performed by the States themselves, as well as by a number of private and public judicially oriented organizations.

Again, it is not my intent in introducing this bill to establish another institute which might duplicate the functions of other Federal agencies and unnecessarily duplicate the work already accomplished by the States and private legal groups.

It is my intent to encourage House hearings to determine the limitations which should be placed on the use of funds for further studies; to determine where jurisdiction overlaps with the

LEAA, the planned Center for State Courts, and private groups; and more importantly to determine the areas of court reform—particularly civil court reform—not covered by these organizations.

In short I look to House hearings as an opportunity for those involved in legal reform organizations to assess the concept and operation of an Institute for Judicial Studies in light of the developments of the last 4 years. Toward this end I feel the bill I introduced yesterday is an excellent vehicle and I urge prompt action by the Judiciary Committee.

#### AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I present for appropriate reference two bills to amend the National Labor Relations Act.

The first bill would clarify the findings and policies as set out in section 1 of the act. The second bill would amend section 10 to provide much needed improvements in the enforcement procedures of the National Labor Relations Board, in the quasi-judicial procedures invoked by the Board, as well as improvements in the judicial procedures involved in court review of NLRB decisions.

Mr. Speaker, Congress wrote the original Wagner Labor Relations Act in 1935. Major amendments were made when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947 and when the Landrum-Griffin Act was enacted in 1959. The preamble to this law—its statement of findings and policies—has through all these years made it clear that employees shall have the right to join unions and bargain collectively. To most of us, Mr. Speaker, when Congress says employees shall have the right to join unions, we would assume there is a choice involved—and that the same employees have the concomitant right not to join a labor union, if they choose not to do so. Unfortunately, the law has not impressed the National Labor Relations Board in that fashion. NLRB decisions for decades have espoused a much narrower view. The result has been an erosion of the employee's free choice. This has come about through the Board's apparent conviction that the central purpose of these laws has been to foster union organization at the expense of the employee's right to make a choice in the matter.

My amendment, Mr. Speaker, would expand the language of the preamble to make it absolutely clear that part of the free choice in joining a union is the equally free choice not to join; and that the right to engage in concerted activity includes the right not to engage in it if that be the choice of the employee.

The second bill, Mr. Speaker, touches, as I indicated above, on five very significant areas of enforcement and judicial review. The bill would amend section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act; first, to prevent the NLRB from issuing punitive and abusive orders not author-

ized by the law; second, to clarify replacement rights of employees guilty of flagrant misconduct while on strike; third, to restrict parties to labor disputes in the extent to which they may now whipsaw one another by going to various judicial forums for adjudication of the same complaint; fourth, to clarify jurisdiction for court review by limiting that review to the judicial circuit in which the unfair labor practice was committed, and fifth, to require a preponderance of evidence test for appellate review of NLRB findings.

I will comment briefly on each of these five provisions.

Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act empowers the NLRB to take such action as will effectuate the policies of the law in unfair labor practice cases. Normally, this has meant that when an employer is found to have committed an unfair labor practice, he will be ordered to stop the prohibited conduct and to post a notice at a conspicuous place in his plant. This notice would tell his employees the NLRB had found that an unfair labor practice had been committed, and that the employer will no longer engage in the prohibited conduct. In recent years the NLRB has broadened its remedial order by requiring that an employer found to have committed an unfair labor practice must then make a public confession of that fact to his employees. Happily, Mr. Speaker, courts of appeal have not seen fit to enforce these expanded orders in precisely the form the NLRB issued them. See *J. P. Stevens v. NLRB*, 380 F. 2d 202; *NLRB v. Laney and Duke Company*, 369 F. 2d 859. Obviously, Mr. Spaker, if Congress had intended that any such punitive and abusive order was within the power of the NLRB, it would have said so. Since the NLRB first began to require that notices be posted at conspicuous places where employees could see them, Congress has had two opportunities to amend the law. It made such amendments in 1947 and 1959, but in neither case did it include any legislative language or any legislative history which would have given the NLRB the kind of authority it proposes to take in cases such as those I have cited. It is pretty clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that had Congress intended to broaden the authority of the NLRB in this regard it could have done so when it passed the Taft-Hartley amendments in 1947, or again when it passed the Landrum-Griffin amendments in 1959. Accordingly, the amendment I propose here today would make it clear that in issuing remedial orders where unfair labor practices have been committed, the Board would be limited to those purposes now set out in the statute—the requirement that certain employees be reinstated, the requirement that there be bargaining in good faith upon the request of the union, and the requirement that suitable notices be posted stating that the prohibited conduct will not be repeated.

The next amendment would prevent the reinstatement of strikers who engage in flagrant misconduct during the course of a strike. Beginning about 10 years ago, and notably in the *Kohler* case (300 F.2d 699; 345 F.2d 748) the NLRB began the

process of reversing standards which had prevailed for more than 30 years. These were enunciated in the *Fansteel* case (306 U.S. 240) and provided that a striker would not be entitled to reinstatement with pay if he engaged in violence or coercion during the strike. This was so even though the employer might have committed unfair labor practices in that strike. Since *Kohler*, the Board compares the type of employee misconduct with the kind unfair labor practice committed by the employer. It then decides on the basis of this comparison whether such employee should be reinstated with pay. The result has been reinstatement for people who have engaged in various forms of violence during strikes. See *Montgomery Ward and Company*, 155 NLRB 999; *W. J. Ruscoe Company*, 166 NLRB 75; *Beaver Bros. Baking Company*, 171 NLRB 98; and *Trailmobile*, 168 NLRB 31.

As with the novel remedies referred to in the first amendment of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the courts have happily shown very little disposition to go along with the NLRB in its recent effort to favor those strikers who have engaged in flagrant misconduct. Nevertheless, there is sufficient precedent to require that Congress issue a new set of directives for the NLRB in this area as well. This is what my second amendment will do, Mr. Speaker. It will make certain that the offending party who is guilty of violent misconduct, or threats thereof, cannot justify that behavior or be rewarded for it by any claim before the NLRB that the other party to the dispute had been guilty of an unfair labor practice.

The third amendment in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to prevent one party to a labor dispute from whipsawing the other by moving to one judicial forum after another for a redress of the grievance involved. As the situation now stands, one party may choose to take his case to the NLRB, and if he doesn't like the outcome there he may go to the courts, or bring the matter before an arbitrator. My amendment, Mr. Speaker, would not deny a complaining party his right to bring his case before the forum of his choice. However, it would require that once he had made that choice, he could not change it unless his case were dismissed solely on jurisdictional grounds. A number of recent cases underscore the confusion which can beset unions and management as a result of this uncertainty about a final decision in any dispute. However, I would like to comment briefly about just one of these cases. I have in mind the *United Aircraft Corporation* case, 337 F. 2d 5. In that case there was an agreement to arbitrate the grievances of strikers who were denied reinstatement because of alleged misconduct during the strike. The arbitrator ruled against the reinstatement proposal and then the union filed an unfair labor practice charge with the NLRB. The employer tried to enjoin the proceeding but the Court of Appeals held that the Labor Board could take jurisdiction of the case even though there had been the earlier ruling by the arbitrator. This amendment will bring a much needed measure of clarity to this very confused situation.

The fourth amendment in this bill,

Mr. Speaker, will limit appellate review of NLRB orders in unfair labor practice cases to United States Courts of Appeals in the circuit where the unfair labor practice occurred. This will correct a practice known as forum shopping which has grown up in recent years. The law now permits review of Board orders in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, as well as in the circuit where the unfair labor practice actually occurred. This has given rise to a situation where lawyers, each trying to get into a circuit court they believe most favorable to their side of the case, have literally been racing against the clock to have jurisdiction asserted either by the District of Columbia court or by one of the other circuits. Again, I would cite the *Kohler* case to illustrate the need for this particular amendment. The NLRB found that an unfair labor practice had been committed in Wisconsin. The employer filed his notice of appeal with the Seventh Circuit, but the union was able to file a notice 1 hour earlier with the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. A motion to have the case reviewed in the Seventh Circuit did not prevail, even though it was in that circuit that the unfair labor practice had been committed. This amendment, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, will limit review to the circuit in which the unfair labor practice actually occurred.

The last amendment deals with standards for court review of NLRB orders. The law now provides that Labor Board findings of fact are conclusive if they are supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole. This language was written into the law in 1947 in order to broaden the scope of court review beyond that accorded under the 1935 Wagner Act where Board findings were deemed conclusive if supported by evidence.

In a long series of cases, beginning with the 1951 *Universal Camera* case (340 U.S. 474), the courts have turned back to the standard which Congress set aside in the 1947 amendments. It has been held that the Board's interpretations and its application of the law in doubtful situations will prevail even though the preponderance of evidence does not support them. See *NLRB v. Denver Building Trades* (341 U.S. 665); and *NLRB v. Interboro Contractors* (388 F. 2d 495). The courts will not draw different inferences from those of the Board, even if it seems more reasonable to do so. See *NLRB v. H & H Plastics* (389 F. 2d 678).

Of the great complaints advanced by students of labor-management affairs, Mr. Speaker, is that the courts have given entirely too much credence to what is called the expertise of the National Labor Relations Board. Because of this deference to the NLRB, too many outrageous Board decisions have been allowed to go unchallenged by the courts. When Congress expanded the test for court review in 1947, it obviously intended that the courts broaden the scope of the review they had exercised prior to that time. This, however, has not developed as Congress intended. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, my amendment would

now replace the test of substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole. It provides that on review by court of appeals, findings of fact by the NLRB would be conclusive only if they are supported by the preponderance of evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the amendments encompassed in these two bills to the early attention of the House.

#### TRUTH IN SAVINGS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Roy) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would provide for the full disclosure of the terms and conditions under which earnings on savings deposits are payable. This bill is identical to one which Senator HARTKE is introducing in the Senate. The objective of this bill is to establish uniform definitions of savings terms for the benefit and education of the consumer.

Today the multiplicity of differences in interest rates, the methods of computing these rates, and the complex of penalties and terms involved in those computations, present a confusing choice to the depositor. He is confronted with such savings systems as "low balances," "first-in-first-out," "last-in-first-out," "day of deposit to day of withdrawal," just to mention a few. Combined with this plethora of systems are the infinite possibilities by which a savings institution may compound the interest or earnings which accrue to the depositor.

