

Whittier, Harold W. XXXX  
 Wickers, Charles A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wilkins, Vancourt XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wilkinson, Duryea S. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wilson, Charles D. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wilson, Daniel S. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wortham, James T. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 York, Dennis A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Youngblood, Kenneth XXX-XX-XXXX

## CHAPLAIN CORPS

## To be colonel

Benson, John D. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Bloxham, Earl S. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Blunk, James B. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Coleman, James V. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Huffman, Cloma A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Malanowski, Thaddeus XXX-XX-XXXX  
 McMinn, Thomas L., Jr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Meek, Charles A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Murphy, John J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sullivan, John J. XXX-XX-XXXX

## MEDICAL CORPS

## To be colonel

Albrite, James P. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Allen, Samuel M. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Bellas, Joseph J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Chappell, Harold R. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Eskridge, Jack XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Gelinas, Joseph A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Gore, Albert L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Greenberg, Jerome H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hauschild, Thomas B. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Maier, John G. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Mason, Roscoe E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 McCaleb, Foster C. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 O'Shaughnessy, Edward XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Patow, Warren E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Patton, Maurice G. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Schroeder, Peter XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Svjaginste, Juerl XXX-XX-XXXX  
 West, Glenn A. XXX-XX-XXXX

## DENTAL CORPS

## To be colonel

Belser, John H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Daniel, Roy E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Everhart, Robert J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Fehl, Merle I. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Karlson, Fredrick A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Knapp, Milton J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Kono, Tom M. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Lewis, Sherman XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Paul, John K. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Schwartz, Donald E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sheridan, Roland C. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Smith, Thomas J. XXX-XX-XXXX

## VETERINARY CORPS

## To be colonel

Meckstroth, Leslie XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Moran, Guy G. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Pede, Elmer R. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Powell, John J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Rosser, William W. XXX-XX-XXXX

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

## To be colonel

Bailey, Robert W. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Bates, Roy L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Benner, James H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Brigadier, Mort B. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Coker, Larry W. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Eddinger, Clyde C. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Garza, Rene C. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Heady, Harold T. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Kanaya, Jimmie XXX-XX-XXXX  
 O'Neill, William B. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Witt, Gustave S. XXX-XX-XXXX

## ARMY NURSE CORPS

## To be colonel

Busler, Lelia J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Cannon, Erin E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Cleveland, Martha E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Dunlap, Lillian XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Farland, Vivian XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hathaway, Edythe J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hoehn, Bertha J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hughes, Margaret E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Johnson, Virginia L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Kegler, Ruth A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 LeVangie, Catherine XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Mahar, Mary E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Matlavage, Mary M. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 McCormick, Helen L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Phillips, Margaret XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Piller, Vivian L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Reider, Bernadette XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Roberts, Lucile M. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Singer, Kathryn C. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Smith, Roberta W. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Weydert, Margaret E. XXX-XX-XXXX

## ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

## To be colonel

McGary, Virginia E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 The following named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

## ARMY PROMOTION LIST

## To be lieutenant colonel

Butler, Charles L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Carrillo, Arnold R. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Dickerson, George W. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Levy, Walter XXX-XX-XXXX

## ARMY NURSE CORPS

## To be lieutenant colonel

Fritz, Mildred C. XXX-XX-XXXX

## ARMY PROMOTION LIST

## To be major

Baker, Robert M. Sr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Blanton, Philip T. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Forte, Johnie Jr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Letzky, John D. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 MacKinnon, Ray D. Jr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Simmons, James L. XXX-XX-XXXX

Sutherland, John H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Theuer, Paul J. XXX-XX-XXXX

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

## To be major

Tate, Charles G., Jr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Turlington, Philip B. XXX-XX-XXXX

## ARMY PROMOTION LIST

## To be captain

Ahrens, Robert E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Aronld, David B. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Arrington, Jimmy S. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Asselin, Leo J., Jr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Austin, Andrew L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Benton, John G., III XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Bixler, Louis R. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Blanton, Philip T. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Brown, Nolan H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Carden, Charles H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Clark, Ralph C. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Cooke, John R. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Crybskay, Harry E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Gross, Ray A., Jr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Haramoto, Donald I. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hewitt, William F. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hieronymus, Edward W. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hospodar, William G. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Hutton, Irvin L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Johnston, William E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Keeton, Jesse L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Mayhue, Norman L. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Medlock, Michael D. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Merritt, Donald E. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Ott, William H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Perkins, Williams M. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Perrino, Peter H. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Rowe, Michael A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Salinas, Carlos R. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sandell, Lawrence J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thomas, John T., Jr. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Walker, John C. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Watts, Charles D., Sr. XXX-XX-XXXX

## MEDICAL CORPS

## To be captain

McCarty, Alan J. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Neal, Gary L. XXX-XX-XXXX

## DENTAL CORPS

## To be captain

Petrucci, Vincent A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Phillips, Bruce B. XXX-XX-XXXX

## VETERINARY CORPS

## To be captain

Hall, William C. XXX-XX-XXXX

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

## To be captain

Williams, Jimmy G. XXX-XX-XXXX

## ARMY NURSE CORPS

Blackwood, Lynn G. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Daugherty, Marcus A. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Dela Cruz, Jessie M. XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Kurlansik, Edward XXX-XX-XXXX

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 19, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Make me to know Thy ways, O Lord: And teach me Thy paths.—Psalms 25:4.*

O Thou who dost speak to us in the stillness of the morning and in the quiet of the evening, speak Thou to us now in the midst of the day as we continue to labor for the welfare of our country. During these strenuous hours make us aware of Thy sustaining strength and Thy supporting spirit. Guide us by the light of Thy truth and lead us by the life of Thy love that our work may be well done for the good of all our people.

Bless Thou our Nation and make her a channel through which freedom and

tolerance and justice may flow into our world.

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.

## U.S. FINANCIAL BACKING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday relative to the move now underfoot in the United Nations to expel the Republic of China—a charter member of that organization—and replace her with Communist China.

The gentleman is chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that handles the appropriations for the United Nations and he, perhaps more than most Americans, is aware that "Uncle Sucker" has been the main financial crutch of

this U.N. Tower of Babel since its inception. In fact, the American taxpayers are shelling out about 38.3 percent of the horrendous annual cost of operating this debating society.

The gentleman from New York has put it to the other member nations in a plain and easy-to-understand fashion, to wit: If you kick Nationalist China out, you get no more money from the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) and join him completely in the sentiments he has expressed.

#### A STRONG FEED GRAIN PROGRAM FOR 1972

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the terms of the 1972 feed grain program announced yesterday show that the Department of Agriculture is making a real effort to cut back sharply on corn production and raise corn prices to reasonable levels. Secretary Clifford Hardin's harshest critics must concede the new program will provide substantial incentives to farmers to withdraw more than twice as many feed grain acres from production. Next year's target of 38 million acres compares with only 18 million acres set aside this year.

This is to be reached by increasing the mandatory set-aside from 20 to 25 percent of base acres, and by an additional voluntary set-aside of at least 10 percent. The guaranteed direct payment on the mandatory set-aside will be raised from 32 to 40 cents per bushel with an increased payment of 52 cents per bushel being made to those who participate in the voluntary set-aside. An additional 5- to 10-percent diversion will be authorized if conditions warrant in mid-March, also at the 52-cent rate.

The strong program now announced for 1972 was made urgently necessary by this year's record corn crop estimated to reach 5.4 billion bushels. The Department planned this year for a recurrence of last year's corn blight, but serious overproduction of corn resulted when the blight did not in fact recur.

Secretary Hardin should be congratulated on using the flexible provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1970 to prevent the continuing overproduction of feed grains next year. I also want to commend the Department for moving so promptly to formulate and announce the program much earlier than in previous years. For example, the 20-percent set-aside was not announced until February of this year. Announcement in mid-October will enable farmers to start making definite plans for the next crop year. It should also expedite the orderly marketing of this year's crop at improved prices; 1971 corn can now be moved without danger of its running into another bumper crop next year.

#### EMERGENCY SCHOOL DESEGREGATION BILL

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have just come to the floor from a meeting of the House Committee on Rules where we are considering the Higher Education Act on the premise that it is an emergency matter that has to be dealt with by this session of Congress. Meanwhile the emergency school desegregation bill remains bottled up in the House Committee on Rules.

This morning I received a wire from the president of the American Association of School Administrators, John Kissinger, saying the superintendents of 31 different cities from Baltimore to Birmingham and Boston to Chicago and Denver to San Diego are pleading that the Committee on Rules release funds to be made available by this vitally important legislation.

I certainly hope that the Democratic leadership of this House will permit this legislation to get a rule and come out of the Committee on Rules.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. ABZUG. 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:

[Roll No. 306]		
Addabbo	Downing	Mathis, Ga.
Ashley	Eckhardt	Minshall
Barrett	Edwards, La.	Patman
Broyhill, N.C.	Flynt	Poage
Cabell	Gallagher	Rosenthal
Celler	Gray	Satterfield
Chisholm	Hagan	Scheuer
Clark	Halpern	Staggers
Clay	Hawkins	Stephens
Derwinski	Ichord	Symington
Diggs	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Dorn	McMillan	Thompson, N.J.
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Wiggins

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on rollcall No. 304, on the cooperative animal disease control bill, I was necessarily absent from the Chamber. Had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

#### MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

#### MRS. FERNANDE M. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5318) for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5318

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Fernande M. Allen, of Alpena, Michigan, the sum certified to him by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to section 2.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total additional amount of widow's pension benefits to which the said Mrs. Fernande M. Allen would have been entitled under title 38, United States Code, had she filed her application for such benefits on October 1, 1960, instead of on June 8, 1962.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill 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.

#### MARIA LUGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

#### WILLIAM D. PENDER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5657) for the relief of William D. Pender.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

#### JANIS ZALCMANIS, GERTRUDE JANSONS, LORENA JANSONS MURPHY, AND ASJA JANSONS LIDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6100) for the relief of Janis Zalcmans, Gertrude Jansons, Lorena Jansons Murphy, and Asja Jansons Lidars.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to



the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SALMAN H. HILMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6998) for the relief of Salman M. Hilmy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H. R. 6998

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Salman M. Hilmy, an employee of the United States Information Agency, for reimbursement of the amount he was required to pay in settlement of a default court judgment rendered by a local court in Rhodes, Greece. An amount not to exceed \$843.33 may be allowed in full and final settlement of the claim. There is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$843.33 for payment of said claim. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

The bill 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.

MRS. ELEANOR D. MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7569) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTELLE M. FASS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4485) for the relief of Estelle M. Fass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4485

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to determine the amount of benefits under the Uniformed Services Contingency Act (USCOA) (now Retired Servicemans Family Protection Plan (RSFPP) to which she would be entitled if (1) the Air Force Poard for the Correction of Military Records had recommended to the Secretary of the Air Force that Lieutenant Colonel Maurice I. Fass (deceased) (XXXXXXX), had, prior to November 1954, elected certain options under the USCOA and the Secretary of the Air Force had approved the Board's recommendation and (2) The Department of the Air Force thereupon had certified to its Finance Center a voucher which would have authorized payment of said benefits to Estelle M. Fass in the appropriate amount effective as of September 15, 1955.*

(b) Upon such determination, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Estelle M. Fass, benefits under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act which would have been applicable pursuant to the provisions of that Act.

(c) From the date of enactment of this Act it shall be held and considered that Estelle M. Fass is entitled to benefits under the Contingency Option Act and the Secretary of the Air Force is directed to pay her continuing benefits accordingly.