My bill would require that a savings institution disclose to potential and existing depositors its annual and periodic percentage rates, the minimum length of time a deposit must remain on deposit for earnings to be payable at that percentage rate, the annual percentage yield, the number of times per year that earnings are compounded, and the dates on which earnings are payable. These disclosure requirements involve basic information which must be available if money is going to be invested wisely. This bill will make it possible for an individual to compare various savings methods and choose, in an intelligent way, that method which is most beneficial to him.

In addition to these requirements, the bill provides for the prominent disclosure of this information in advertisements relating to savings accounts. All advertisements must clearly state the annual percentage rate and the annual percentage yield, and if that rate or yield is payable only if a deposit meets certain minimum time or amount specifications. These requirements would not, it seems to me, place an undue hardship on the advertising programs of financial institutions, since they would be disclosing information already at hand. On the contrary, I believe that the economic stability of this country would be improved by the competition among savings institutions that these provisions would generate.

Perhaps the bill's most meaningful contribution to the consumer, however, is its establishment of a common savings

language. Although the lexicon of savings terminology does not intentionally mislead the depositor, it may, too often, have that effect. This common language has three basic terms which will enable the prudent consumer to make informed choices about where he will invest his savings. The first term, "annual percentage rate," means the nominal annual percentage rate used to compute earnings. "Earnings" is used in this bill rather than "interest" because it is more precise for the purposes of the bill; for example, banks pay "interest," but savings and loan associations pay "dividends." The second term "periodic percentage rate," is really the most important because it is critical for determining the annual percentage rate, and the annual percentage yield, as well as any earnings. The annual percentage rate is determined by multiplying the periodic percentage rate by the number of periods in a year. The third term, "annual percentage yield," expresses the rate obtained by applying the periodic percentage rate each period to the principal balance plus any accrued earnings. Furthermore, this act directs the Federal Reserve Board to strive to coordinate the terminology used in both credit and savings transactions. It confers on the Board the authority to issue appropriate regulations, including regulations which provide for clear, concise, and uniform disclosures regarding such classifications, adjustments, and exceptions as the Board determines are necessary.

Any savings institution which fails to comply with the provisions of this act would be liable for a minimum amount of \$100 and a maximum amount of \$1,000; and, in the case of a successful action to enforce the foregoing liability, court costs and reasonable attorney's fees. However, if a savings institution can show that any error was unintentional or notifies a depositor of an error within 15 days of its discovery, the liability can be avoided. The bill does, nevertheless, provide for a maximum fine of \$5,000 for willful and knowing violation of the requirements of this act. Compliance with this act would be administered by those agencies that now have responsibility for savings institutions. The Federal Reserve System is charged with prescribing regulations for implementing the act. The Federal Trade Commission is charged with enforcing the act where no other agency has jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for clear and meaningful savings disclosure and a need to develop a national concern for the problems of consumer depositors. I think the bill that Senator HARTKE and I have introduced answers those needs. The American public deserves to have all the facts needed to make a prudent investment decision, not merely to be protected from misleading practices. This bill sets disclosure standards which all consumers, and indeed all saving institutions, should welcome. It, in no way, tells financial institutions what they should pay or how they should pay it. They are free to compete. It merely directs these institutions to present, in a clear and direct manner, what they are actually doing, and what they intend to do, for the depositor. I invite my colleagues to read

this bill, the text of which is included below:

H.R. 8365

A bill to provide for uniform and full disclosure of information with respect to the computation and payment of interest on certain savings deposits

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Truth in Savings Act."

#### FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that economic stability would be enhanced and competition among savings institutions would be improved by the full disclosure of the terms and conditions under which earnings on savings deposits is payable. It is the purpose of this Act to require a meaningful disclosure of the terms and conditions of the payment of earnings on individual savings deposits so that the individual will be able to compare the various savings programs available to him.

#### DEFINITIONS; APPLICABILITY

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of this Act—

- (1) "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;
- (2) "individual" means a natural person;
- (3) "individual savings deposit" means any deposit or account which consists of funds (A) deposited to the credit of one or more individuals, or (B) in which the entire beneficial interest is held by one or more individuals, and upon which earnings is payable, and such term includes regular, notice, or time deposits or share accounts and any other such deposit or account whether or not evidenced by a negotiable or nonnegotiable instrument;
- (4) "earnings" means any amount payable to or for the account of any individual as compensation for the use of funds constituting an individual savings deposit and such term includes dividends and interest on any individual savings deposit;
- (5) "payable", when used with respect to a certain date or period of time, means the date on which or the period of time after which an absolute right to earnings exists;
- (6) "savings institution" means any person who in the regular course of his business receives, holds, and pays earnings on individual savings deposits; and
- (7) any reference to this Act, to any requirement imposed under this Act, or to any provision thereof includes reference to the regulations of the Board under this Act or the provision thereof in question.

(b) Nothing in this Act applies to any transaction involving—

- (1) a deposit of funds if the principle purpose of that deposit is to secure or guarantee the performance of a contract or the conditions of a contract for the sale or use of goods, services, or property;
- (2) interest payable on premiums, accumulated dividends, or amounts left on deposit under an insurance contract;
- (3) a deposit of funds of a principle amount in excess of \$25,000; or
- (4) any obligation issued by any Federal, State, or local government, or any agency, instrumentality, or authority thereof, except that the Board may prescribe rules and regulations to require disclosures by any agency, instrumentality, or authority of the Federal Government.

#### DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE, PERIODIC PERCENTAGE RATE, AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD

SEC. 4. (a) The annual percentage rate applicable to any individual savings deposit is that nominal annual percentage rate which will yield a sum equal to the amount of earnings payable in 1 year when that rate is ap-



plied to the principal amount (excluding any earnings theretofore paid or credited in that year) of an individual savings deposit.

(b) The periodic percentage rate is the annual percentage rate divided by the number of compounding periods in one year.

(c) The annual percentage yield applicable to any individual savings deposit is that nominal annual percentage rate which will yield a sum equal to the amount of earnings payable in 1 year when that rate is applied to a sum equal to the principal amount of an individual savings deposit plus any earnings theretofore paid or credited to that deposit in that year and not withdrawn during that year.

#### REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act. Those regulations shall provide for clear, concise, and uniform disclosures of information required by this Act, and may contain such classifications, adjustments, and exceptions as the Board determines are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act. All disclosures required by this Act shall be made only in terms as defined or used in this Act, as defined or used in the Truth in Lending Act or in regulations prescribed under that Act, or as such terms are further defined by the regulations of the Board. The Board may authorize the use of tables or charts for the disclosure of information required by this Act.

(b) The Board may prescribe such other rules and regulations as it determines to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

#### GENERAL REQUIREMENTS OF DISCLOSURE

SEC. 6. (a) Each savings institution shall disclose in writing to any individual at a time before he initially places funds in an individual savings deposit in such savings institution the following information with respect to individual savings deposits:

- (1) The annual percentage rate;
- (2) the minimum length of time a deposit must remain on deposit so that earnings are payable at that percentage rate;
- (3) the annual percentage yield;
- (4) the periodic percentage rate and the method used to compute the balance to which this rate will be applied;
- (5) the number of times each year earnings are compounded;
- (6) the dates on which earnings are payable;
- (7) any terms or conditions which increase or reduce the rate of earnings payable above or below items (1) or (3);
- (8) any charges initially or periodically made against any deposit; and
- (9) any restrictions and the amount or method of determining the amount of penalties or charges imposed on the use of funds in any deposit.

(b) Each savings institution shall disclose annually and at the time any earnings payment or report is made to an individual with respect to his individual savings deposit—

- (1) the amount of earnings payable;
- (2) the annual percentage rate;
- (3) the periodic percentage rate;
- (4) the principal balance to which the annual percentage rate was applied, and the method by which that balance was computed;
- (5) a detailed explanation of the difference, if any, between the amount of earnings payable and the maximum amount of earnings that would have been payable if the terms and conditions for such maximum payment had been met; and
- (6) any charges made against the principal of the deposit during the period covered for purposes of computing the payment of earnings or making the report.

(c) The Board may, by regulation, authorize or require the disclosure of periodic

percentage rates, tables of periodic factors which reflect compounding, and such other information as it determines to be necessary or appropriate in order to facilitate the individual's ability to verify the computation of earnings payable on any individual savings deposit.

(d) Not less than 10 days before a savings institution adopts any change in policy or procedure with respect to any item of information required to be disclosed under this section, that institution shall notify each individual depositor of each such change.

#### DISCLOSURES IN ADVERTISING

SEC. 7. (a) Every advertisement relating to the earnings payable on an individual savings deposit shall state with equal prominence (1) the annual percentage rate, and (2) the annual percentage yield, with respect to such deposit. If that rate or yield is payable only on a deposit which meets certain minimum time or amount requirements, those requirements shall be clearly and conspicuously stated.

(b) No such advertisement, announcement, or solicitation shall—

- (1) include any indication of any percentage rate or percentage yield based on a period in excess of one year or on the effect of any grace period; or
- (2) make use of the term "profit" in referring to earnings payable on such deposits.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 8. (a) Compliance with the requirements imposed under this Act shall be enforced under—

(1) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, by the Comptroller of the Currency;

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), by the Board;

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System), by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(2) section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, section 407 of the National Housing Act, and sections 6(1) and 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (acting directly or through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation), in the case of any institution subject to any of those provisions; and

(3) the Federal Credit Union Act, by the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration with respect to any Federal Credit Union.

(b) For the purpose of the exercise by any agency referred to in subsection (a) of its powers under any Act referred to in that subsection, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed to be a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. In addition to its powers under any provision of the law specifically referred to in subsection (a), each of the agencies referred to in that subsection may exercise, for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any requirement imposed under this Act, any other authority conferred on it by law.

(c) Except to the extent that enforcement of the requirements imposed under this Act is specifically committed to some other Government agency under subsection (a), the Federal Trade Commission shall enforce such requirements. For the purpose of the exercise by the Federal Trade Commission of its functions and powers under the Federal Trade Commission Act, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. All of the functions and powers of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act are available to the Commission to enforce compliance by any person with the requirements imposed

under this Act, irrespective of whether that person is engaged in commerce or meets any other jurisdictional tests in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) The authority of the Board to issue regulations under this Act does not impair the authority of any other agency designated in this section to make rules respecting its own procedures in enforcing compliance with requirements imposed under this Act.

#### RIGHT OF RECISSION ON TIME DEPOSITS

SEC. 9. In the case of any individual savings deposit subject to a time requirement, the individual shall have the right to a full return of his deposit with earnings therein at the advertised annual percentage rate until midnight of the thirtieth day following the making of that deposit or the delivery of the disclosure required under this section and section 6(a) of this Act, whichever is later. The savings institution shall clearly and conspicuously disclose to any individual subject to this section his rights under this section.

#### CIVIL LIABILITY

SEC. 10. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, any savings institution which fails in connection with any transaction subject to this Act to disclose to any individual any information required under this Act to be disclosed to that individual is liable to that individual in an amount equal to the sum of—

(1) twice the amount of the interest in connection with the transaction, except that the liability under this paragraph shall not be less than \$100 nor greater than \$1,000; and

(2) in the case of any successful action to enforce the foregoing liability, the costs of the action together with a reasonable attorney's fee as determined by the court.

(b) An institution has no liability under this section if within 15 days after discovering an error, and prior to the bringing of an action under this section or the receipt of written notice of the error, the institution notifies the individual concerned of the error and makes whatever adjustments in the appropriate deposit are necessary.

(c) An institution may not be held liable in any action brought under this section for a violation of this Act if the institution shows by a preponderance of evidence that the violation was not intentional and resulted from a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such error.

(d) Any action under this section may be brought in any United States district court, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction, within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation.

#### CRIMINAL LIABILITY FOR WILLFUL AND KNOWING VIOLATION

SEC. 11. Whoever willfully and knowingly (1) gives false or inaccurate information or fails to provide information which he is required to disclose under the provisions of this Act, or (2) otherwise fails to comply with any requirement imposed under this Act shall be fined not more than \$5,000.

#### VIEWS OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 12. In the exercise of its functions under this Act, the Board may obtain upon request the views of any other Federal or State agency which, in the judgment of the Board, exercises regulatory or supervisory functions with respect to any class of savings institutions subject to this Act.

#### EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

SEC. 13. (a) This Act does not annul, alter, or affect, or exempt any savings institution from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the disclosure of information in connection with individual savings deposits, except to the extent that those laws are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or regulations promulgated under

this Act, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

(b) This Act does not otherwise annul, alter, or affect in any manner the meaning, scope or applicability of the laws of any State, including, but not limited to, laws relating to the types, amounts or rates of earnings, or any element or elements of earnings, permissible under such laws in connection with individual savings deposits, nor does this Act extend the applicability of those laws to any class of persons or transactions to which they would not otherwise apply.

(c) Except as specified in section 9, this Act and the regulations promulgated under this Act do not affect the validity or enforceability of any contract or obligation under State or Federal law.

#### REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 14. The Board shall report to the Congress each year concerning the administration of its functions under this Act, and shall include in its report an assessment of the extent to which compliance with the requirements under this Act is being achieved and such recommendations as it deems necessary or appropriate.

#### SEPARABILITY

SEC. 15. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

#### THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOCAL 9, INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF THEATRICAL STAGE EMPLOYEES

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, May 10 was the 80th anniversary of the founding of Local 9 of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees. It was one of the original 11 locals organized in 1891 as the Theatrical Protective Union of Syracuse, N.Y.

The members of local 9, although they seldom share the spotlight, are the ones who provide the spotlight. Without their dedicated services, hardly a public program of note would take place in the central New York area. I personally am much indebted to them for their activities and the whole of our community owe them a debt of gratitude.

I want to take this opportunity to offer a special note of congratulations to Mr. James E. Foley and to each of the members of local 9.

#### NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT OF 1971

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last week the Supreme Court agreed to hear three cases dealing with the rights of newsmen under our Constitution to protect their sources and the information they gather from official scrutiny. The cases will be heard next winter. While the Supreme Court deals with the constitutional dimensions of this important issue, I believe the Congress should act to preserve our important tradition of a free press. To this end I have introduced the Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971.

This bill would prohibit any court, grand jury, or governmental agency—including the Congress and its committees—from requiring any journalist to disclose confidential information disclosed to him in his capacity as a newsmen or the source of any of his published information. This bill would protect radio and television, as well as newspapers and magazines.

The news media in America today are powerful. But for all their power they are uniquely vulnerable to intimidation. Their very power to reach and influence millions makes them an object of envy, anger, fear, and distrust.

All of us in public life have had occasions to feel that we were unfairly treated by a news program. Yet I think it is clear that no institution in our democracy is more vital to its preservation than a vigorous press.

The recent CBS program "The Selling of the Pentagon" is a vivid case in point. One can argue about the points of view expressed and even the accuracy of the story told. But one thing is beyond dispute—the program was an articulate critique of an important public issue. The response by those who disagree with its message should be to present their case to the public, not to intimidate CBS.

It is cheap politics to attack a newspaper, a television program, or a reporter. And it is dangerous politics. As government gets larger and is able to spread its control and influence over more people and resources it becomes more essential than ever to control governmental power. We have seen this problem vividly in the area of surveillance and the proliferation of official recordkeeping. In that area I believe we have in the United States today a growing consensus that legislation is required to safeguard basic freedom.

The area of preserving freedom of the press is no less pressing than that of insuring privacy. We must enact effective legislation now to protect newsmen from governmental intimidation and interference.

The only exceptions to this basic principle are cases of immediate threats to life or the national security, and my bill provides exceptions where a judicial determination is made that such a threat exists.

I would urge every citizen, when he reads his morning paper or watches an evening newscast, to remember that in totalitarian societies there is only one official "truth" and one official news service. We must not allow ourselves to be pushed, even slightly, in that direction. As the power of government to invade personal privacy and to intimidate the independent minded individual increases, we must all fight that much harder to preserve our traditional liberties. For this reason I urge the Congress to take action on the Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971.

#### SUPPORT FOR BLOOD DONATION TAX DEDUCTION BILL

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on January

21 I introduced H.R. 853, a bill allowing a \$25 tax deduction for blood donations given to nonprofit blood collecting organizations. Twenty-two of our colleagues are cosponsoring this legislation with me.

H.R. 853 is designed to increase both the quantity and quality of the supply of transfusable blood. It responds to the critical problems now besetting most hospitals because of the increased quantity of hepatitis-contaminated blood getting into their blood banks.

I have received a letter of endorsement for H.R. 853 from John V. Connorton, executive vice president of the Greater New York Hospital Association. I would at this time like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Connorton's statement:

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN V. CONNORTON

One of the most constructive and possibly most effective steps to have been taken in recent years to reduce the risk of transfusion-induced serum hepatitis is embodied in H.R. 853, introduced by Rep. Edward I. Koch (D., N.Y.) This bill would establish a \$25 tax credit to be applied for each voluntary contribution of blood.

As you may know, experts estimate that an American patient receiving commercially purchased blood runs 12 times as high a risk of contracting serum hepatitis as another patient who receives blood donated by a volunteer.

The tax-break incentive envisioned in Mr. Koch's bill would encourage proportionately more numerous voluntary blood donations by responsible taxpaying citizens and correspondingly there would be less frequent need to obtain blood from commercial sources. The result is likely to be a reduced incidence of transfusion-related hepatitis and, with it, a reduced toll in disability and death from this disease, which reportedly attacks 50,000 to 60,000 Americans every year.

For these reasons, I hope you will do everything you can to support the passage into law of H.R. 853.

#### CAMP JOHN F. KENNEDY OF THE ORDER OF BROTHERLY LOVE PAYS HOMAGE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the Order of Brotherly Love in Philadelphia has an outstanding record of public service and community involvement. The Camp John F. Kennedy of the Order recently visited the grave of the late President Kennedy to pay homage. That visit was accurately reported in the South Philadelphia American, a local newspaper. Under unanimous consent I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

#### DR. FRANK DIDIO LEADS OBL CAMP TO PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY'S GRAVE

Two bus loads of members and friends of Camp John F. Kennedy of the Order of Brotherly Love travelled to Washington, D.C. and to Arlington National Cemetery to pay homage to our martyr, President John F. Kennedy.

Let by its new master, Leonard Talarico, Esq., and its founder, Dr. Frank P. DiDio, the entourage consisted of past Master, Michael Carbone, and Carmen Saulingo, many members of the Grand Executive Council, officers and members of the Camp and friends. A wreath was placed on President Kennedy's

by the Master, Leonard Talarico, Michael Carbone, John LoCastro, and Carmen Saulino.

During the ceremony, Dr. Frank P. DiDio, its founder, conducted the following ritual which was written for the occasion:

"In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:

Let us gather together around this national shrine which contains the mortal remains of our martyred President John F. Kennedy and let us in silent prayer and meditation review the events of his life and his greatness as a dedicated American, his deeds as a war hero, and his greatness as a President. His quotes exemplifying the greatness of America will live with us forever.

Today the members of the Camp of the Order of Brotherly Love are fulfilling one of the pledges of incorporation, namely, to help perpetuate the memory of this great President and to pay homage to this shrine by this pilgrimage. And now, let us bow in reverence and again let us reflect for a brief moment upon the frailty, brevity, and the uncertainty of human life and then let us raise our heads toward the heavens above and ask Almighty God for forgiveness of our transgressions and to grant us love and peace among all peoples and may the souls of the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace."

The ceremony was most impressive and visitors paused to observe the fine Order of Brotherly Love's presentment.

The trip also featured a luncheon at the famous Cedar Knoll Inn, a visit to the famous shrines, Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument, Iwo Jima Memorial, and the Roman Catholic Cathedral.

Upon returning, dinner was served at Capriotti's, Mt. Ephraim, on the Black Horse Pike. A fine time was had by all on this most memorable of occasions in the brief history of Camp John F. Kennedy.

#### THE DEMONSTRATIONS PRODUCED ITS CRY BABIES

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding work of the Washington police in maintaining law and order during Washington's recent serious problems with demonstrators is very widely recognized and soundly applauded. Strong work by a determined and dedicated force prevented a collapse of the processes of government in the Nation's Capital city. Now it is over, but the shrill protests of frustrated May Day leaders against police procedures are still to be heard. This is no more than is to be expected. They conspired to break the law and their actions endangered the lives and safety of the people. They failed and they are unhappy about it. They are not even good revolutionaries. They are cry babies.

It is most unfortunate that their cause has been championed by a few judges whose rulings indicate that they think they are in fact dealing with children at play who must be protected rather than punished for wrongdoing. These judges are not a credit to their profession or their calling.

Then there are the broadcasters and the columnists who, since the Washington disorders, have filled the news media with whining accusations against the police. This spectacle is nauseating. They ignore in its entirety the magnificent job

done by the police to preserve order in spite of the overwhelming influx of troublemakers. These same police whom they now criticize literally saved the broadcasters' heads, their jobs, and their livelihood, for these would have gone down the drain had the revolutionaries accomplished their goal of a takeover of the Government. The broadcasters even ignore the fact that their vaunted freedom of the press also would have been gone; a freedom which they count so highly and which they abuse nearly every day of their lives.