The bill 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.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DOROTHY G. McCARTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1810) for the relief of Dorothy G. McCarty.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FRANK J. McCABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1862) for the relief of Frank J. McCabe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EDDIE TROY JAYNES, JR., AND ROSA ELENA JAYNES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 306) for the relief of Eddie Troy Jaynes, Jr., and Rosa Elena Jaynes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

HELEN ROSE BOTTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1966) for the relief of Helen Rose Botto.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

VITO SERRA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5586) for the relief of Vito Serra.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

**CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

**AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA TO THE CENTRAL DAKOTA NURSING HOME**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1763) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the Central Dakota Nursing Home.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1763

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this Act, by quitclaim deed, to the Central Dakota Nursing Home, Jamestown, North Dakota, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands near Jamestown, North Dakota, together with all buildings and other improvements thereon:

A tract of land situated in the southwest quarter northeast quarter and the southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 24, township 140 north, range 64 west, 5th principal meridian more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the center of section 24, township 140 north, range 64 west, 5th principal meridian;

thence south 89 degrees 50 minutes east 771.5 feet;

thence north 00 degrees 21 minutes west 800.0 feet;

thence north 89 degrees 50 minutes west 1,065.8 feet;

thence south 23 degrees 52 minutes 30 seconds west 456.7 feet;

thence south 00 degrees 40 minutes 30 seconds east 385.6 feet;

thence north 89 degrees 44 minutes east 479.7 feet to the point of beginning and containing 22.1 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to the conditions that:

(1) The Central Dakota Nursing Home pay to the United States as consideration for the land authorized to be conveyed the amount of \$5,500;

(2) All minerals, including oil and gas, in such lands authorized to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United States;

(3) The lands, including buildings and other improvements thereon, authorized to be conveyed shall be used by the Central Dakota Nursing Home solely for health care facilities, and in the event that such lands, including such buildings and improvements, cease to be used for that purpose, title thereto shall immediately revert, without payment of consideration, to the United States;

(4) The Central Dakota Nursing Home (including its assignees and successors) agrees to waive any and all claims arising on or before the date of any conveyance pursuant to this Act, which such home might have

CXVII—2317—Part 28

against the United States as a result of blown silt or other causes resulting from or in connection with the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Jamestown Dam and Reservoir; and

(5) All expenses for surveys and the preparation and execution of legal documents necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be paid by the Central Dakota Nursing Home.

The bill 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.

**PROVIDING FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN WYOMING**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2082) to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Wyoming to the occupants of the land.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2082

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey to the successors in interest of Ferne M. McNeil all right, title, and interest of the United States, except right, title, and interest in deposits of oil and gas, in lands in resurvey lots 38C, 38D, and 38F (original survey southeast quarter southwest half, north half southeast quarter), section 25, township 52 north, range 103 west, sixth principal meridian, Park County, Wyoming, lying east and south of the Cody Canal. Such conveyance shall be made only upon application therefor within six months after the date of this Act, and upon payment of the fair market value of the land as of May 13, 1949, plus the administration costs of making the conveyance, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, within one year after notification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due. In determining the fair market value of the land, the Secretary of the Interior shall not include any values added to the land by Ferne M. McNeil or her grantees or their heirs. Any conveyance made pursuant to this Act shall reserve to the United States all deposits of oil and gas in the lands, together with the right to mine and remove the same, under applicable laws and regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Acceptance by Ferne M. McNeil or her successors in interest of any conveyance made hereunder shall constitute a waiver and release by them of any and all claims against the United States arising out of the operation, maintenance, or construction of the Buffalo Bill Reservoir as now or hereafter authorized, including, without limitation, by reason of enumeration, claims for seepage, wave action, blowing silt, or increase in ground water level.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8: Strike the words "southwest half" and insert "southwest quarter."

Page 2, line 9: Strike the words "or her grantees or their heirs." and insert "and her successors in interest."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill 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.

**PROVIDING FOR CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8653) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 8653

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota, that tract of land situated on the campus of the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks, North Dakota, which is a portion of a tract of land which was heretofore deeded to the United States by the University Memorial Corporation. The tract being hereby conveyed is more particularly described as follows:

That part of the south half of the southwest quarter of section 4 township 151 range 50 bounded as follows: Commencing at a point on the north boundary line of the Great Northern Railway right-of-way which is 913 feet east of the west line of said southwest quarter, thence east along said north boundary line a distance of 150 feet; thence north and parallel to the west line of said southwest quarter a distance of 376.10 feet; thence east a distance of 107 feet; thence north and parallel to the west line of said southwest quarter a distance of 350 feet; thence west a distance of 257 feet to a point 913 feet east of the west line of said southwest quarter and 726.10 feet north of the point of beginning; thence south to the true point of beginning.

The north boundary of the above described tract lies along a line which commences at the northeast corner of lot 20 in block 2 of the University Park Addition, Grand Forks City, according to the plat on file in the Office of the Register of Deeds, Grand Forks County, North Dakota, and recorded in book 87 of deeds, page 12, and which continues west along the south line of the alley in said block 2, extending to a point described above as the northwest corner of the tract.

The bill 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.

**MRS. ROSE SCANIO**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2828) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Scanio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2828

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, on such terms as he deems just, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to compromise, release, or discharge in whole or in part, the liability to the United States of Rose Scanio, a window clerk at the United States Post Office, Melrose Park, Illinois, for the loss resulting from a theft on December 18, 1967, at that post office.

The bill 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.



## LLOYD B. EARLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4497) for the relief of Lloyd B. Earle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4497

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lloyd B. Earle of Chester Depot, Vermont, the sum of \$2,189.85 in full settlement of all of his claims against the United States arising out of the automobile accident which occurred on February 20, 1967, in Cuttingsville, Vermont, involving a vehicle operated by the said Lloyd B. Earle and another vehicle operated by a member of the United States Army.*

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

This bill is not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding laches or any statute of limitations, the United States Army Claims Service is authorized and directed to receive, consider, adjudicate, and, if found meritorious, to pay the claim of Lloyd B. Earle, of Chester Depot, Vermont, against the United States arising out of an automobile accident which occurred on or about February 20, 1967 in Cuttingsville, Vermont, involving a vehicle operated by the said Lloyd B. Earle and another vehicle operated by a member of the United States Army."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill 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.

## NINA DANIEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4779) for the relief of Nina Daniels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4779

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nina Daniels, a teller in the Accounting and Finance Office, Stewart Air Force Base, New York, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$4,250, representing that part of the loss resulting from the unexplained disappearance of money which occurred sometime between October 24 and October 27, 1969, at the Accounting and Finance Office, Stewart Air Force Base, New York, and for which Mrs. Daniels is being held liable by the Department of the Air Force. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.*

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury

is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nina Daniels, a teller in the Accounting and Finance Office, Stewart Air Force Base, New York, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid by her, or withheld from sums otherwise due her, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike "Daniels, a teller" and insert "Daniel, a former cashier".

Page 1, strike "Daniels" and insert "Daniel".

Page 2, line 6, strike "Daniels" and insert "Daniel".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read "A bill for the relief of Nina Daniel".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CPL. MICHAEL T. KENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6739) for the relief of Cpl. Michael T. Kent, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6739

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Corporal Michael T. Kent, United States Marine Corps Reserve, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$362.04 representing overpayment of active duty pay and allowances for the period beginning on April 4, 1969, and ending on April 3, 1970, paid to him as a result of an administrative error which occurred without fault on his part. In the audit and settlement of accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States credit shall be given for amount for which liability is relieved by this section.*

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Corporal Michael T. Kent an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated under this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5: Strike "362.04" and insert "\$351.15."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill 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.

## FREDERICK E. KEEHN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 654) for the relief of Frederick E. Keehn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 654

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Frederick E. Keehn, of Wasco, Oregon, is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$496.30 representing the amount of an overpayment he received from the United States, as the result of administrative error in determining the number of days of unused leave for which he was entitled to be paid upon his discharge from the United States Navy on October 30, 1968. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.*

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Frederick E. Keehn, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of any amount appropriated under this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of this subsection is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON  
H.R. 8687, MILITARY PROCUREMENT  
AUTHORIZATION, 1972

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8687) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1972 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, together with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amend-

ments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will protect the gentleman's right.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished minority leader several questions pertaining to the motion to instruct the conferees.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Michigan for that purpose?

Mr. REES. I will, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. And I would ask the distinguished minority leader who will be handling the motion to instruct the conferees?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it depends upon whom the Chair recognizes. I have suggested to the Speaker that he recognize the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REES. What would be the form of the motion to instruct? Is the minority leader familiar with it?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am familiar with it, but I think it is proper procedure for the Members of the House to await the reading of the text of the motion by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. REES. Once I waive that right to object I waive that right that I think I have as a Member on this floor.

I would like to ask the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services what the form of his motion to instruct is?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman from California that in a very few moments, as soon as I am able to present it to the House, I will tell the House what the motion is.

Mr. REES. I would not wish to waive a right I have as a Member of this House to await a motion being brought to the floor which I have no knowledge of, and I am sure the other Members have not either.

Mr. ARENDS. I have no suggestion to the membership or to the gentleman from California as to what you should do. I am sorry, but I would not presume to tell you what to do, or what not to do.

Mr. REES. Does the distinguished minority member of the Committee on Armed Services refuse to say what the motion to instruct will be?

Mr. ARENDS. As I said just a moment ago, I have it right here, and I will announce it to the House at the proper time, when I am recognized.

Mr. REES. Upon a direct inquiry from this Member the gentleman refuses to let the House know what that motion to instruct will be. Am I correct?

Mr. ARENDS. I cannot say it in any

plainer words than I have said it. I will read it very carefully for the benefit of the whole House at the proper time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I might ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is it his intention to allow this House to debate this motion?

Mr. ARENDS. I would say to the gentleman from California that I will have control over the time, and I will intend to yield time.

Mr. REES. How much time?

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if it is his intention to allow this House to debate the motion to instruct for the full 1 hour?

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will state that the chairman will not make any move to curtail the debate or restrict it, nor make any move to cut off the debate.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman.

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

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I only do so to propound a parliamentary inquiry—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Assuming the gentleman from Illinois proposes to offer a motion to instruct the conferees, and assuming that that motion does not contain the so-called Mansfield amendment, when the previous question is requested on that motion is it in order that if the previous question is voted down to offer an amendment to that motion to instruct the conferees?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois in response to his parliamentary inquiry that if the previous question on the motion to instruct is voted down any germane amendment would be in order.

Mr. YATES. Is in order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) as to whether the questions he asked of the minority side on the Committee on Armed Services were asked because the gentleman from California fears that through a parliamentary maneuver this House of Representatives will not have the opportunity to vote on or possibly even debate the merits of the so-called Mansfield amendment pertaining to the ending of the war in Vietnam?

Mr. REES. I can only surmise from the answer of the ranking member on the minority side of the Committee on Armed Services that the gentleman does not want to let this House know at this time what his motion to instruct is. There seems to be an inclination not to allow this House to vote on a motion to instruct in regard to the Mansfield Vietnam dismanagement amendment.

Mr. HOWARD. I would certainly hope that the minority side on the Committee on Armed Services would not attempt to prevent this body, representing all of the people in America, to debate this vital issue which is of great concern to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Illinois advise the House as to why he refuses to tell us the substance of his motion to instruct at this time?

Mr. ARENDS. I have not yet been recognized for any purpose at all at this time, but when the time comes and I am recognized, if and when I am recognized, then I intend to do so.

Mr. NEDZI. I am yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Then I will be glad to yield the gentleman from Michigan some time when that time comes.

Mr. NEDZI. It would appear to me that if the gentleman has substance in his motion, the House should know about it and have some opportunity to review it.