The police have a responsibility to protect the public and this they did in exemplary fashion during the Washington demonstrations. They deserve full credit—not abuse—and I am confident they are receiving this in the minds and hearts of a grateful American public.

#### THE DOLLAR PROBLEM IS SIMPLE; THERE ARE TOO MANY OF THEM IN EUROPE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is an old political adage that states: When you get hit in the face with lemons, you make lemonade. But lemonade without sweetening is not very palatable.

That is the unhappy situation in which the United States finds itself as it seeks to work its way out of the throes of the monetary crisis abroad which struck so savagely last week. The dollar problem is simple. There are too many of them in Europe.

For many years, the United States has sent dollars, dwindling in value but plentiful in number, to foreign capitals in the form of loans, grants, and contracts. This is the foreign aid program in all its aspects. In addition, American business has been spending more abroad than at any time in history. The American consumer has placed increasing demands on foreign manufacturers and importers of foreign goods. U.S. Armed Forces abroad, plus the various supporting programs, plus families of servicemen abroad, also have contributed billions to the supply of dollars in foreign countries.

The hard cold truth is that dollars are so plentiful abroad that people are taking a second look at them. Many are deciding they prefer to have their own currency.

During this heavy flow of American dollars overseas from various sources, dollar transactions took place at a rate of exchange agreed upon by the International Monetary Fund members.

Finally, last week, several governments decided they did not like the rate of exchange. They said, in effect, that the deal they made to exchange their currency for ours no longer was a good deal and they wanted out. They stated they would set the rate of exchange themselves and, in substance, allow their own currency to float to an acceptable level based on the law of supply and demand.

Thus, after years of siphoning American dollars into their economies, we have discovered that our own economy can no

longer stand the strain in relationship to those of foreign governments.

The value of the American dollar declined. The value of foreign currency increased.

Our economy has been hit in the face with lemons. There is not any sweetening—or maybe just the least little bit. There is another side. The net result, if no reassessment takes place, will be that foreign goods now will cost more American dollars to purchase. This can have a good effect for our industries at a time when American workers are being threatened at every turn by low-priced foreign imports.

#### OKLAHOMA LEADS NATION

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that Oklahoma led the Nation during February in the number of students graduated from medical self-help training courses and had the greatest number of graduates based on population.

Dr. R. LeRoy Carpenter, commissioner of health in Oklahoma, was notified of the recognition by Dr. Henry C. Huntley, Director of the Division of Emergency Health Services, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rockville, Md.

Medical self-help courses, taught in high schools, colleges, Government agencies, industry, and civic clubs have as their primary purpose the preparation of the individual to provide emergency medical assistance in any circumstance where professional medical care is not available.

Oklahoma's goal is to train one member of every family in this lifesaving program. Since its inception in 1963, Oklahomans, under program direction of the State department of health, have taught approximately 300,000 persons.

Dr. Carpenter tells me that the Department has confirmed evidence that one person's life was saved just last month by a graduate of a medical self-help course in Oklahoma. This is ample reward in itself for the time, effort, and cost of conducting this program.

I am proud of the many people across Oklahoma who have taught these training courses in their various organizations. They are exhibiting a true Oklahoma spirit of being prepared to aid their fellow man in time of disaster and personal need.

I congratulate and commend Commissioner Carpenter and his staff and all who have contributed to the success of this worthwhile program.

#### SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURE

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I request not more than a few minutes to speak on a matter of great importance to farmers, agriculture, and rural America.

In these days of urgent and over-

whelming urban problems, many articulate spokesmen have come forward to raise their voices. Urban problems are indeed grave and they must be heeded. At the same time rural America and agriculture must not be displaced from the mainstream of American life, culture, and economy.

Therefore, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak up today for agriculture. One of the farmer's perennial complaints is that he is at the mercy of businesses which, because of size and centralization, can bargain more efficiently with him than he with them.

I have introduced legislation which would redress that complaint. It is the national agricultural marketing and bargaining bill of 1971. It has been strongly supported by organizations representing the farmer.

The 1967 Agricultural Fair Practices Act, which I also sponsored, established standards of fair practices required of handlers in their dealings in agricultural products. However, it did not include an affirmative duty to bargain thus not dealing with the refusal of handlers to negotiate with a producer bargaining association.

The new bill requires bargaining in good faith on the part of processors and associations of producers. It does not require agreement.

The bill sets up administrative machinery to administer the program and sets qualifications for farmer bargaining organizations. Only organizations meeting these qualifications can bargain with handlers or processors. Five provisions must be met before an organization can be defined as a bargaining association.

The requirement to bargain imposes negotiation on price and terms of sale, other contract provisions, and a written contract if either side wants it.

Handlers would not be permitted to negotiate with other producers while bargaining with a qualified producer association and could not purchase from other producers at terms more favorable to the handler than those set by a qualified bargaining association.

The legislation also sets up procedures for investigation of charges of refusal to bargain, enforcement of the bargaining procedures, and judicial review of alleged violations.

This legislation does not compel farmers to join in a bargaining association or compel handlers and producers associations to reach an agreement or establish Government-managed marketing boards.

It does meet the need of improving the legal foundations on which the farmers can build their own effective marketing and bargaining programs.

I, at this time, urge other Congressmen to support this legislation. I am reintroducing H.R. 7597 tomorrow. Please call my office to be listed as a sponsor on this bill.

#### THE STATE OF THE PUERTO RICAN ECONOMY—UNEMPLOYMENT

(Mr. BADILLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, when I took the floor of the House last week to discuss the many problems confronting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the plight of Puerto Ricans, both on the mainland and the island, I urged the establishment of a national employment bank aimed at providing job training for unskilled and semiskilled Puerto Ricans who are forced to seek employment on the mainland.

In my speech I stated that the labor market in Puerto Rico is simply unable to cope with the large and growing labor force and that Puerto Ricans are increasing their migration to the United States in search of better economic conditions and employment opportunities. One of the primary factors compelling Puerto Ricans to migrate to the mainland is the lack of jobs and the soaring unemployment rate. Our colleagues will recall that I mentioned that unemployment is currently at 12.2 percent, according to Labor Department figures. However, unemployment actually approaches 25 to 30 percent when you take into account those who have been discouraged and rejected and are not actively seeking employment.

My contention has been supported in recent testimony before the House General Labor Subcommittee by Mr. H. C. Barton, Jr., president of the Puerto Rico Development Group, Inc. Last Friday and Saturday, the General Labor Subcommittee held hearings in San Juan, Puerto Rico in connection with the pending minimum wage legislation and, particularly, the application of the Federal minimum wage to Puerto Rico. In discussing this issue, Mr. Barton presented some pertinent and informative statistics which describe the full extent of the unemployment crisis in Puerto Rico. Particularly noteworthy is the valid distinction which he makes between official surveys and actual unemployment conditions. Also, he cites the important issue of the quality of the work force.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will be interested in reviewing this important data. Accordingly, I include herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, some of the statistics which Mr. Barton presented to the General Labor Subcommittee last week as well as pertinent excerpts from his testimony:

#### STATEMENT

The magnitude of Puerto Rico's deficiency in jobs is estimated in the accompanying table. The significant figures appear in the columns headed "calculated employment deficiency." For both sexes there was an estimated deficiency of 362 thousand jobs in February of this year. This amounts to an unemployment rate for our potential labor force of 33%—one third of our manpower resources are idle.

The estimates presented in this table require explanation because they differ from our official figures on the size of the labor force and on the amount of unemployment. Please note first that the figures in the second column for "civilian, non-institutional population" are taken directly from the official survey of our Department of Labor on "Employment and Unemployment in Puerto

Rico." So also are the figures for "reported employment" shown in column five. The difference in these estimates from the official figures is introduced in the third column which is headed "% in the U.S. labor force."

These estimates are based on a different definition of labor force from that used in the official statistics. In the official survey only those individuals who are at work or who are actively seeking work are included in the labor force. In Puerto Rico there are many individuals who do not actively look for work because they know that there is no job available for which they are qualified. But they are able and willing to work whenever a suitable job does become available. The estimates presented here include in the labor force those who are able and willing to work, even though they are not actively job hunting at the moment.

Thus the "calculated labor force" shown in column six is based on the assumption that, if job opportunities here in Puerto Rico were comparable to those in the States, Puerto Ricans in each age and sex group would actively look for work and have labor force participation rates equal to those prevailing in the States. This, I believe, is a conservative assumption. U.S. labor force participation rates are not high by international standards. High school and college enrollment in Puerto Rico is considerably below U.S. levels. Many more women in Puerto Rico are heads of families for which they must try to provide and few heads of families can afford early retirement. It is thus conservatively estimated that, if the jobs were available, the Puerto Rican labor force would currently total 1,106,000.

Subtracting the number actually working from this calculated or "standardized" labor force leaves a deficiency of 362,000 jobs. This job deficiency is highly concentrated among the young people of both sexes. Nearly half the jobs we need are for workers under 25 years of age. Most of these young people are under-educated, unskilled and without previous work experience. It is precisely these beginning level jobs for which training time is relatively short that are most sharply affected by the application of minimum wage legislation.

The pressing need of Puerto Rico for unskilled jobs and the corresponding need to upgrade the quality of our labor force is shown by the comparisons made in the accompanying table on the occupational distribution of the labor force in the United States and in Puerto Rico. As the table shows, the occupational distribution of employed workers in Puerto Rico is not markedly different from the distribution of employed workers in the States. We still have a higher proportion of blue collar and farm workers and a comparative lack of better paying white collar jobs but the differences have been diminishing over the years and will probably disappear before many more years have passed.

The differences in the composition of the unemployed, however, are very great. In the United States, there is considerable resemblance between previous occupations of the unemployed and the occupational distribution of those who have jobs and only about 12% of the unemployed are without previous work experience. In Puerto Rico, the great bulk of the unemployed have never had a paid job or, at best, have worked in unskilled, blue collar jobs. In addition to the young people who have never had a chance at a meaningful job, there are many women, especially in rural areas, for whom job opportunities simply do not exist. Unemployed young men can and do migrate in large numbers but for single girls, migration is possible only if close family members are already established in the States.