Mr. ARENDS. When I am recognized, and I will tell the gentleman once more—when I am recognized, I will be glad to do that.

Mr. NEDZI. I am yielding to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. ARENDS. I have not been recognized by the Speaker to offer any motion as yet, and I have no intention at this particular time to do that.

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

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

Mr. HOWARD. I asked the gentleman from Michigan if his concern might be that if we do permit this motion to instruct to go through and it precludes any kind of vote on the Mansfield amendment for ending the war, then the gentleman from Illinois is correct—we could talk about it but we would not be able to make any determination about it—is that what concerns the gentleman from Michigan?

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

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Under the procedure anticipated, if the gentleman from Illinois is recognized, there will be an opportunity under the proper parliamentary procedure for what, in effect, the gentleman wants.

Mr. NEDZI. I am perfectly aware of that, but the added time that we might have to review the gentleman's motion is perfectly in keeping with the procedures of the House and is highly desirable in the kind of society in which we live.

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

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. As I indicated earlier to the gentleman from Michigan, I am perfectly willing to grant the gentleman time if I am recognized to make a motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand from the colloquy that is taking place that the gentleman from Illinois is going to have preference on the motion to instruct the conferees and the



gentleman will have control of the full 60 minutes of debate on what issue we do not know as yet. But as the gentleman well knows, there is now a considerable number of Members of the House who would like at least an hour to review the pragmatism of setting a date to terminate totally American involvement and personnel in Southeast Asia, and considering that we have lost 55,000 American lives, and so forth. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois how you plan to apportion that 1 hour of precious time that you have indicated; you intend to give time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI) and you have indicated you may give time to myself—have you made any determination as to how or what kind of equitable apportionment you may want to give to the American people to have an opportunity to have here this matter fully debated?

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman, I always try to be fair as possible and I, of course, will try to be as fair as possible now. In view of the fact that we have so many requests for time, I cannot give everyone time, but as I said to the gentleman from Michigan earlier, as a member of the committee, I will be happy to give him as much time as I can. But if it gets down to a matter of 1 minute, then I think it is useless.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman, if the previous question is voted down on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois, then we will have an hour to debate the so-called Mansfield resolution. Let us vote it down.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. We hear a great deal of talk about the Mansfield amendment.

It might interest the Members of Congress to know that there is another Mansfield amendment in this package which as a matter of economics has a more serious impact on the welfare of this country as a whole and is one on which we will probably need added time.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he is going to devote the whole hour of debate to the Mansfield amendment on ending the war or are we going to have some time allowed to some of us who are very seriously affected by the Rhodesian situation and chrome and that is the Mansfield amendment—will that be in the package? Or, if there is a package of amendments, will the time be divided and will we be able at least be able to present the question of the survival of the American steel industry at this time?

Mr. ARENDS. If the gentleman will come over and talk to me real nice, we may be able to give him some time.

Mr. DENT. I will come over abounding. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illi-

nois whether he would tell us how and in what respect his particular motion will differ from the Mansfield amendment. We have looked forward to this day, many of us, with the hope that finally the Congress, this House of Representatives, would vote to end this war. I insist upon my right to speak as a Member of the Congress and to vote. I think, moreover, that everyone here should have a right to vote on that very germane amendment. Therefore, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois if his proposal would offer us less opportunity than we would have on a simple motion to vote up or down on the Mansfield amendment?

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has clearly explained the situation. If the previous question is voted down, then whatever Member is recognized will have 1 hour to discuss the question.

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

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry: If in fact we proceed at this point and the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the committee, is recognized, is my understanding correct that there will be 1 hour of time, which the gentleman from Illinois will control, to debate whatever is in the secret motion that he has to offer? Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman makes a motion, he will be entitled to 1 hour.

Mr. RIEGLE. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he has copies of his motion available that can be distributed to the Members so we can examine into it, since an hour is certainly not very long to have a chance to consider what I am sure will be a very complicated package and to vote at the end of that time? I think it would work a hardship unless there are copies here we can read and study.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. If I am recognized, I shall have copies in detail available.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am wondering if an hour is adequate time for that purpose. It is clear that the ranking minority member does not want to distribute copies at this time.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) had a secret motion or a secret weapon?

Mr. RIEGLE. Continuing my reservation, Mr. Speaker, I think 1 hour of time is not adequate. I do not think it is adequate at this stage, after 10 years of war

in Vietnam, to consider this when, in fact, copies are not available and the Member refuses to make them available, and I do object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan objects?

Mr. RIEGLE. Yes, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

#### MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HÉBERT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8687) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1972 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, together with Senate amendments, thereto disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference request by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 1 hour on his motion.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the reason I make this motion, a motion directed by the committee of which I have the privilege of being chairman, is in order to bring to the House this very important measure which, as you know, contains many items in disagreement. Only through this method can we get to a conference, and only through this method can we proceed in an orderly manner to go to such a conference. There are more than 40 items in disagreement, including eight aircraft programs; a \$318 million difference in the Navy shipbuilding program, more than \$350 million in disagreement on research and development programs; and some nine substantial amendments adopted by the Senate and not considered or included in the bill as passed by the House. The only orderly manner in which we can pursue and resolve these differences is to take the matter to conference.

This is the reason I make the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the pending motion.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, is the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana amendable?

The SPEAKER. Not if the previous question is ordered.

Mr. NEDZI. If the previous question is voted down, can the motion be amended by instructing the conferees?

The SPEAKER. Not on this particular motion, but a motion to instruct is in order following the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. NEDZI. Do I understand correctly that a motion to instruct as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana is not in order?

The SPEAKER. This motion now un-

der consideration only goes to the question of sending the bill to conference.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ARENDS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Chair, according to the precedents as I read them, on 784, the minority have no special privileges as to asking for instructions as to the conferees. I want to know what the point of order is in recognizing the minority on this motion.

The SPEAKER. This is under the precedents of the House, I will advise the gentlewoman, starting with Speaker CANNON and consistently so held since then.

The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARENDS moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 8687, are hereby instructed not to agree to any portion of the text of the Senate amendment that is not germane to the House bill, H.R. 8687.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would most sincerely hope that the membership would pay some attention to what I now have to say, which will take some time. It is not because I am making this statement, but I think there has been a great deal of misunderstanding as to what may be proposed here, and I will try my best to explain clearly and tell exactly what we face in the House when we are called upon to vote.

The purpose of the motion to instruct is very simple—it is designed to clarify the position of the House and its conferees in respect to nongermane Senate additions to a House-passed bill.

Under the rules of the House, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970—Public Law 91-510—the House rule of germaneness was made to apply to the subject matter of bills in conference.

The House adopted this concept of the Legislative Reorganization Act as part of its standing rules on January 22, 1971. This provision provides a limitation on the authority of House conferees to act on Senate amendments which would have, if made in the House, been considered nongermane and subject to a point of order.

As you know, only a short time ago your House conferees were confronted with this same problem in connection with the bill which extended the induction provisions of the draft law. At that time, the Senate added numerous provisions to the bill which were not germane to the bill as it originated in the House.

During the conference, the managers on the part of the House pointed out that under the rules of the House they were precluded from accepting any portion of these nongermane Senate amend-

ments since they were subject to a point of order in the House. However, as explained by our chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT), we finally were forced to achieve a compromise on the legislation and therefore were required to go to the Rules Committee to obtain a waiver of points of order on the conference report on the draft bill.

Every Member in this House knows the difficulty and the trauma that we experienced in attempting to persuade the Rules Committee of the necessity of this action. Members of the Rules Committee were understandably reluctant to approve a waiver of points of order since it effectively negated one of the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

During the subsequent debate on the granting of a rule waiving points of order on the draft extension conference report, on August 4, 1971, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) stated, and I quote:

So I want to state that, so far as I am concerned, this is not a precedent which I intend to follow in future matters. If conferees bring in subjects or material which are outside the scope of authority of the conference as defined by Clause 3 of Rule XXVIII, they should not expect the Rules Committee to protect them.

Mr. COLMER, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, agreed with the statement made by Mr. SMITH, and said:

I would like to add to the statement of my able friend that we want to serve notice now that this is not setting a precedent that we in the Committee expect to follow.

Mr. SISK of the Rules Committee, in opposing the granting of the rule, stated:

I am not here condemning the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, our able Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and his conferees, and I can well understand the very difficult situation they had in the conference. I am doing it rather to serve notice on the other body that our rules are somewhat sacred to us, and we pass these rules to be abided by, to give us orderly procedures, and that we are not going to continuously stand aside for non-germane material, for legislating within the confines of a conference, but that we, as individuals, are going to jealously guard the prerogatives of this House in having rules and abiding by the rules which we have.

Other members of the Rules Committee, and other Members of the House, reiterated the views expressed by Mr. SISK in strongly objecting to the action of the other body in loading down complicated legislation passed by the House with additional nongermane provisions.

In order to fully understand the rationale of this House rule, let me briefly refer to the report issued by the Committee on Rules on H.R. 17654, the bill which became the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. The House report on this subject states as follows:

There has been increasing concern over the growing practice of the other body of adding extraneous language to such bills. This material, often broad in scope, may be bad or good. The merit of the language is not the issue. What concerns many Members is that this practice (1) by-passes the normal orderly legislative process in the House and

necessitates hasty decisions on the floor without adequate consideration, (2) deprives House Committees of the right to consider matters pending before the House that fall within their jurisdiction, and (3) denies the House' membership an opportunity to engage in meaningful debate on vital issues pending before it. (H. Rept. 91-1215, June 17, 1970, pp. 9-10)

Now, that is the legislative history which resulted in the issue before us today.

The issue is whether or not the House intends to abide by its rules and the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, or whether the House wishes to repudiate the action taken by this body as recently as January 22, 1971.

Make no mistake about it, this issue was clearly enunciated by our able colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) in stating his opposition to any violation of this rule, when he said:

"I am doing it rather to serve notice on the other body that our rules are somewhat sacred to us, and we passed these rules to be abided by, to give us orderly procedures, and that we are not going to continuously stand aside for non-germane material . . .

Let us therefore keep these facts in mind.

We are concerned here with the question of upholding the existing rules of the House rather than a discussion of the merits of the various nongermane provisions incorporated by the Senate in this legislation.

There are many of us who are sympathetic to the objectives of some of these nongermane provisions added by the Senate. However, to embrace this action by the Senate would be tantamount to our repudiating the entire concept of the legislative process heretofore observed by the House.

We would, in effect, underwrite the destruction of the legislative jurisdiction of every one of our standing committee in the House as well as invading the prerogatives of the Appropriations Committee.

Let me briefly review some of these nongermane Senate amendments to the House-passed bill to illustrate my point.

Section 503 of the Senate amendment amends the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 by restricting the President's authority to prohibit the importation of materials determined to be strategic and critical pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act.

This clearly is a provision which is not germane to the subject matter of the House bill and had it been offered as an amendment in the House, would have been subject to a point of order.

Section 507 of the Senate amendment states that none of the funds authorized or appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the purpose of carrying out aircraft flying operations at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Los Alamos, Calif., until the Secretary of Defense has submitted a report to the Congress.

The military procurement bill does not authorize operation and maintenance funds and the amendment clearly would be a restriction on funds not authorized by the military procurement bill. This, this, clearly would be subject to a point



of order, had the amendment been offered in the House.

Section 601 of the Senate amendment sets a fixed date 6 months after the enactment of the proposed legislation for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Indochina subject to the release of all U.S. prisoners of war. The military procurement bill does not deal with this subject matter in any way and, thus, had section 601 of the Senate amendment been offered in the House it would clearly have been subject to a point of order.

Sections 701-704 of the Senate amendment provides pay increases for certain pay grades of the uniformed services. The military procurement bill did not deal with military pay in any way, shape, form or manner and, thus, had these sections been offered as an amendment in the House would have clearly been subject to a point of order.

Section 801 of the Senate amendment deals with comparability adjustments of Federal pay. The military procurement bill does not deal with Federal pay in any way, shape, form, or manner. Thus, section 801 would have been subject to a point of order had it been offered as an amendment in the House.

Now these are the legislative facts of life.

We are not considering the importation of chrome from Rhodesia or amending the tariff laws;

We are not considering our military operations in Southeast Asia.

We are not considering the question of military pay; and

We are not considering the question of the Federal pay adjustment.

We are neither considering the merits of these issues nor the issues themselves.

The question we must address is whether or not we will abide by the rules of the House.

Are we going to abide by the rules of the House or are we going to roll over and play dead and let the other body take complete control of the legislative process of the Congress?

Are we going to repudiate the committee system in the House and resolve issues purely on the basis of the fragmentary information we develop during floor debates?

Are we going to succumb to the blackmail implicit in this type of action by the other body which, in effect, says "take our nongermane amendments or you won't have a bill?"

Are we going to ignore our sacred responsibility to legislate in a meaningful manner which is truly representative of our constituents?

I think not. And I therefore know that the majority of the Members of this body will sustain and support this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today young Americans are getting their guts blown out in Vietnam. Yet, we here on the House floor are debating the question of germaneness.

Mr. Speaker, had I been recognized, I would have introduced a motion to in-

struct the conferees to agree with the language of the so-called Mansfield amendment. I would have done this because I think the most important issue confronting the United States and the U.S. Congress today is the question of American lives being lost in Vietnam.

As I see it, the Mansfield amendment issue is simply this: If you vote for the Mansfield amendment, you will be voting to shorten the war, you will be voting to save American lives. If you oppose the Mansfield amendment, you will be voting to prolong the war, condemning additional American boys to death.

Mr. Speaker, in the past the Congress has provided funds and equipment to send American boys to fight on foreign shores. However, what disturbs me, as I suggested on the House floor previously, we simply do not know why we are in Vietnam today. Every reason that has been advanced as to why we are there has been repudiated. There simply is no reason for our being in Vietnam today.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is sad, as a Member of Congress, to have to write a constituent a letter of condolence on the occasion of the death of a son in Vietnam. In my opinion it is even more tragic, and, indeed, indefensible, when you cannot explain to a constituent why his son has died in Vietnam. That, in my opinion, is the great issue confronting this Congress today.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we were not able to get a direct vote on the Mansfield amendment. Of course, the procedure today is proper under the rules of the House. But I think the message is very clear—by refusing to vote directly on the Mansfield amendment, it reveals the fact that the leadership feels they do not have enough votes.

I think this victory, whether it be on the direct vote or by an avoidance, brings a very clear message to the people of our Nation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly apparent to all of us that what we are witnessing is a very transparent effort to avoid a clear-cut vote on the most serious issue in the United States today. This principle of germaneness is so overwhelming that Members of this body were not advised of it until the very last moment, after very high-level strategy meetings.

To me it is a very sad commentary. I like to operate in the open. When we have something to say we say it, we let the other side know so that they can marshal their arguments against it. In this particular case the same courtesy was not accorded us.

When we talk about procedures we should point out that events have occurred since the passage of this bill by the House. An election took place in Vietnam which reflected the weakness of our own Vietnam policy, and in my judgment the importance of this issue supercedes the question of procedures, and the House should definitely have the right to express itself. But, unfortunately,

that expression is going to be somewhat obscured today.

Vietnam is still one issue that is very important, and is simply not going to go away. The public and elected officials are at the moment bothered and wearied by Vietnam, but we cannot wish it away. In my decade as a Member of this body, Vietnam has been the one issue above all others that has damaged the relationship between the Executive and the Congress, and between both branches and the people.

Regrettably, the history of the war revealed repeated instances where the Congress has been bypassed, or not fully informed so as to respond correctly, and even at this late date to assert the role of the Congress as a coequal or at least a responsible branch of the Government.

We can do so and still be in support of the President.

The Mansfield amendment puts the Congress on record, in my judgment, in a very responsible manner.

This amendment is an endeavor, as was the Nedzi-Whalen amendment of last June, to express the dismay of the Congress about our continued involvement in Vietnam, and it is an attempt to place in the decision of withdrawing the suggestion that it be the policy of the United States to withdraw its military forces from Vietnam 6 months from the time of the enactment of this amendment on the condition that our prisoners are returned and that the missing are accounted for. The amendment, like Senator MANSFIELD himself, is restrained and even gentle. It is far from a violent challenge to the President's policy.

As Senator MANSFIELD himself said during the course of the Senate debate on September 30, 1971:

The amendment does not have the force of law. It is a little stronger than a sense of the Congress resolution; it declares it to be the policy of the Congress and the executive branch, the Government of the United States, and in that sense, it is a very strong expression of hope, but it certainly does not tie the President's hands.

This amendment would put the Congress on record as calling for an end to the war. It is supportive of the President if he really means to get out. And it is a message to the President of congressional apprehension over reports that the administration is considering a residual force in Vietnam beyond 1972.

Most of us would agree, I believe, that the Vietnam war has done great damage to the United States. It has damaged our national security because of its very length and its moral ambiguity. It has weakened motivation and morale in the Armed Forces and accelerated the drug problem there. And it has created great divisions domestically.

The President has indeed been "winding down" the ground war in Vietnam, but he has proceeded as though he had the luxury of time. Five years have passed since the 1966 congressional elections clearly indicated public dissatisfaction with the war. Three years have passed since the 1968 presidential election, and the war is still going on. Who

would have believed it in 1968, let alone 1966.

The Congress of the United States has a moral obligation, it seems to me, to at least go on record with an expression of its true feeling over this longest of all American wars. We have honored our commitment well beyond what reasonably could have been expected of us. It is time for our Nation to change, and we must help it change, not as bystanders, but as the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to vote down the previous question when the motion is made, and it is my intention at that time to offer an amendment to the motion to instruct the conferees offered by the gentleman from Illinois, the contents of which will be to instruct the conferees to accept the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI), who just spoke, in one way or another have alleged that the vote that will be taken on the previous question is less clear cut than the vote that was taken in June when we had the same problem before us.

Actually, the procedure is insignificantly different. In June the gentleman from Ohio was permitted to have the opportunity to instruct the conferees to accept the Mansfield amendment.

At that time we had an hour of debate and the gentleman from Ohio controlled the time. At the conclusion of the time, the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman, moved to table the motion to instruct on the part of the gentleman from Ohio. That was a parliamentary procedure—and the vote was on the motion to table. The vote was not on the Whalen motion to instruct. So there was not in that instance a clear-cut vote.

The vote today will be on ordering the previous question—another indirect but perfectly proper parliamentary procedure. So I do not think the allegations and contentions are at all valid that we are trying to hide the issue today any more than the issue was hidden in June—*commeci commeca*.

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

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

Mr. WHALEN. I want to set the record straight. I did not control the time in June. That was the privilege of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. The hour of debate was on his motion to take from the table. After that debate was completed, then I was recognized on my motion on the Mansfield amendment. At that time there was a tabling motion by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will accept the gentleman's explanation, but the procedure, as I described it, was accurate.

Mr. WHALEN. I do not think there is any question here regarding the propriety of the procedure.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the issue will be raised here precisely in the same way under the proper rules of the House.

In June there was the motion to table. Here today the issue is on ordering the previous question.

I would like to make one other observation. In 1970 the House of Representatives and the other body approved the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. That was considered to be landmark legislation for the reorganization and the reform of the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives and of the U.S. Senate.

I do not recall how the vote went, but it was an overwhelming vote of approval in favor of the Reorganization Act.

What we are seeking to do here is to maintain the integrity of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which many, if not most of the Members on both sides of the aisle supported.

In the motion to instruct we did not pick and choose between nongermane amendments. We took them all. As to some of those nongermane amendments, if I had to vote "yes" or "no" on them, I might have wanted to delete one or more, but we took them all because we felt that if we were going to make a point of defending the integrity of the Legislative Reorganization Act, we had to include all of them, which we have done.

So the motion to instruct tells our conferees to uphold the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 which we incorporated in our rules on January 22, 1971.

I would like to make another point. On September 22, the President signed into law the extension of the Selective Service Act.

A conference report on that legislation was approved by this body on August 4, 1971, and it was subsequently approved by the other body in September.

In that legislation which is now on the statute books, you have a modified Mansfield amendment. You already have on the statute books practically what is included in the current Mansfield amendment which was approved in the other body on this legislation.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I asked the question in good faith—how many times do we have to put on the statute books virtually the same legislation? We have Mansfield legislation on the statute books—I think it is good and most of us voted for it. Why do we have to put something on the books that is redundant?

Second, the President is going to Moscow and Peking. I believe if we take this action today to instruct the conferees to accept a new or second version of the Mansfield amendment that we will be undercutting the efforts of the President in both China and the Soviet Union to find a way and the key to a broad and permanent peace.

The President needs all the flexibility that he can get in these negotiations on these two important missions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will approve the motion to order the pre-

vious question and then vote to instruct the conferees, as the gentleman from Illinois has indicated.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional half-minute.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. In passing the Congressional Reorganization Act, is it not true that the Senate specifically, as a consequence of passing that act, endorsed the rule of germaneness to which the gentleman has alluded to today?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think so. They approved the provisions of that reorganization act, and it provides that the House cannot accept with a specific vote any nongermane amendments. That is the point we are trying to make today.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. So the net effect is that the other body has concurred in the rule which provides for objection in the House to nongermane Senate amendments.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) for debate purposes only.

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for making this time available. Still I think we have to recognize that the time that has been made available to the majority today has been 22½ minutes, while the time made available to those who are trying to get some kind of debate on the war issue has been no more than 11 minutes, including my time.

I support "Lu" NEDZI and the motion he will make. I tend to think that we have got to strike down the previous question. We must amend the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois and instruct the conferees to totally terminate the war.

The ostensible purpose of our military involvement in Vietnam has been to secure for the people of South Vietnam the right to determine their own future without outside interference, the right to choose their own government and their own type of government. In seeking this goal, we have given 55,000 young American lives, more than \$150 billion, we have wounded 300,000 American kids, and we have imposed upon ourselves about \$200 billion of veterans' benefits between now and the year 2050. We have spent 17 years in Vietnamizing the ARVN Army. We have been engaged in the longest war in our national history. The war has done more damage to our economy, more damage to our defense posture and military morale, more damage to our national priorities, it has desecrated our aerospace industry, and has done more damage to the relationship between the American people and their government than any other war in history.



Despite the bravery of our men in the field and the sacrifices we have made at home, we have not succeeded. The Thieu government is not necessarily the choice of the Vietnamese people; rather, it rules by methods common to police state Stalin-type dictatorships the world over. It has imprisoned, as you recall, Truong Dinh Dzu, the main contender in the last general contest we have had in Vietnam, and he remains in jail today. The Thieu regime's crowning glory was the recent election in which General Thieu was reelected by a 90 percent vote, and I think you have to keep in mind that General Thieu's campaign organization was right there on election day counting the votes to see that these people, as observed by Joe Kraft, made their selection in a little 10 second ploy to express their position in favor of the existing autocrat.