CALCULATED EMPLOYMENT DEFICIENCY IN PUERTO RICO, FEBRUARY 1971

[In thousands]

Age and sex	Civ. non-institut. population <sup>1</sup>	Percent in U.S. labor force <sup>2</sup>	Calculated potential labor force <sup>2</sup>	Reported employment <sup>1</sup>		Calculated employment deficiency		Age and sex	Civ. non-institut. population <sup>1</sup>	Percent in U.S. labor force <sup>2</sup>	Calculated potential labor force <sup>2</sup>	Reported employment <sup>1</sup>		Calculated employment deficiency	
				Number	Percent	Number	Percent					Number	Percent		
<b>Both sexes:</b>															
14 to 19	362		148	44	104	70		45 to 54	109	94.2	103	86	17	16	
20 to 24	263		186	123	63	34		55 to 64	85	83.0	71	56	15	21	
25 to 34	378		270	215	55	20		65+	85	26.8	23	22	1	4	
35 to 44	271		195	154	41	21		Total	895		682	523	159	23	
45 to 54	229		168	116	52	31		<b>Females:</b>							
55 to 64	168		107	67	40	37		14 to 19	178	34.9	62	10	52	84	
65+	174		32	25	7	22		20 to 24	130	57.7	75	44	31	41	
Total	1,845		1,106	744	362	33		25 to 34	202	50.1	101	71	30	30	
<b>Males:</b>								35 to 44	148	51.1	76	52	24	32	
14 to 19	184	47.0	86	34	52	60		45 to 54	120	54.4	65	30	35	54	
20 to 24	133	83.3	111	79	32	29		55 to 64	83	43.0	36	11	25	69	
25 to 34	176	95.8	169	144	25	15		65+	89	9.7	9	3	6	67	
35 to 44	123	96.9	119	102	17	14		Total	950		424	221	203	48	

<sup>1</sup> Employment and unemployment in Puerto Rico, February 1971, Commonwealth Department of Labor.

<sup>2</sup> 1970 average civilian labor force participation rates in the United States.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. participation rates applied to corresponding age-sex groups in the Puerto Rican population.

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE LABOR FORCE  
[In percent]

	Employed		Unemployed	
	United States <sup>1</sup>	Puerto Rico <sup>2</sup>	United States <sup>1</sup>	Puerto Rico <sup>2</sup>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar <sup>3</sup>	48.3	38.2	27.2	3.4
Blue collar <sup>4</sup>	35.3	40.5	45.2	17.9
Service <sup>5</sup>	12.4	12.6	13.2	2.5
Farm <sup>6</sup>	4.0	8.7	2.0	3.0
No work experience			12.4	73.2

<sup>1</sup> 1970 monthly average.

<sup>2</sup> Data for February 1971.

<sup>3</sup> Professional and semiprofessional; managers, officials, and proprietors, except farms; clerical, sales, and kindred workers.

<sup>4</sup> Craftsmen, and foremen; operatives and kindred workers; nonfarm laborers.

<sup>5</sup> Private household workers; protective services; and other services: personal, commercial, maintenance, etc.

<sup>6</sup> Farmers and farm managers; farm laborers and foremen.

Note: Unemployed in Puerto Rico include 97,000 reporting previous occupation, 7,000 reporting no previous work experience, plus 258,000 "potential" workers assumed to have had no previous work experience.

FAMILY PRACTICE OF MEDICINE

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during debate in the House on Tuesday on the pending supplemental appropriation bill for 1971—H.R. 8190—the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) offered an amendment to fund under the Family Practice of Medicine Act of 1970.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) made a point of order against the language of the amendment and the chairman sustained the point of order.

I recognize the basis for the Chair's ruling and regret that the point of order was made and insisted upon. This barred discussion as to the merits of the amendment and the extremely questionable validity of the President's action in his so-called pocket veto last Christmas Eve.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the action in the House yesterday, ruling out consideration of the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I am today introducing the Family Practice of Medicine Act as it was finally approved by the House and the Senate and sent to

the President for action last December.

I am extremely hopeful that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will take early action on this measure and start it through the legislative process once again.

NEED INCREASES DAILY

The need for increasing the number of family physicians is growing day by day.

If the committee were to accept the bill as passed by both Houses after hearings and floor consideration last fall, action could be very quick and conceivably could provide assistance to the medical schools and hospitals for the school year next September.

The shortage of physicians is a national disgrace, and it is essential that the Federal Government act to encourage and assist medical students in engaging in the practice of family medicine.

There are many thousands of specialists today, and only a very small percentage of all physicians are practicing family medicine. This is in direct contrast to the percentage engaging in family practice as recently as 10 or 15 years ago.

Families today need to have access to a physician who is willing and capable of treating all members of the family and thereby being able to take into account the many soul and hereditary factors which very often can be extremely important.

BILL TO CLARIFY VETO POWER

Mr. Speaker, the brief discussion yesterday referred to the extremely questionable action of the Chief Executive last Christmas Eve in exercising what he described as the "pocket veto" of the family practice of medicine bill.

In this regard, I am today also introducing legislation to clarify the intent of the Constitution with regard to the Presidential veto authority.

My bill would make it clear that the right of the Chief Executive to exercise the "pocket veto" provision of the Constitution would exist only after a sine die resolution of the Congress.

CONGRESS IN CONSTANT JEOPARDY

Unless this clarification is made in law, the Congress will be in constant

jeopardy of a usurpation of its rights by the Chief Executive during brief adjournments for holidays—or even for long weekends.

The necessity for this clarification is based on the President's action with regard to the family practice of medicine bill last Christmas Eve when the House and Senate were in holiday recess.

When the Senate adopted its adjournment resolution for that weekend, it provided specifically that an officer of the Senate could receive messages from the Chief Executive during the adjournment period.

Thus, the Senate made specific provision for receiving a veto message from the President, and there was no necessity for him to utilize the pocket-veto procedure.

Indeed, I feel personally that his use of the pocket-veto procedure was illegal. Of course, however, that is a matter for the final determination of the courts.

REINSTATING THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include statements of two constituents.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1962 Congress adopted an investment tax credit for the purpose of providing an incentive to business to modernize and expand the Nation's productive plant and equipment in order to raise productivity, increase employment, accelerate economic growth, and strengthen our competitive position in world markets. This tax credit was continued—except for a brief suspension period—until 1969. During that period the Nation enjoyed a rising level of economic prosperity, though we all recognize that the unwanted war in Vietnam was also accountable.

The economy once again needs a stimulus such as was initially provided in 1962. Thus, I have introduced today a bill to reinstate the 7-percent investment tax credit to give a needed boost to small businessmen and farmers in rural America and to stimulate the general economy to faster recovery.

My measure is uniquely different from the 1962 law, however, in that it restricts

the availability of the credit to U.S. produced equipment. Accordingly, the credit would be denied for acquisition of property containing more than a small amount of foreign manufactured components or materials or involving more than a minimal amount of manufacturing, production, or assembly overseas. The purpose of this restriction is, of course, to assure that the benefits to be gained by the credit are enjoyed by American management and labor instead of workers and companies abroad. Today's date would be the effective date after which credit would apply to investments.

When the credit was initially proposed in 1961, the economy had been caught in the doldrums beginning in 1957. A few major economic indicators will demonstrate the extent of stagnation during that period and the extent to which the economy responded so favorably to stimuli beginning with the investment tax credit in 1962.

Industrial productivity stood at a level of 63.2 in 1956 and advanced to only 69.4 by 1961—1967 equals 100. During the period 1962-69—the years for which the investment tax credit was in effect—the productivity index increased from 74.8 to 109.3.

In the 5-year period 1957-61 the gross national product increased from a level of \$441 billion in 1957 to \$520 billion in 1961. In contrast, during the 8-year period 1962-69 the national product expanded from \$560 to \$931 billion. Although some of the increase of the production in the latter period—as well as in the earlier period—was accounted for by increased prices, the real growth was substantial for each of the years during the period.

A similar resurgence occurred in expenditures for plant and equipment following the adoption of the investment credit. During the 5-year period 1957-61, expenditures for plant and equipment amounted to \$176 billion. During the period 1962-69 these expenditures aggregated to a total of \$453 billion.

I certainly do not wish to imply that the investment tax credit was solely responsible for this substantial increase in productivity, economic growth, and investment in productive facilities during 1962-69. The war was a major factor along with excessively inflationary Federal spending policies. However, I do maintain that the data is evidence that the credit constituted a significant contribution to an overall Government fiscal program that promoted highly successful results.

The economic data I presented for the period 1957-61 should alert the Congress to the danger that our economy could be kept down to an unhealthy level for some duration. This is important to realize at the present time when our economy is lagging, with only partial indication of significant recovery in the near future. Unless the Congress immediately takes proper fiscal action, we could subject ourselves to a slower recovery than is necessary during the present transitional shift from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Thus, to bolster the present gradual recovery, it is imperative to take

positive fiscal action by restoring the investment tax credit now.

At this time, I would like to review various major economic indicators to characterize generally the present state of our economy. These indicators reflect directly President Nixon's successful winding down of the war along with attendant reductions in defense-related activities. However painful, they are necessitated by the present transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and by the President's courageous attempt to reorder our national priorities. Industrial production declined from a level of 109.3 in 1969 to a level of 106 in 1970. While the productivity index showed some increase in the months of December 1970 and January 1971 over the low of November 1970, largely due to the settlement of the General Motors strike, the index showed another decline in February. Gross national product, measured in real terms—that is, adjusted for price inflation—showed a decline in the period 1969 to 1970. Early reports for the national product thus far this year indicate much ground remains to be made, even though we have passed the trillion dollar mark for the first time in history. Expectations for plant and equipment expenditures in 1971 are not as encouraging as we would like.

As a result of a survey in January and February of this year by the Commerce Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission, expenditures for new plant and expenditures are expected to increase by 4.3 percent. Other indicators show an excessive rate of unemployment and inhibited corporate profits. Personal incomes which showed signs of strength in January showed a sluggish gain for February.

In January of this year, President Nixon announced liberalization of depreciation allowances by business and took other broad steps to revive the economy. One of the major purposes of the depreciation allowance action is to promote additional investment by business and to help business through tax reductions to accumulate capital required for investment. The administration is hopeful that, as a result, new and modernized equipment in American business will increase productivity, strengthen our position in world markets, and provide additional job openings. There is new evidence that this is occurring. The most recent OBE-SEC survey shows an expected strengthening of manufacturing outlays during the course of 1971. From the first half of this year to the second, manufacturers' outlays in the aggregate are expected to rise 6 percent on the expectation of sharply accelerated sales growth.

Similar action was taken by the administration in 1962 to liberalize depreciation. Thus, in that year, the investment tax credit and liberalized depreciation fiscal measures which proved to be extremely beneficial to the economy. Similarly, supplementing the already announced liberalized depreciation with reinstatement of the investment tax credit could go a long way toward injecting the necessary stimulus in our economy at this time.

Actually, the investment tax credit is

a more potent stimulus to investment than liberalized depreciation. It goes much further than depreciation in raising the rate of return on investment—even though the revenue loss is the same. The investment tax credit results in an immediate and outright tax reduction in addition to normal depreciation allowed for the asset. Liberalized depreciation merely speeds up the depreciation deduction; the overall tax reduction over the life of the asset is the same under either normal or accelerated depreciation.

Certain currently existing favorable factors would help to assure the success of reinstating the investment tax credit to stimulate additional investment and—as a consequence—a high level of economic activity. As you are aware, the Tax Reform Act of 1969, strongly pushed by the Nixon administration, provided substantial individual income tax reductions which will become effective over a period of several years. Thus, during the intervening years until the reductions become fully effective, personal disposable incomes can be expected to increase. This additional spendable income along with already high levels of incomes and accumulated savings create a potential for significantly increased levels of effective demand. As a consequence, business should more readily respond with increased levels of investment in productive facilities. This will induce even further demand for the products of industry and once again return the economy to the high level of economic activity that we all desire.

I wish to comment on one other segment of the economy. This involves housing. We know from experience that housing often suffers when the demand for funds for capital investment is high. Funds for housing often dry up as interest rates soar. I am happy to report, however, that our mortgage market and interest rate market have shown a remarkably favorable turn in recent months. Reports on housing starts are good. Funds available for mortgages have increased substantially, and mortgage rates have declined. Thus, the risk that the reinstatement of investment tax credit would have a seriously adverse effect on the housing market at this time is not imminent.

I would like to mention that leading authorities support my views on reinstating the investment tax credit. While some expressions toward the investment tax credit have been stated modestly, there is a growing feeling of urgency for this type of economic stimulus.

I wish to introduce into the RECORD at this point an explanation of some of the more technical aspects of this measure prepared at my request by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

The bill provides—in section 2(a)—that the investment credit is to be available for property qualifying for the credit which is placed in service in the future, except in two cases. First, the credit would not be available if the property was either acquired or ordered before the introduction of the bill. Second, in the case of property being constructed by the taxpayer, the credit would not be avail-

able for that part of the cost of the property attributable to costs incurred prior to the introduction of the bill. These limitations on the availability of the credit are based on the principal that acquisitions, orders, and construction prior to the introduction of the bill were not stimulated by the credit—that is, they were undertaken without regard to the investment credit—and, thus, it would not be appropriate to extend the credit in these cases.

Any property eligible for the credit under existing law because of the application of the transition rules contained in the 1969 repeal of the credit would continue to be eligible for the credit under the bill.

Under existing law, the amount of investment credits which a taxpayer may claim in a year—including carrybacks and carryovers to the year of credits which were not usable in other years—is subject to two limitations. First, the credits claimed generally may not exceed 50 percent of the taxpayer's tax liability for the year. Second, carrybacks and carryovers to the year may be claimed only to the extent of 20 percent of the total amount of carrybacks and carryovers to the year. This limitation was adopted at the time of the repeal of the credit because of the substantial amount of unused credits which taxpayers had at that time. Since taxpayers would not be generating current credits after the repeal which would fill up, so to speak, the generally applicable 50 percent of tax liability limitation, they could have, in the absence of the 20-percent limitation, rather quickly claimed their unused credits. This would have produced quite a significant revenue loss.

Once the credit has been restored and in operation for a period of time, this problem will no longer exist since taxpayers will be currently generating new investment credits. Accordingly, the bill would continue the application of the 20 percent limitation for a short period of time—through taxable years ending before 1972—and then would terminate its applicability.

Finally, the bill would deal with the situation where property for which a credit has been claimed is disposed of by casualty or theft before the end of the period taken into account in determining the amount of the credit originally allowed.

The amount of the cost of property eligible for the credit would be determined, if the credit was restored and the rules of prior law reinstated, with reference to the period of time it would be used by the taxpayer: The amount qualifying would be one-third if the period was 4 to 6 years, two-thirds if it was 6 to 8 years, and 100 percent if it was more than 8 years. In addition, there generally would be a recapture of the credit where there was an early disposition of the property. Prior to the repeal of the credit, the law contained a complex set of rules to deal with the situation where investment credit property was disposed of by casualty or theft and then replaced with new property. The application of these rules, which generally resulted in an adjustment to the amount of the credit re-

captured or the amount of the credit allowed on the replacement property, was terminated when the credit was repealed.

Although it does not seem appropriate to reinstate these rules because of their complexity, some provision is needed, if the credit is restored, to prevent taxpayers from obtaining undue benefits in the situation where investment credit property is disposed of by casualty or theft and then replaced. For example, in the absence of a provision to deal with this situation, a taxpayer, who had property with a life of 8 years destroyed after 1 year of use and who replaced that property, would have received a full credit on the destroyed property, even though it was only used 1 year, and also would receive a full credit on the replacement property. Accordingly, the bill—in section 2(c)—would provide that where investment credit property which is disposed of by casualty or theft is replaced, the otherwise allowable credit on the replacement property would be reduced by the amount of the credit which would have been recaptured with respect to the property disposed of under the generally applicable rules.

I would like to note that my thinking with regard to the investment tax credit has certainly been influenced by a provocative, well-reasoned statement submitted to me by Mr. Richard Horner, president of the E. F. Johnson Co., of Waseca, Minn. I include Mr. Horner's presentation at this point in my remarks:

#### THE CASE FOR THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The current status of the United States economy has been the subject of extensive discussion by economists, politicians, and lay Americans. There are a few characteristics concerning which there seems to be general agreement, and which in their composite constitute an unsatisfactory economic posture. Unemployment is at an unacceptably high level and has continued to grow in a time period when the cost of labor has simultaneously continued to increase. Further growth in labor costs at a rate that is disproportionate to prospective improvement in productivity appears to be likely. In addition to labor rate inflation, the cost of renting capital has been high and although there has been a recent reduction in some borrowing rates, the difficulties of putting capital to work continue to frustrate the American industrial manager. For example, most purchases of capital goods that are needed for the improvement of productivity to counter the inflation in wages require long term investment and the availability/price characteristic of long term capital is a deterrent to such investment. Thus, the increase in supply of products lags while the potential demand, as measured by personal savings accounts, is at an all-time high. The cost of living continues upward while unemployment grows; and the gap between potential and actual Gross National Product increases as we price ourselves out of the world markets and even give up substantial fractions of domestic markets to foreign competition as our international balance of trade deteriorates. Something must be done to break the dam which is holding back productivity.

Although there is substantial agreement on the general nature of the disease, there is great debate on the specifics of the symptoms and the treatment indicated by each to effect a therapeutic cure. The economic philosophers are enjoying a heyday in the mass media and the government can receive a large variety of professional advice by simply selecting a variety of professional sources.

Who is to say which advisor has merit and which is promoting a thesis that is not fitting the needs of the moment. There is probably insufficient time to try even the most promising theories in sequential practice to measure results, but to the practitioner of industrial economics, that seems to be the course we are following. To this individual, there seems to be one major oversight. He steers his course with two primary sources of economic information . . . the balance sheet and the profit and loss statement. If he has found the time to review these pages from his annual report for the last ten years, there is revealed a solution to our current dilemma with startling clarity. The industrial investment in capital goods turned up sharply early in the decade with the passage of the investment tax credit statute and turned down sharply with its withdrawal in early 1969. Since this was the intended effect of this legislation, there is no reason for surprise, but the occurrence that should be noted was the unpredicted government budget surplus that came as an immediate consequence of the industrial stimulation and resultant expansion in the tax base. For the decade of the '70's, a new version of the investment tax credit offers a mechanic for attaining the best performance of the capitalistic, free enterprise, competitive system of industrial economics, and in the great competition between world social orders, improved performance is vitally necessary. The advantages to be expected can be discussed under four headings:

#### I. THE GENERATION OF FULL EMPLOYMENT ECONOMY

The Executive Office of the President has announced the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of a growth economy as a national goal with the short term objective of 4% unemployment by the middle of 1972. The attainment of that objective by the simple institution of a more plentiful money supply and increased government spending is highly problematical and fraught with the severe risk of inflation. If the lower cost of capital afforded by increased money supplies are immediately balanced by increased costs of labor as enforced by wage inflation, the industrial manager cannot afford to make the long term risk investment in capital goods which will ultimately reduce labor costs by making it more efficient through the use of better tools which will in turn permit price competition, lower product prices, and increased consumption. The important feature of the investment tax credit is the incentive that it provides to the industrial manager to make the necessary long term capital investments since that is the only way he can realize the proffered, effective reduction in capital costs.

This is not to say that some increase in money supply will not be necessary. It is simply not a sufficient condition to generate the needed increase in productivity. It is a recorded fact that the composite capital goods budget for the American manufacturing and service industries is set at an all-time high in 1971. The statement of this fact is usually in the context of proving that revitalization of our economy is at hand. It should be simultaneously stated, however, that next year's capital budget is a projection of what industry would like to have happen, and it is almost always at an all-time high when it is next year's budget. It is an equally certain fact that that budget will not be spent unless the business conditions reflected on current balance sheets and profit and loss statements support the wisdom of the investment. The reinstitution of the investment tax credit can be the key log in the jam. The economy is poised for action. The consumer has the savings accounts and the current income. Industry has identified product and service needs and has made their plans for investment in capital goods. The capability to start that investment with

their tax credits would inevitably start the chain of increased manufacturing activity in the capital goods industry and then increased productivity in all manufacturing and service organizations with the consequence of increased employment and higher government revenues. The result was effectively proven in the 1962 experience.

#### II. INFLATION CONTROL WHILE EXPERIENCING ECONOMIC GROWTH

It is now generally accepted that the combination of the investment tax credit, large increases in government spending with high government deficits, and a contingent relaxation of the control of the money supply produced the out-of-control inflation of the late '60's. With the usual hostility of individuals toward large organizations and what is usually called "big business", the democratic processes repealed the investment tax credit in 1969 while slowing down the rate of growth of government expenditure. There was also a cycle of tightening and then loosening the control on the supply of money. One can only conclude that this sequence of events took place because these were the controls that were politically possible when the constituency didn't recognize that by removing the investment tax credit they were taking away business management's capability to match increased wages with increased productivity. They were in effect "biting the hand that feeds them" and de-escalating the whole industrial process. Having accomplished this de-escalation and noting dissatisfaction with the resultant employment levels, the most popular solution seems to be a resumption of the high rate of increased government spending with further relaxation of money control through a combination of deficit spending and a responsive Federal Reserve system.