Now we are committed to end the war, subject only to the safe withdrawal of our troops and the safe return of the prisoners of war. This is the meaning of the modified Mansfield amendment, and what we are called upon here to do is to put a few more teeth in the Mansfield amendment, the modified Mansfield amendment. We have agreed to ask the President to seek to negotiate a ceasefire, and to negotiate a day certain to end our involvement in Vietnam, to seek staged withdrawals of troops in response to a staged return of prisoners of war.

Today we must choose whether we are going to set a date for withdrawal or going to allow the President to cling to the concept of a residual force.

The President has led the Congress and has led the American people into the Vietnam conflict. I think that it is our responsibility now for the Congress to lead the President out. I think that at this point the Congress and the President are not really too far apart. We have had great success with the Vietnamization program down to this point. There are very precarious times ahead for us. We are not going to negotiate for our prisoners of war until we set a day certain. That has been manifestly made clear.

The Mansfield amendment does not extricate the United States from Vietnam until we solve the prisoner-of-war problem. I fully expect the President to come out next month and say we are going to get out by next summer providing we solve the prisoner problem. I think we ought to upgrade that by a month. I do not think we ought to have the President jerk the war out from underneath the House. I think we ought to go ahead and express ourselves. I think we should go ahead and express ourselves as favoring termination within a 6-month period. That is the intent of the Mansfield amendment. It goes no further than that. It is a sense of Congress resolution.

If we go ahead and vote down the previous question and then go ahead and vote for a modified instruction to be offered by Mr. NEZSI, we will go far toward ending the war.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. FORD has incorrectly stated here that, under the Reorganization Act of 1970, the House is precluded from accepting Senate amendments that are not germane. Is it not true that the Reorganization Act requires that a separate vote be taken on nongermane amendments, which is precisely what we are trying to achieve here.

Mr. LEGGETT. That is exactly correct. That is under section 126(a), clause 1 of rule XX of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for purposes of debate only.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I think there are enough who are speaking about the one Mansfield amendment. I would like to discuss for a few minutes another amendment.

As I understand it, a motion is going to be made to amend the Arends motion by instructing the conferees only on that Mansfield amendment dealing with Vietnam. For the benefit of the House, if we just let the other amendment go through as it is—rather, if we allow it to be stricken at this time, that one dealing with chrome ore from Rhodesia—then we do not need to worry about ending the war, it will end itself, because we will not have the necessary materials to keep the war going.

Do the Members know today that this Nation in the matter of a strategic material so designated by the Congress is wholly dependent upon Russia and Japan for its supply? Chrome ore from Rhodesia is coming to the United States, yes, but it is coming by way of Japan in some amounts, but the major source is Russia. Russia has a great deal of low grade cheap chrome ore which they are pawning off onto the American industry at ever-skyrocketing prices, while the Soviets are using the greater part of the ore they buy from Rhodesia for the production of their tool steel.

Do the Members know that neither this country nor any other country can exist without chrome ore, and we have none except what our friendly Soviet people want to send to us?

This is a farce. It has gone long beyond anything which should be tolerated. There will be the most serious disruption of the American tool steel and the specialty steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, I beg of the so-called ultraliberals not to give industry this kind of deal, not to give my labor people this kind of deal. But I know what will be done. I know some of the Members will be going home satisfied, their palates full, thinking they have struck a blow to end the war. But the Members know if we strike a blow for the independence of the American steel companies, we will be doing a little bit more for this country than what some think they will be doing in their way.

We must tie an additional clause to this amendment. I beg the House to order the previous question and defeat the whole package, because I know there will be only one amendment offered, as I have

been told, and that will be on Vietnam. Certainly I will vote with you, but I will not get the same consideration from you, because on almost every occasion on which I have asked for a vote, there has been a vote for the so-called free trade. I hope we in this free Nation of ours, by voting for English colonialism, do not vote our independence down. We know if we want Cuban cigars, we can buy them from Great Britain.

My colleague from the 24th Congressional District of New York, MARIO BIAGGI today urged his colleagues to accept a Senate amendment to the military procurement bill that would permit a relaxation of 5-year-old trade sanctions with Rhodesia.

The Bronx-Yonkers Congressman said: The United States halted all trade with Rhodesia as part of the United Nations sanctions against that country's break with the United Kingdom, as a result this Nation has had to turn to the only other supplier of chrome ore—the Soviet Union.

He added:

The Soviets have been ruthlessly raising the price on chrome ore as a result of their monopoly hold on the market. While our strategic stockpiles of chrome ore are substantial at the moment, it is ironic that we are dependent on one of our international antagonists for our supply of this essential metal.

He also noted:

The exclusive prices we are paying for the chrome ore adds dollars to the coffers of the Soviet Union at a time when the U.S. monetary position is very weak.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) also said arguments claiming Rhodesia's denial of voting rights to its majority black population or the possible erosion of the U.N.'s enforcement powers justified continuation of the sanction were weak in light of "national security considerations and sound international relations." He said:

We would be in a far better position to influence domestic policies in Rhodesia as a friend instead of an enemy. Additionally, our support of the colonial interests of the United Kingdom against the declaration of independence by Rhodesia is contrary to our American principles.

He emphasized that—

I would like to see "a broader based electorate in Rhodesia, but I would remind my colleagues that this Nation had a very limited number of people enfranchised in its early days. Blacks, women and people under 25 did not receive the right to vote for almost a century or longer after this Nation's founding.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) for debate only.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask either the chairman or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) this one question. If this particular motion carries, is there anything restricting us from offering suggestions to the conferees, as we have done previously, for consideration during the conference?

Mr. ARENDS. No, there is not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) for debate only.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, like, I assume, most Members of this body, I was not aware of just what motion would be offered when I came to the floor today. I should like to have a little clarification, if I may.

Am I correct in assuming that if the motion to instruct which is now before us is accepted by this body the conferees then cannot consider any language dealing with the termination date for the war? Am I correct on that point?

Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, could I direct this to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) or any Member who wants to respond? Would the effect of this motion to instruct be to deny the conferees the opportunity to consider not only the Mansfield language but also any modification of the Mansfield language?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for that clarification. I must say I receive that news with regret, because just as I would vote against locking in the conferees on the Mansfield language—I believe the language should be improved—I also believe the Congress does have the responsibility to speak to the question of war termination date.

We have spoken on the subject before, but I believe we can speak with greater precision and still do so in a manner that will not impair the President's negotiating position in Moscow or Peking.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say my answer was blunt, and I wanted it to be so, on the case of this motion to instruct. However, in the committee of conference we can reach an agreement, as we did under the draft bill when we accepted practically all of the Mansfield amendment with the exception possibly of the date. We were very fair in taking the Mansfield language and trying to come back to this House, in all fairness, with an amendment which could be accepted. Again I believe we would go there in a real effort to try to work out acceptable language and to try to work the will of the House.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Obviously the conferees could come back for further instructions as to language in any one of the particular instances that are included in the motion to instruct.

Mr. FINDLEY. I believe the conferees on the draft bill acquitted themselves very well. They gave me confidence that once again they could do a similar constructive job, and that is why I do not believe instruction is justified on this occasion.

The only problem I have with the Mansfield language is the implication it carries that when the President puts his name to a bill with that language in it he is thereby publicly disclosing his own deadline date for the war. I question the prudence of causing the President to take such a step, even though I hope he has a very early and precise deadline to

which he is adhering. The Mansfield language should be changed to show the deadline as the sense of Congress, not the policy of the Government. This can be accomplished by leaving conferees uninstructed.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, we are a separate and an equal branch of the Government.

I believe the issue today is whether we are going to follow the marching orders of the executive branch, whoever might be President, and be a rubberstamp for the White House, or whether we are going to do as the Constitution of the United States requires, and make our own independent judgments.

I believe this is a rare moment of truth for the House, for today finally we can, if we have the courage, vote "yes" or "no" to end this war. So I appeal to my colleagues, let us free ourselves by voting down the previous question. Let us think for ourselves on this one, because the country is hoping and praying that we will.

The enormous courage of our men in Vietnam and the American POW's deserves no less.

Frankly, it is their lives that we hold in our hands today. Can we ask even one more man, woman, or child to die in this war if we lack the courage today to face the issue with an honest, forthright "yes" or "no" vote?

All I am asking for is just that vote—yes or no. Let us decide, 435 of us, how we choose to answer that question, because each one of us can make our own independent judgments. That is why we meet here and why we do not meet at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. The Constitution says that this is our decision to make and, after 10 years and 55,000 lives, can we not at least vote yes or no to end this war in the next 6 months? Let us defeat this previous question.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER), a member of the committee.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes available to me I would like to try to probe for the real issue involved in the so-called Mansfield amendment.

Several speakers today have suggested that the amendment means the saving of American lives and an end to the war. I suggest that is not the point at issue because I do not know of a single man or woman in this House who wants to give another American life in this war and who does not want to get it over with at the earliest possible moment. I do not think that is the issue at all.

What happens if the Mansfield amendment becomes law and the prisoners of war are not returned in 6 months? What happens? Does the war go on? If they are not returned is the Mansfield amendment another Gulf of Tonkin resolution giving the President authority to continue the war if prisoners are not returned?

The actual return of prisoners of war

is a negotiable matter which must be negotiated by the people sitting at a conference table who are responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs. You cannot negotiate the terms of a prisoner of war return on the floor of a parliamentary body.

The very essence of negotiation is the existence of a quid pro quo. If you legislatively set a withdrawal date, which is the real and most potent quid pro quo, then how in the world do you expect to negotiate decent terms for the return of prisoners?

You cannot negotiate with foreign countries in a parliamentary body. I say let the negotiators do it.

Mr. Speaker, this war is ending and will be over soon. So I respectfully suggest that maybe the real issue involved here today is not ending the war or saving lives but who gets credit for ending it. I suggest respectfully to the people who urged the end of this war years ago, there is plenty of credit for them. There is also credit for Johnny-come-lately doves, there is plenty of credit for the Congress and plenty of credit for the President.

Let us end the war as soon as possible—earlier than 6 months if possible—but let us do it in the only way that it can be done, which is at the negotiating table and not in the statute books.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for the purpose of debate.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, all the illusions of Vietnam have been shattered. All that now remains are the stark realities of a brutal and senseless war.

For a decade this Nation has sent her young men to die in Asia. The price from this tragic venture has been incalculably high: in terms of lives lost and blood shed, in terms of opportunities missed and treasure squandered, in terms of the disaffection of our young and the polarization of our society.

Rather than preventing a bloodbath in Vietnam, a bloodbath has been created—by bombings, fire-free zones, search and destroy missions. Since January 1, 1961, more than 53,000 American lives have been lost; more than 750,000 Vietnamese. Vietnam has been ravaged, the victim of bombs, herbicides, depopulation, forced evacuations, and constant warfare. Laos and Cambodia share her fate.

As far as the self-determination of the Vietnamese people is concerned, the recent sham elections shattered that illusion too. A silenced majority is still subject to a dictator who would perpetuate the war. The presidential elections may have demonstrated that each citizen has one vote—but only one man for whom to vote.

The administration's vaunted Vietnamization policy has not brought peace, but continued death and destruction. It contemplates South Vietnamese armed forces pursuing a military victory sustained by American air and logistical support.

But this is the same litany of disaster as was served up in the Johnson years. It is time for the Congress to change that policy and assert its responsibility.

The Mansfield amendment offers the



Congress the opportunity to live up to its responsibility. It offers us the opportunity to turn this country around. It offers us the opportunity to give peace a chance.

This amendment would declare it to be the policy of the United States to withdraw all U.S. forces from Indochina not later than 6 months after the date of enactment, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war.

The American people, who have expressed their opposition to the continuation of this war both in public opinion polls and at the polls, are entitled to know how their Representatives in Congress stand on the war. It is a disservice to the American people for the Republican leadership to obfuscate the issue by setting up a false issue. To deprive Members of the House of a clear-cut "yes" or "no" vote on the question of fixing a date certain for ending our military involvement in Vietnam is an affront to the people of America and their representatives.

This parliamentary maneuver will be seen for what it is—a device to avoid a direct vote.

The Mansfield amendment is very germane to the mothers, wives, and families of American prisoners of war and other courageous servicemen whose lives are in jeopardy every minute this war continues.

The most pressing question before the American people today is not the rules of the House, but whether or not this House of Representatives is relevant, whether or not this House of Representatives is willing to vote to end the war.

Despite the parliamentary obstacles which have been placed in our path, there is a way to bring the Mansfield amendment to a vote. That will require defeating the previous question on the Arends motion to instruct. If the previous question is defeated, then it will be possible to obtain a vote on instructing the conferees to accept the Mansfield amendment.

For too many years we have abdicated our responsibilities. Now we have an opportunity once and for all to set a date to end the war, to end the dastardly destruction and to make our society whole once again.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) for the purpose of debate only.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the issue before this House today is whether we are going to respond to the will of the American people. It is imperative that we set a date to withdraw from Vietnam.

It is procedurally imperative that we instruct the conferees, whose vote in conference may well differ from the vote of a majority of the Members of this House and whose actions in conference may well not reflect the views of this House. We must instruct them—clearly and unequivocally—on a matter so important to the entire Nation.

A majority of this House as well as a majority of the American people want to set a date certain for the withdrawal of all of our troops from Vietnam. Yet a minority of this House seeks to thwart

the majority of this House and a majority of the American people from obtaining a clear vote on this question by refusing to allow a vote on the Mansfield amendment.

It is politically imperative, in light of the forthcoming election year at the very least, that the House respond to its constituents on the issue that has caused unprecedented upheaval and chaos in the American conscience and economy.

It is morally imperative that the House of Representatives adopt a position of concern for the thousands of Americans and Vietnamese dead in this futile war and those still dying and being wounded.

Every day that passes without our setting a date certain for ending the war makes us more and more responsible, on a personal basis, for continuing the killing.

Since our last vote, we have had the Pentagon Papers, the Hanoi offer of release of prisoners and the South Vietnamese nonelection. Surely, this requires us to have a new vote on setting the date.

Mr. Speaker, is the Mansfield amendment germane? Of course it is. It is most germane and very correct that the motion to instruct the conferees to support the Mansfield amendment comes up in connection with the Military Procurement Act. This bill contains authorization for billions of dollars for missiles and weapons, while we cannot get the money we need for education, food stamps, health, housing, and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, this vote would show the American people that Congress has finally come to its senses and has recognized the fact that even as it considers authorizing an unjustifiably large military budget, that it must and does cut off the war in Indochina, the worst example of our incorrect military policy.

This would put an end to the national torment over the war.

I and a majority of the American people are profoundly skeptical that the President can be trusted to wind it down without this expression of the sense of Congress. How can we expect the President to be trusted to wind down the war while he continues to bomb, supports a rigged election, and refuses to respond to the seven-point peace proposal offered by the NLF on July 1 at the Paris peace talks—the first point of which specifically offered to release our prisoners of war in conjunction with setting a date for U.S. troop withdrawal.

We are perfectly prepared to allow the President to get the credit for setting the date and ending the war. We are perfectly willing to let him seek a political solution at the negotiating table. But let us instruct our conferees and the President to set a date. Then he can negotiate not only in Peking and Moscow but in Paris as well. He can bring our prisoners home, stop the killing, and withdraw from Vietnam on a date certain.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it was May

1965 when I, along with a very few of our colleagues, first stood in this well and opposed our mistaken policy in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that some 6½ years later this House cannot express its will on a vote, up or down, as to whether we are going to end this dreadful, immoral adventure.

I say to you that this may look like a cute strategy to some to hide behind the Republicans' procedural strategy, when most of us did not learn until 60 minutes ago what the device would be.

American public opinion has finally reached the conclusion that we should not have been there in the first place; we should not have stayed there in the second place; and they want us out, lock, stock and barrel, now, they do not want to waste one more American life, and they do not want to waste one more of anyone's life over there, and they do not want to spend one more dollar of American taxpayers' money on this damned folly.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this House and this country must consider both the long-range and the short-range chances for peace in this world. The Congress and the President need to cooperate in this search for peace. I think it would be a serious mistake for this Congress at this time to do anything that would materially hamper or adversely interfere with the present efforts that are underway to bring the war in Southeast Asia to an end, which I believe is the desire of everybody in the House and the overwhelming desire of our people generally.

The President is going to Peking, the President is going to Moscow, and it seems to me that to rock the boat at this time or to take any action that would likely be so construed would be most damaging to our efforts to promote the cause of peace.

Of course, the pending motion involves a procedural question and not a direct vote on the various issues encompassed in the several Senate provisions. I wish to say that I am supporting the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) on this procedural question, and I believe that the majority of this House will support them in giving them what in effect will be an opportunity to go unfettered, as it were, to conference. The motion is in a package form. I do not agree that ultimately the House itself should disagree to every Senate provision involved, but under the parliamentary circumstances, at this stage, I believe we should support the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have just come back from Vietnam, where I have witnessed the ravages of drug abuse destroying our young soldiers;

where I saw racial tensions at the breaking point which could lead to bloody battles, making some of our worst battles pale in significance.

I saw boredom eroding the very patience of our troops. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I saw indisputable evidence that America has fulfilled her mission in Vietnam. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if there are two ounces of wisdom left in our judgment, and an ounce of concern for our soldiers, we will vote down the previous question and vote for the Mansfield amendment to bring our boys home immediately.

A yes vote on the previous question is a vote to keep those troops there indefinitely.

The distinguished minority leader is asking us to accommodate the President in his dealings with two of the most brutal burglars in the world at the expense of the American troops in Vietnam.

I shall vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the question was raised in the course of this debate about the importance of the element of germaneness as amendments relate to this bill. It seems to me that the precedent of reviewing each issue that the Senate brings up is something that the House should always consider. The fact is that we should always vote on each amendment issue separately.

I am particularly concerned with the excellent remarks made by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania on the subject of chromium.

I want to tell you a few things about chromium, because this is a military procurement bill.

We are talking about chromium, and chromium is a strategic material. Chromium is the material that makes stainless steel stainless. It is used in tools, it is used in medical equipment, it is used in missiles, and in making all our ships and aircraft. Do you realize that less than 1 percent of the chromium that we use each year in this country is produced domestically?

It is a very important strategic commodity, yet today nearly all of the chromium that we use in this country is imported from Russia—from Russia. In 4 years we have turned to Russia as the source of supply, and the price of chromium has gone up from \$30 a ton to \$72 a ton.

In this bill there are many things which we will not have the opportunity to talk about, like that of a free country having the right to sell goods to America if a Communist country is selling those goods to America. This issue to me is a military procurement matter. I hope that in the future there is some procedure so that we can talk about each amendment separately. Our House should be given an opportunity to provide that a free country may sell goods to America, and not make ourselves subject to, nor make ourselves dependent upon, a Communist country as our source of supply for a major strategic material.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that, given the opportunity, I would oppose the so-called Mansfield amendment. I would oppose it because I do not feel that it is necessary. Further, I would oppose it because I believe it would be detrimental to the efforts now being made to end the war.

I hasten to add that I respect the opinions and the motives of those who support the Mansfield amendment, both in the Congress and throughout the country. Everyone is weary of this war. We all—each of us—want to end the war—and I want to end it just as much as anyone in this Chamber. But the adoption of the Mansfield amendment would not help end the war. In fact, in my judgment, it would have just the opposite effect.

In our anxiety to extricate ourselves from our involvement, we seem to ignore some fundamental facts that bear directly on the issue. Let us remember that President Nixon was elected principally because of his promise to get us out of Vietnam. He has repeatedly told the American people that he expects to be held accountable for his actions to this end, and most certainly he will be. We all know that the American people are not going to grant him a second term next November if he has not kept his word.

I say the Mansfield amendment is unnecessary because what it seeks to accomplish is, in essence, assured by the very structure of our political system. Our news media reminds us daily of the coming presidential election. This campaign has already started. Candidates are criss-crossing the land, and the President, himself, has recognized and addressed the war issues. This is as it should be. This is in our tradition and the American people are going to have the last word. This will be the crucial test of the President's promise to get us out of Vietnam. So, when you stop to reflect on it, you can only conclude that a date much earlier than would be imposed by the so-called Mansfield amendment has been guaranteed to the people by the election laws of several of our States. Commonsense dictates that if the President expects to be reelected, our involvement in Vietnam must be ended within the next few months.

Why? Because the primary elections throughout the country require that the President make his accounting well before next November. In at least 18 different instances, the people will pass judgment in early 1972.

To the people of New Hampshire, President Nixon will be held accountable on March 7—just a short time from now. The campaign in New Hampshire is on right now. We all know that.

He must answer to the voters of Florida on March 4—just a week later.

His record will be on the line in Illinois March 21.

The citizens of Wisconsin will render their judgment on April 4.

Across the Nation, again and again, the American people will speak:

April 11 in Rhode Island;

April 25 in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania;

May 2 in the District of Columbia, Indiana, and Ohio;

May 9 in Nebraska and West Virginia;

May 16 in neighboring Maryland;

May 23 in Oregon; and

June 6 in California, New Jersey, New Mexico, and South Dakota.

So, while the President has not stated a date certain for our withdrawal on national television or at the Paris Conference, I am confident that he has such a date in mind and that he is proceeding accordingly. When we look at the record of what he has done to wind down the war, why should we undermine the President's efforts? Why should we here in Congress deny him our best bargaining chip for the release of our POW's? Why should we provide a timetable for attacks against our remaining forces at their most vulnerable time? I share the view that by refusing to accommodate Hanoi we maintain a certain advantage that accrues to America—and to our remaining forces in Vietnam, as well as to the South Vietnamese, who must ultimately be responsible for their own defense.

When President Nixon came into office, there were 543,400 American troops in Vietnam. As many as 500 Americans were dying each week, and the war was costing in excess of \$28 billion a year. These were the sad realities of January 1969. The options open to the President were extremely limited. But look what has happened since that time. We are getting out of Vietnam. To date, 337,000 Americans have been withdrawn, about two-thirds of the American troop strength that existed when President Nixon took office. Casualties are down dramatically—eight last week—eight too many. But weekly casualties used to be in the hundreds, and the cost is about a third of its level 2 years ago.

President Nixon did not start the Vietnam war. But he is bringing it to an end. The President has kept his promises. He deserves our support as he strives to end this war for all America.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the American combat role in South Vietnam is irrevocably coming to an end. It is doing so, not because some well intentioned soul amended an existing piece of legislation to make it happen, but because President Richard Nixon has made a commitment to bring it about, and is living up to his word.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need an amendment to bring the troops home now. They are coming home. More than 300,000 are already back, with more being returned each day. The Commander in Chief has exceeded all plans and promises. Why, oh why, should we telegraph our strategy and our intent?

I must ask, where was such an amendment in 1964, or 1965, or 1966, or 1967, or



1968? Surely we remember that period of "gradual escalation" when American forces reached more than 500,000 men. But, then again, there was a different President, was there not?

It appears to me, that many of those same individuals who want to "jump ship" today, were helping to paddle then.