In recognition of the fact that these actions produced unacceptable inflation in the '60's, the companion suggestion has been the institution of some type of wage and price control, either through mandate or coercion. This procedure will not produce the best results in our free enterprise, capitalistic, competitive system. In fact, it is a subversion of the system and we will be trying to do a centralized planning and direction of our economy without the benefits of the characteristics of a dictatorship, which makes the system used by our chief competitor in world affairs effective. By far the best prospect for inflation control is the one that has always worked, the increase of the supply of products and services at reduced costs through the improvement in productivity. This is especially true if the resultant tax revenues produce government surpluses, as was the case in the previous experience of introducing investment tax credits.

#### III. THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF THE U.S. IN WORLD MARKETS

Historically, the production of U.S. industry has always had to compete in the world market in the presence of a relatively high tax burden and high labor rates. If we are to continue to support and enlarge social programs of government sponsorship while current labor laws and government policy permit and encourage the growth of labor rates, then some compensation must be found to enable the maintenance of an acceptable balance of trade between exports and imports. In recent months, the textile and shoe industry have received a great deal of attention and an attempt at remedial legislation to provide import barriers to protect our domestic higher cost products. There has also been some attention given to more sophisticated manufactured products, such as electronic components and equipments, but the prospect of imposed import duties always brings a clamor from free trade objectors with the dire predictions of retaliatory trade barriers that usually use the export of American farm products as the area which is most

likely to suffer if an international trade war develops. These objections seem a little ridiculous in view of the world's food shortage and especially inasmuch as ours is not basically an agrarian economy, but there is no question that the isolationism of import tariffs would ultimately work to our disadvantage in terms of our international monetary and military relationships, if not our trade balances. Therefore, a way must be found to maintain satisfactory trade balances without the direct imposition of duties and this means more competitive products in the world market. The investment tax credit provides a facility for attaining that objective in at least two ways.

As mentioned above, it will improve the productivity of American industry and therefore improve the competitive posture of American products wherever they are needed. In addition, by providing the condition that the investment tax credit will pertain only to the purchase of capital goods manufactured in the U.S., we will automatically provide an effective counter to the national tax and regulatory provisions that are currently used by many potential markets to inhibit the sale of American products. It is now common practice in the European markets to use the selective imposition and exclusion of value added taxes to aid and abet national exporters. The use in the U.S. of an investment tax credit for the purchase of those capital goods manufactured in the U.S. would serve as an equivalent to the discriminatory use of the value added tax while it was simultaneously motivating American industry to improve productivity.

It is thus a procedure which should be completely acceptable to advocates of free trade and would have an adequate and immediate therapeutic effect on our balance of trade. For example, in the case of the ailing textile industry, a new surge of automation to improve the competitive posture of the product could be undertaken without the investment of non-existent profits, whereas simple import tariffs will only have the effect of raising the consumer price for the product of a less efficient industry.

#### IV. THE USE OF TAX INCENTIVES AS A POLITICALLY FEASIBLE SOLUTION

As an immediate aftermath of the 1968 election with inflation and the Viet Nam War as the two overwhelming problems of government, it was entirely understandable that the campaign promises concerning the use of tax incentives to attain desirable social and economic objectives, fell by the wayside. In the eyes of the lay American, inflation and industrial activity were very closely linked together and even though it was a counterproductive move, it is understandable that repeal of the investment tax credit to reduce industrial activity was taken as a mechanic for slowing the inflation. In the period after the 1970 election, however, there is wide acceptance of the need for industrial stimulation. High unemployment, a record number of business failures, low market values of industrial equities, and sharply reduced industrial output all serve to make up an environment in which the voting public is looking for government leadership to increase the tempo of economic activity.

There is even an increasing awareness that most American voters participate in ownership of American industry, either through the direct purchase of equities, or through retirement and insurance programs, all of which have suffered a decrease in valuation from their ownership. Under these circumstances, politicians of both parties can well afford a statesman-like approach to the reconsideration of the investment tax credit. Everyone now holding office will be rewarded with an improved image in the eyes of their constituency if they support a bipartisan measure which results in increased employ-

ment, a more stable economy and a favorable balance of international trade. With our present government, the enactment of any tax bill must of necessity receive bipartisan support.

In summary, the economy is poised for action. The stringent testing of the past two years in solving the problem of inflation has had therapeutic results in refining management procedures, improving training and establishing the basis in plans in American industry for a marked improvement in productivity. The major deficiency is the confidence and motivation to make the long term risk investment in capital goods to put the plans, training and organization to work for realization of the potential improvements in productivity. We are at the crossroads and investment tax credit for the purchase of capital goods manufactured in the U.S. would provide the direction and the impetus. It would not only result in immediate orders for capital goods, but it would provide the confidence in industrial management that the government understood the workings of our free enterprise system and was not going to be satisfied with yet another round of wage and price increases with short term prosperity induced by government deficit spending. On the domestic and international economic scene, nothing could enhance our posture so much as a balanced budget, reduced unemployment, increased industrial growth, and international trade balances. All of these results are possible in the next two years if the move is made now.

Finally, as a further indication of the importance that should be attached to this measure, I include for the RECORD at this point a letter I have received from Mr. William M. James, president of Scherr-Tumico, Inc., of St. James, Minn. Mr. James' comments concerning the machine tool industry should not under any circumstances be brushed aside lightly, because this industry is basic to industrial expansion and to a vigorously operating economy. The letter follows:

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,  
U.S. Representative,  
Rayburn Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANCHER: As an executive of a business engaged in the manufacture of precision measuring tools, I have been vitally concerned over the past few years with the continued domestic deterioration of the machine tool industry. Our firm, as a member of this once vibrant industry, has suffered currently with the decline of this particular industry and over the past two years have experienced a reduction of approximately 50% in our work force. In addition, a reduction in the manufacturing work week, from 45 and 50 hours in 1967 and 1968 to our present 32 hour work week, has been in effect here at Scherr-Tumico for approximately the last six months, as well as during the summer months of calendar 1970. As one of the two major industries in the community of St. James, Minnesota, this reduction in payroll has had serious adverse effects in our local community of 4,100 people and has in turn effected many of the local retail businesses within our community.

Needless to say, our own reduced level of business activity is being shared by other American manufacturers in the precision tool industry as well as other industries within the broad frame of the machine tool industry. Last year the machine tool industry experienced in the neighborhood of roughly a 40% drop in economic activities and some metalworking magazines have even quoted this reduction as high as 47½%.

The cause of the decline in the machine tool industry can be traced to a number of significant factors. However, one of the most important factors is the retraction of the



investment credit in April of 1969, and we ourselves experienced an approximate 60% drop in activity in the capital goods portion of our business as a result of this retraction. An additional significant factor has been the constantly increasing influx of foreign imports of machine tools into the American marketplace and it has been these foreign imports that have forced American manufacturers of perishable tools—such as drills, taps, and reamers—to cut their profit margins through lower selling prices and increased discounts in an effort to more effectively compete with these foreign imports.

I have read with interest in many financial magazines the supposed end to our current recession and the recent upturn in corporate earnings for many types of industry, especially the automotive industry. I would like to call to your attention an article in the April 29, 1971, edition of *The Wall Street Journal* and I quote—"Profit Turnabout—Firms' Earnings Rose in the First Quarter after a Lengthy Slump—Executives in most industries are confident that the profit gain is more than a passing phenomenon. There are exceptions with special problems, of course—like machine tool makers and the aircraft industry—but most industries are counting on a broad strengthening of the economy to help make the next several months increasingly profitable ones."

As you can see from this article, the machine tool industry's problems are far greater than the problems of most industries and a further stimulus by the present administration and Congress will be necessary in order to return the machine tool industry to a more healthy state. In my opinion, one of the single greatest stimuli would be the reinstatement of the investment credit. I think this step is absolutely necessary if we are to see a turnaround yet this calendar year in the machine tool industry. For many years, the industry has been recognized as a significant barometer of over-all economic activity and portrays the confidence of business in the future growth of our economy. It is also an industry which has played a vital role in the defense of our country. In an effort to keep American industry competitive in today's world market, it is essential that American industry be provided incentives to keep it technologically abreast of other foreign economic powers. Technological advancement is a "must" in a country which has the distinct disadvantage of finding itself with the highest "labor costs" in the world market today. We ourselves are in an industry where the cost of labor averages approximately 65% of the total unit cost of an item being manufactured. We are trying to compete in a world market where other countries have labor costs of approximately one-fourth to one-fifth that of ours, with import duties on precision hand tools that are presently ranging in the area of from 10% to 20%. Because of these conditions, must we sacrifice our machine tool industry in the cause of the promotion of world trade? I think that it is important that we take a second look at this ailing industry and provide the necessary steps to bring about its recovery.

I would sincerely appreciate your immediate consideration to the problems as expressed in this letter.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM M. JAMES,  
President, Scherr-Tumico, Inc.

#### THE 23D ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues who have lauded the

great and courageous State of Israel on this, its 23d anniversary. I wish to submit for the record my statement presented to a rally for Israel in Baltimore on Thursday evening, April 29, 1971.

Please accept my regrets for being unable to be with you tonight, but a prior commitment at the Hillel Foundation of the University of Pennsylvania requires me to be away. I shall be speaking about similar concerns at the University of Pennsylvania. The concerns that bring you together tonight. At a time when the people of Israel are forced to continue their struggle for a lasting peace, I believe it is important, and somewhat comforting, to look upon her achievements. Twenty-three years is a relatively short time, yet when three wars are fought in that time, 23 years can be an eternity.

There is much to be admired in Israel. The will to preserve the homeland has inspired accomplishments far beyond those of military might. What was once tired land has been made arable. Israel can provide for its hungry as well as the hungry of other nations. There are modern cities and villages. A fine university, a symphony orchestra, and all the arts flourish. Israel's economy has progressed so as to allow her to make a contribution to other young nations. All of these growing upon a set of truly democratic institutions make her an example for other developing nations.

Yes, on this 23d anniversary of the State of Israel, it is clear to all of us, Israel does live, it must live.