Where was such an amendment, when American casualties were running as high as 300 dead each week? But then again, we played by a different set of rules at that time, and today, many of those same people who would not buy a used car from the present occupant of the White House, bought everything the "sage of the pedernales" and his chief whiz kid had to offer, including the esteemed author of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, the Senator from Arkansas.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that prior to 1969, we were sending men to Vietnam to fight. Since that time, we have been bringing them home to live. But strangely, now that there is a different President in the White House—one committed to end the war—the amendments to "help him," have been dropped into the hopper like so much confetti.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, he does not need our help now, just our moral support. The President is bringing the troops home. The Saigon government will be able to stand alone, and, although I know such information must "gall" a number of people, it is the simple truth. Perhaps that is why it hurts.

I say, let the President get on with the job. In the meantime, let us confer and pass this arms bill in the spirit that if we err, it will be in favor of defensive strength.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), to instruct the House conferees on the military procurement authorization bill to disagree to nongermane Senate amendments, including the Mansfield amendment.

The Mansfield amendment, as we all well know, declares it to be a policy of the United States to withdraw all of our troops in Indochina within 6 months of the date of the bill's enactment, subject only to the release of all of our prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, the time to end American involvement in the horrendous conflict in Southeast Asia has come—that time, in fact, is long overdue. Day by day, week by week, casualties mount on all sides of the war. How can any American, let alone any Congressman, ignore the lamentable litany: 55,000 Americans killed; another 300,000 wounded, about 35,000, of whom are permanently disabled; 1.3 million South Vietnamese civilian casualties in the last 5 years; 1.5 million refugees in Cambodia, rendered homeless by a widening war.

We have diverted \$130 billion from urgent domestic needs to conduct the war everyone wants terminated.

And the highest cost may, in the end, be the tearing apart of the fabrics of American society. From 12,000 miles away, this conflict in a remote area of the world is setting parent against child,

old against young, frustrated citizens against established institutions.

Eight months have passed since 73 percent—almost three of every four persons included in a national survey—told pollsters they favored congressional initiatives to end the Indochina war by December 31, 1971.

How long, Mr. Speaker, can we permit this tragedy to continue?

The time has come for us in the Congress to exert our legislative authority as provided in the Constitution to undo what has been done by Executive fiat. Although we have earlier expressed the sense of Congress that the United States should terminate as quickly as possible all of its military operations at a date certain, subject to the release of all U.S. prisoners, and the President has signed that declaration as part of Public Law 92-129, the President has refused to set that date certain. It is difficult to understand the President's refusal to comply with the expressed sense of Congress. The United States has no open-ended commitment to President Thieu to provide him with endless supplies of American dollars and American lives. Besides, South Vietnam now has as viable a government as it can ever have. The undeniable fact is that South Vietnam today has more than a million men in its regular armed forces and another half million in militia-type forces—one man in five is formally under arms. In recent months we have been told about substantial South Vietnamese military successes in Cambodia and Laos. One of our top civilian advisers in Vietnam, John Vann, noted in a national news magazine interview recently that Saigon has extended its control of the countryside to the point where many Vietnamese believe the war to be all but over. Mr. Vann concluded, "If the South Vietnamese do not succeed from here on out, it cannot be blamed on the lack of U.S. support."

If anything, setting a definite date for the total withdrawal of our troops will have a healthy effect on Saigon's fighting capability. It would serve notice on that Government's leaders that the United States is not about to leave its combat forces in Vietnam forever, and that they had better undertake fully the responsibility for their own defense.

In summary, setting a definite date for total pullout of U.S. Armed Forces from Indochina will have several positive effects:

First, the Saigon government will be forced to assume, once and for all, the full responsibility of its own defense;

Second, we can put to rest the terrible divisiveness which has started to sour American life; and

Third, the door will be opened for the return of our prisoners of war.

If we have any sense at all, it should be clear to us by now that we cannot bomb the enemy into releasing our prisoners of war. If we could, our men would have been released years ago. We should realize, too, that the best probable way to achieve the release of American prisoners of war is to name a date certain for complete withdrawal of our troops, subject only to the safe release of our pris-

oners of war, as called for by the Mansfield amendment.

In the strongest possible terms, I urge my colleagues to vote down the previous question on the Arends motion, so that we may amend it to instruct our conferees to agree to the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the issue of germaneness, posed by the distinguished leader from Illinois is a reasonable question. But that question, which has never been put as a major issue on this floor before, so far as I recall, can be handled at another time when it does not conflict with and cloud the more tremendous and supervening issue of Vietnam. Compared to Vietnam, the question of germaneness is a triviality. If germaneness was so important, this House would have dealt with it long ago.

Faced with a great moment in history that might end U.S. involvement in the tragic Vietnam war, the Congress now offers a triviality which prevents the confrontation with this monumental issue at this time. I predict that the people will reject this erosion, and that Congress will soon be brought kicking and screaming to face its bounden duty.

Mr. Speaker, during the history of the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, engineered mainly on the initiative of the Executive, the Congress of the United States has very largely lost the manhood with which it was clearly endowed by the Constitution.

Beguled by the slogan "the President is our leader, the Congress has eagerly followed the chieftain, just as medieval vassals followed their leige lord. Forgotten was the lesson that our fathers delegated coordinate power to the Congress, precisely because feudal and monarchical practices were still fresh in their minds, and they are not acceptable in a democracy.

Armed by the constitutional phrase that the President is Commander in Chief, the Congress has bowed to the Executive claim that there is an area of authority to which the legislative prerogative does not extend, and in that area the Executive exercises sole command. On the contrary, the Legislative authority vested in the Congress is not limited in any way by the Constitution. It extends to every nook and cranny of Federal Government. It extends to declaration of war and use of military forces. The Congress has by custom allowed the Executive to take emergency military action in cases where commonsense requires it, but that is only as surrogate for the complete Government, which includes both executive and legislative.

In matters of high policy, joint action is essential. Sadly, the Congress has failed in this respect. The Executive has been allowed on his own recognizance to wage war in several countries that were not designated by the Congress. He has been allowed to spend immense sums of money secretly and unbeknownst to the Congress which should have been a watchdog over the people's treasure. He had shed the people's blood without so much as a "by your leave" to the people's representatives in Congress.

It is time that this once great legisla-

tive body reasserted its prerogative. Let us defeat this motion. Then let us pass a motion to instruct the House Conferees to set a date on U.S. military involvement in Indochina. It would be a historic and ringing assertion of congressional independence. Besides it would be the most positive step yet taken by the United States to end its cruel involvement in the Vietnam war.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, the underlying question in this debate is one which we have really never faced in this country—that is the very important and fundamental question of whether, and to what extent, we are willing to accept the role of a great power in the world, with all the burdens, anguish, responsibilities, and opportunities which such a role entails.

There are two legitimate sides to this question, and it certainly deserves debate. The American people might well be happier if we could retreat, in material measure, to our own shores. I incline to the belief that it is late in the day of our history, and that of the world, for such a decision; and I do not believe that an activist and international role in today's world, is possible without a military aspect.

However, this may be, it is my submission that we cannot, in any responsible way decide this grave question by a vote on the Mansfield amendment here today.

We are presently engaged in war. The President of the United States is charged with the responsibility for its conduct and its conclusion, and the policies of our Government are under question and attack. The adoption of the Mansfield amendment would alter this factual situation not at all. It would assure neither return of our prisoners, nor any other of the results we may desire. It would, however, under existing circumstances constitute a repudiation of the President and his policies; and it would embarrass and harass our Government in the conduct of our affairs in the world.

At a proper time and place let us, by all means, face up to and debate the underlying question to which I have made reference; but here today let us support the President and the Government of the United States, and let us defeat the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Mansfield amendment to H.R. 8687, the military procurement and R. & D. authorization for fiscal year 1972. The amendment would establish as U.S. policy the withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Indochina within 6 months, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war.

Millions of words have been spoken about this amendment and the facts and policies which make its passage imperative. I fully realize that each of us, regardless of his position on this matter, has struggled with it as a matter of conscience.

We must act now. We must assert the manifest will of the people. We must not succumb to the specious argument that by acting we will be humiliating the President.

As a lawyer I have been trained that calm and dispassionate advocacy is most

likely to succeed. But how can I be calm when today—after the deaths of more than 50,000 of our men, after the international excoriation of our Vietnam policy, after the sickening revelations of the Pentagon papers, and after the shameful elevation of a fifth rate dictator in South Vietnam—when, after all these historic catastrophes, it appears that this House will once again fail to put an end to our military involvement in Indochina.

We must question whether in any sense we have made progress in extricating our nation from the Vietnam war. It is said that there are less American troops in Indochina than were there a few years ago. Yet recent evidence acquired by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and by our Armed Services Committee indicates that the Central Intelligence Agency, which is sovereign unto itself, is fielding a massive army of mercenaries in Laos and elsewhere.

It is said that the South Vietnamese Army is better able to defend its own country. And yet the clear consensus of expert opinion is that North Vietnamese forces could overrun the South if they chose.

It is said that we have "given democracy a chance" in South Vietnam. In fact, we have facilitated the perfection of a totalitarianism which is indistinguishable from, and in some cases far less benign than, the totalitarianism in the North.

It is said that by not deviating from "our commitment" we have shown the nations of the world that the United States does not renege on a pledge. And yet the net result of our Indochina policy in most of the unaligned nations of the world has been a severe diminution of our influence and appeal.

One of the most tragic aspects of the Pentagon papers is the evidence they provide of the domestic implications of this war. We learn that almost since the war began, our highest leaders have perceived domestic opposition to the war as a kind of petty nuisance not to be taken seriously. Again and again, the attempt has been made to accommodate public opinion to our mistaken foreign policies, rather than to adapt those policies to the will of the people. Even now, when withdrawal from Indochina is the announced policy of the President, the same rusty canards are paraded before the American people, as if in a magical, mollifying incantation. These slogans of the Dulles era no longer control our foreign policy with regard to mainland China, the Soviet Union or Latin America. Why do they pervade the President's statements and policies regarding Indochina?

I do not seek to embarrass any of us by rehearsing the recent ridiculous and tragic political developments in South Vietnam. I would note only that we should not view those developments as a minor setback. They reflect the essentially corrupt and fundamentally unstable political apparatus of that country, into whose treasury we have poured so many billions of dollars.

Our decision today on the Mansfield amendment is more than symbolic. Of course, we recognize that the President

has so much power that he can ignore the Congress if he chooses, just as he has ignored the Congress with respect to other limitations on our involvement in Indochina, notably in Laos. But history will not record our actions today as frivolous or as a mere gesture.

Each of us must recognize that when this war eventually passes into history, historians will reflect on the impotence of the Congress in a time of crisis, just as they now reflect on the omnipotence of Congress in the Wilson era. Historians will note that our Indochina policies were abetted by the inaction of the representatives of the people, an inaction largely facilitated by the personal influence of the President, not by the expressed desire of the people.

And historians will note, it grieves me to state, that in 1971 we did not end the war, we merely turned to yet another of its interminable phases while fewer American men died in a war their Nation knew was wrong.

Each of us must do what he believes is right and be willing to accept the consequences.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, America's decade of commitment to South Vietnam has become a sterile exercise. We have committed more than 55,000 dead boys, more than 300,000 wounded, and close to \$150 billion. In return, we have received nothing but world indignation, division at home, and the frustration that comes from seeking to do the impossible. The time has come for America to end this exercise in futility once and for all in order to turn its attention swiftly to the problems besetting us at home.

Our social problems have become social cancers on the body politic. From mass transit, housing, and waste disposal to education, environment, and consumer protection, we are in need of reallocating our resources and restructuring our national priorities. Our cities, containing the vast majority of our people cry out for attention if we are to curb the slide toward social and economic disaster now confronting us.