#### STATUE OF BOB BARTLETT NOW STANDS IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

(Mr. BEGICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, in the rotunda of the Capitol there now stands a statue of a most important figure in the achievement of Alaska's statehood—Bob Bartlett.

Last week, on April 27, 1971, the people of Alaska made their first contribution to Statuary Hall in the form of a bronze statue of Bob Bartlett, Territorial Delegate to Congress and Alaska's first senior Senator.

The statue is the work of Felix G. W. deWeldon who spent many hours with Mrs. Bartlett while working on the statue. Mr. deWeldon said:

It was she who helped me to show her husband's sensitivity.

Mrs. Bartlett came from Alaska to attend the ceremony in the rotunda and to unveil the statue of her husband. Also present for the unveiling were the two Bartlett daughters.

Bob Bartlett spent so much of his productive life in Washington that it is fitting that his likeness will remain here always. He first came to the Congress in 1945 as a nonvoting delegate from the territory of Alaska. Many of you were his colleagues until 1959 when he became Alaska's first senior Senator. He remained in the Senate until his death on December 11, 1968.

It is with pride that Alaskans have

honored their first citizen to be commemorated in Statuary Hall. The son of Klondike pioneers, Bob Bartlett seemed to embody the best qualities of a new land: pride, energy, and an ability to dream of things yet to come.

I hope that the millions of people who will visit the Bartlett statue will take the time to look at his face because it is one of warmth and compassion. We all would do well to remember that a capacity for friendship is the greatest of gifts and Bob Bartlett had that in abundance. His statue is a lasting reminder of his many friends and of their appreciation and love.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of illness.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 23, on account of official business.

Mr. WYATT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 21, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 1 hour, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, on May 13.

Mr. HARVEY, for 30 minutes, on May 13.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MIZELL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. GRASSO) and to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HENDERSON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ROY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAPPELL, for 60 minutes, on May 18.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL for today during general debate on the supplemental appropriation bill in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, to revise and extend his remarks in the debate today.

Mr. HOGAN to insert a chart during debate on second supplemental appropriation bill.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
 Mr. SPRINGER in two instances.  
 Mr. PETTIS.  
 Mr. GUBSER.  
 Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.  
 Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. HUNT in two instances.  
 Mr. BRAY in two instances.  
 Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.  
 Mr. LANDGREBE.  
 Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.  
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
 Mr. HOSMER in two instances.  
 Mr. KEATING.  
 Mr. McCLOSKEY.  
 Mr. BROTZMAN.  
 Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.  
 Mr. MIZELL in three instances.  
 Mr. GOLDWATER in three instances.  
 Mr. FRENZEL.  
 Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.  
 Mr. MORSE.  
 Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.  
 Mr. ROUSSELOT.  
 Mr. GUDE.

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. GRASSO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. CHISHOLM in two instances.  
 Mr. FRASER in two instances.  
 Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in three instances.  
 Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
 Mr. HAMILTON.  
 Mr. MONTGOMERY in three instances.  
 Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.  
 Mr. DOW.  
 Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.  
 Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.  
 Mr. HUNGATE.  
 Mr. LEGGETT in five instances.  
 Mr. RODINO in five instances.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.  
 Mr. SISK in two instances.  
 Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.  
 Mr. CHAPPELL.  
 Mr. HAGAN in three instances.  
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
 Mr. ANNUNZIO.  
 Mr. SHIPLEY.  
 Mr. BRASCO in two instances.  
 Mr. SCHEUER in five instances.  
 Mr. MINISH in two instances.  
 Mr. JACOBS.  
 Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.  
 Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.  
 Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. BRINKLEY.  
 Mr. FASCELL.  
 Mr. ECKHARDT.  
 Mr. DINGELL in two instances.  
 Mr. MAZZOLI.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 932. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a revision in the

cotton ginning report dates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1131. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that review committee members may be appointed from any county within a State; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1806. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide for insured operating and other type loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to direct the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to make a study with respect to expanding the basic national rail passenger system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 13, 1971, 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:

707. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and detailed to the Army General Staff, as of March 31, 1971, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 3031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

708. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 32, United States Code, relating to National Guard technicians; to the Committee on Armed Services.

709. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting his annual report for fiscal year 1970, the annual report of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for the same period, and copies of the issues of the Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress published that year; to the Committee on House Administration.

710. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract for the provision of lodging, food, and maritime accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Echo Bay Site of Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada, for the 20-year period ending December 31, 1989, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

711. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of two publications entitled "Typical Electric Bills, 1970" and "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1969"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### 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. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6359, a bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 5257, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 437. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3613, a bill to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 92-199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7109, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 92-200). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 8311. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the act for 2 years, to modify the interest rate on excessive profits and on refunds, and to provide that the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction of renegotiation cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8312. A bill to continue for 2 additional years the duty-free status of certain gifts by members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8313. A bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to continue for 2 years the temporary assistance program for U.S. citizens returned from abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:  
 H.R. 8314. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to completely exempt certain farm vehicles and farm vehicle drivers from the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRON:  
 H.R. 8315. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:  
 H.R. 8316. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide a group life insurance program for State and local government law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8317. A bill to provide for the appointment of U.S. marshals by the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:  
 H.R. 8318. A bill to restore balance in the Federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. Hicks of Washington, Mr. RIEGEL, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 8319. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for its uniform application to all of the navigable waters of the United States and to provide financial assistance to States and municipalities for water quality enhancement and pollution control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 8320. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8321. 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 and to provide for a study relating to causes and treatment of malnutrition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8322. A bill to insure the separation of Federal powers by amending title I of the United States Code, to provide for the implementation of article I, section 7, of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 8323. A bill to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to extend certain financial assistance for construction of water works and sewer facilities to private corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 8324. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 8325. A bill to exempt citizens of the United States who are 65 years of age or over from paying entrance or admission fees for certain recreational areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8326. A bill to make use of a firearm to commit a felony a Federal crime where such use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8327. A bill to provide for annual adjustments in monthly monetary benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, according to changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 8328. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide medical and maternity care in service facilities for certain members of the uniformed service and their dependents after such members are separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 8329. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that a part of any State's grant for comprehensive public health services shall be available only for the conduct of programs designed to determine, and meet, the need of the State for health care personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. BEIGER):

H.R. 8330. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 8331. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 8332. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1977) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 8333. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 8334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the investment tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 8335. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 8336. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 8337. A bill to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injury from hazardous products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8338. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8339. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. LUTJAN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. McKEVITT, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 8340. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior the Indian business development program to stimulate Indian entrepreneurship and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. KING, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. SIKES):

H.R. 8341. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 8342. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualifications of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 8343. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to promote the public health by strengthening the national effort to conquer cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 8344. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 8345. A bill to amend section 554 of title 37, United States Code, in order to authorize additional transportation for the dependents and household goods of members of the Armed Forces who are in missing status and have been in such status for prolonged periods of time; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 8346. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the small issue exemption from the industrial development bond provision from \$5 million to \$10 million; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 8347. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Ohio Canal Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 8348. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the mails a special category of nonmailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors, to improve the protection of the right of privacy by defining obscene mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 8349. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make it clear that civil service survivor annuities are exempt from State inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. FETTES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BELL, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H.R. 8350. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the licensing of customs brokers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 8351. A bill to improve the quality, and lessen the cost, of health care services provided to citizens of the United States under both public and private programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 8352. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 10 years the length of time a divorced woman's marriage to an insured individual must have lasted in order for her to qualify for wife's or widow's benefits on his wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENHOLM:

H.R. 8353. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8354. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 8355. A bill to amend section 16 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1121, 1153, ch. 425; 33 U.S.C. 411 and 412); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. ARENDT):

H.R. 8356. A bill to make permanent the authority to pay special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 8357. A bill concerning legal counsel of recipients of loans under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8358. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to its findings and policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8359. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to clarify judicial procedures standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 8360. A bill requiring personal financial disclosure, and promoting public confidence in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 8361. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia:

H.R. 8362. A bill to provide a penalty for the manufacture, sale, or display of the Vietcong flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8363. A bill to provide increased unemployment compensation benefits for Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. FREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 8364. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to promote the public health by strengthening the national effort to conquer cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 8365. A bill to provide for uniform and full disclosure of information with respect to the computation and payment of interest on certain savings deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself and Mr. GUBE):

H.R. 8366. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 8367. A bill to establish a National Environmental Bank, to authorize the issuance of U.S. environmental savings bonds, and to establish an environmental trust

fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to continue the investment tax credit for the first \$20,000 of investment in each taxable year in a farming business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 8369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for employers who hire unemployed Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 634. Joint resolution amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide certain assistance in the establishment of new State medical schools and the improvement of existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 635. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.J. Res. 637. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution authorizing the President to call an international conference to study the problems with respect to the development and use of supersonic aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 639. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of October 18, 1971, through October 24, 1971, as "National Indian Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 298. Concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of U.S. prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and its allies in Southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 299. Concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of U.S. prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and its allies in Southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 300. Concurrent resolution for an International Economic Conference; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 301. Concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of U.S. prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and its allies in Southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself and Mrs. ABZUG):

H. Res. 439. Resolution to express the sense of the House on relationship between legislative and executive branches of the Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself, Mr. COLMER, Mr. FLOWERS, and Mr. HAYS):

H. Res. 440. Resolution to express the sense of the House on relationship between legislative and executive branches of the Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. Res. 441. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of certain freight rates for the purpose of determining the feasibility of equalizing freight rates for certain primary and secondary production materials as an aid in the alleviation of the solid waste disposal problem; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

169. By Mr. BARING: Memorial of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly: That the Congress of the United States and the National Railroad Passenger Corp are hereby memorialized to reevaluate the decision to omit rail passenger service to Las Vegas, Nev., and to include that city in the proposed rail passenger network; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

170. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to a claim by the State of Washington against the United States for the effective control of outdoor advertising along interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edward J. Chwalek, Brunswick, Ga., relative to American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

73. Petition of the Student Congress, California State College, California, Pa., relative to the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. Also, petition of Lillian D. Yates, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the Great Seal of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE—Wednesday, May 12, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. LAWTON CHILES, a Senator from the State of Florida.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, as we struggle with the vexing problems of our day,

teach us the lessons of history. Show us what the past has to say to the present about the future. Make known to us Thy plan and program for peace and justice in the world.

In this reverent moment once more we dedicate ourselves to Thy service. When Thy guidance shows us the right, give us the courage to do it. In private prayer and thought, as well as in public speech

and action, make us instruments of peace and righteousness. And to Thee we ascribe all thanksgiving and praise. Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the