The war in Vietnam has destroyed the viability of the American economy and the worth of the dollar. Inflation has raged unchecked, joblessness has climbed, and the wage earner is now caught in a bind that is intolerable. All because of the blind, endless commitment to victory in Southeast Asia over an enemy that is as nationalist as it is Communist.

I seek to end that involvement by act of Congress. Power to do this is vested in the Congress, and it must act as an institution or lose the faith of the people at large. It is my intention to support and vote for the Mansfield amendment, which calls for a policy on the part of the United States to terminate, at the earliest possible date, all military operations of the United States in Indochina. It also calls for the United States to provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all of our military forces not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this concept, subject to release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with that govern-



ment. The Congress urges and requests the President under the amendment to:

- Establish a final date for withdrawal;
- Negotiate an immediate cease-fire by all parties; and
- Negotiate a series of phased, swift troop withdrawals.

Here, at last, I believe, is the practical solution to the ongoing agony of Indochina. It is vital that we extricate ourselves forthwith.

With joblessness, unrest and social dissatisfaction at all-time highs at home, it ill behooves us to continue to pursue what has already been proven to be a fruitless, foolish venture. No thinking American supports any further commitment of lives and resources. These are all needed here at home, and as soon as possible.

We must learn from the lessons of the past or we are doomed to repeat the mistakes of that past. I believe we have had enough dead American young men. Indochina is not worth more deaths, more losses and more diversion of dollars we simply must have at home. Passage of the Mansfield resolution by the Congress is our key that will at last unlock the door to final extrication.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has made every dramatic announcement in the past several weeks except the one we have most hoped for these many months. He has promised us several spectacular diplomatic events in upcoming weeks. But he has failed to schedule the one event most looked for by the American people. He has been all boldness and decisiveness—except when it has come to deciding to get out of Vietnam.

The Congress should help the President decide by sending the Mansfield amendment to him for his signature.

The Mansfield amendment sets a feasible deadline for total U.S. troop withdrawal—6 months from the enactment of the amendment. It spells out the one condition for withdrawal on which all are agreed we must insist—release of our prisoners of war. It mandates negotiations for an immediate cease-fire throughout Indochina so that the war snuffed out in Vietnam does not flare up again in the neighboring states of Laos and Cambodia.

The Mansfield amendment will not tie the President's hands during his visits to Peking and Moscow. How could it? The place to negotiate on Vietnam is in Paris. In Paris, we can get an agreement to protect our withdrawing troops and bring the release of our prisoners. In Paris, we can cut short the time during which we risk severe friction between our remaining forces and the South Vietnamese. In Paris, we can put a stop to the deepening crisis of morale and increasing instances of mutiny among our troops, which are so ominous for the long-term security of our country.

Is it any wonder that our sailors and soldiers balk at a mission that the majority of the American people have disavowed?

The Mansfield amendment is a bold, clear, and decisive statement of policy. It is time for the President to sign on and make it official. He will earn the gratitude of the American people.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake about what is going on in the House of Representatives today. What we are confronting in this motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), who is obviously acting under instructions from the Republican leadership and the White House, is a thinly veiled attempt to prevent this body and each of its Members, from being recorded on the Mansfield amendment which declares it national policy that we end our involvement in Vietnam now.

Despite all the verbiage about rules of the House and the germaneness of amendments, the issue before us is very simple: the Nixon administration quite obviously does not believe it has the votes to defeat the Mansfield amendment and rather than risk the embarrassment of a defeat on the substance of the issue, it has taken the cowardly course and run around the issue.

It is a dark day for this administration and if we let them get away with the tactic, it will be a dark day for this body, as well. The urgency for a recorded vote on the Mansfield amendment becomes more apparent with each passing day. The fraudulent election of President Thieu in South Vietnam, the continuing war in Laos, conducted under cover of the CIA in direct violation of a law passed by the 91st Congress, the buildup in Cambodia for which the Joint Chiefs of Staff are pressing so avidly—all make it obvious that rather than getting out of the tragic morass of Indochina, our involvement grows ever deeper.

President Nixon clearly believes he has lulled the American people into a false sense of security about the war and our policy in Southeast Asia. He knows just as well that he is no longer fooling the Congress. Today's transparent tactic by the Republican leadership in the House proves that beyond any doubt. Let the record show just who is squaring with the American people on Vietnam today.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS). Simple fairness demands a straight up-or-down vote on an issue of this magnitude. The people, after all, are entitled to know just how we stand on the Mansfield amendment. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the previous question. If it is defeated, Mr. NEZBI, my colleague from Michigan, will try to amend Mr. ARENDS' motion—making it one that instructs the conferees to maintain the Mansfield amendment intact.

This amendment, now that it has been restored to its original text and tone, would help free us from a war that has defined solution for more than a decade. The Senate's passage of the amendment last June was a heartening sign. It appeared that the Congress, newly sobered and emboldened, was about to reassert its legitimate role in shaping war policy.

This judgment, however, proved too hasty. The conference committee on the Draft Extension Act—the legislation that bore the Mansfield amendment—diluted it in an effort to get some kind of a draft bill through the Congress. The

amendment was made into a routine sense of Congress resolution, lamely suggesting withdrawal from Vietnam but specifying no time limit. It was as if the Congress was afraid to put more than a toe into the water, guardedly testing the temperature before committing itself.

I think it is high time we plunged in, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is high time we enacted legislation demanding—yes, demanding—withdrawal from Vietnam.

How much longer can we wait, after all?

How much more can we endure?

How many more deaths, how many more My Lai's, how many more drug scandals, how many more plundered cities and burned villages?

The history of this war is almost Kafkaesque in its irony. Step by step, inch by inch, we have been drawn into a conflict that now engulfs virtually all of Southeast Asia. Each new escalation—however meek or however daring—was trumpeted as the solution. We gave more troops, more arms, more money, more American blood. But nothing worked. Even the war's most ardent supporters—men once described as Hawks—now concede its futility.

We have already paid dearly for what the State Department calls our commitment to South Vietnam: 45,000 Americans killed, \$250 billion drained from our Treasury.

The Mansfield amendment offers us a way out.

Its goal is simple: withdrawal of all American troops within 6 months, conditional on the release of American POW's still held by enemy forces.

The amendment lacks the kind of legal force that would be binding on the President, forcing him to yield to its provisions. But it would make those provisions a new "National Policy" sanctioned by the Congress.

The administration, no matter how stonily aloof to the legislative branch, could not ignore them.

The amendment would achieve still another goal.

It would demonstrate, clearly and convincingly, that we do not intend to remain forever in South Vietnam yoked to its government's policies.

President Thieu is not our messiah, nor are his policies our holy writ.

If South Vietnam is not yet ready to defend itself, it never will be.

The time to get out is now.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion, offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) to instruct conferees on the Military Procurement Authorization Act that they should not agree to any portion of the Senate amendment to this bill which is not germane to military procurement under the rules of the House.

The key issue here, Mr. Speaker, is of course whether the House should instruct its conferees to accept, without opportunity for amendment or compromise, the Senate language of the Mansfield amendment which purports to set as the policy of the United States a date for total withdrawal from Vietnam of 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

When this same bill was before the House last summer, we debated and rejected an amendment of similar thrust, the Nedzi-Whalen amendment. I supported a substitute to the Nedzi-Whalen amendment, the McDade amendment, which was also defeated at that time. My reasons for opposing Nedzi-Whalen and supporting the McDade amendment were made clear to our colleagues in an extensive statement which I made during the Nedzi-Whalen debate.

My remarks appear in the Congressional Record of June 17, 1971. I would like to incorporate them by reference into this statement on the Mansfield amendment and the Arends motion, because I think that the same arguments apply equally to the Senate language of the Mansfield amendment.

The Mansfield amendment does not provide for any meaningful cutoff of congressional authority to wage war in Southeast Asia, although I think, if adopted in its present form, it could mislead many people into thinking that such a cutoff is provided for. The Mansfield amendment makes no provision for the President to come back to Congress in the event the North Vietnamese do not comply with the conditions of the withdrawal date suggested in the amendment, in the event the North Vietnamese do not wish to negotiate those points raised for negotiation in the language of the amendment, or in the event the President, as Commander in Chief, sees the necessity for a change in the terms of the amendment.

The Mansfield amendment does not provide for any condition which would guarantee by negotiation or otherwise, the safe withdrawal of American forces from Indochina. While the issue of safe withdrawal can easily be dismissed at a time when we, together with the South Vietnamese have achieved a degree of military superiority in South Vietnam, if not in Laos and Cambodia, it becomes a very real issue, and a very real risk of the loss of further human life, when our withdrawals reach the point where less than 75,000 Americans remain in Indochina.

While these are very serious weaknesses in the Mansfield amendment, in addition to the weaknesses in Nedzi-Whalen which I discussed in my earlier statement, I do not feel it is fair to judge the wisdom of this amendment solely in light of arguments which were applicable 3 months ago. A number of factors have changed since the Nedzi-Whalen amendment was debated. A consideration of all of these factors should be undertaken before we decide whether to include the Mansfield amendment, either as passed by the Senate or in some other form, in the Military Procurement Authorization Act of 1971.

First, since the Nedzi-Whalen debate, the Congress has enacted and the President has signed the extension of the Selective Service Act, which includes the Mansfield amendment as amended and agreed upon by a House-Senate Conference committee. The language of the version of the Mansfield amendment which we have enacted into law follows:

**TEXT OF MODIFIED MANSFIELD AMENDMENT PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AUGUST 4, 1971**

Following is the text of Sec. 401 of House Rept. 92-433, the conference report on H.R. 6531.

This is the modified "Mansfield Amendment" adopted by the House 297-108 on August 4, 1971 (Roll Call attached).

This was signed into law on Sept. 28, 1971 by President Nixon as P.L. 92-129.

Sec. 401. It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that the United States terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations of the United States in Indochina, and provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all United States military forces at a date certain subject to the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government, and an accounting for all Americans missing in action who have been held by or known to such Government or such forces. The Congress hereby urges and requests the President to implement the above expressed policy by initiating immediately the following actions:

(1) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an immediate cease-fire by all parties to the hostilities in Indochina.

(2) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for the establishing of a final date for the withdrawal from Indochina of all military forces of the United States contingent upon the release at a date certain of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government.

(3) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an agreement which would provide for a series of phased and rapid withdrawals of United States military forces from Indochina subject to a corresponding series of phased releases of American prisoners of war, and for the release of any remaining American prisoners of war concurrently with the withdrawal of all remaining military forces of the United States by not later than the date established pursuant to paragraph (2) hereof.

It is useful to compare the enacted language with the language which the Senate has proposed to add to the Military Procurement Authorization Act of 1971:

**MANSFIELD AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8687  
TITLE VI—TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES  
IN INDOCHINA**

Sec. 601. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations of the United States in Indochina, and to provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all United States military forces not later than six months after the date of enactment of this section subject to the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government. The Congress hereby urges and requests the President to implement the above expressed policy by initiating immediately the following actions:

(1) Establishing a final date for the withdrawal from Indochina of all military forces of the United States contingent upon the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government, such date to be not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an immediate ceasefire by all parties to the hostilities in Indochina.

(3) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an agreement which would provide for a series of phased and rapid withdrawals of United States military forces from

Indochina in exchange for a corresponding series of phased releases of American prisoners of war, and for the release of any remaining American prisoners of war concurrently with the withdrawal of all remaining military forces of the United States by not later than the date established by the President pursuant to paragraph (1) hereof or by such earlier date as may be agreed upon by the negotiating parties.

The essential difference between the two versions of this amendment is that the amendment we enacted, and which the President signed provides that the President shall immediately initiate negotiations "with the Government of North Vietnam for the establishment of a final date for the withdrawal from Indochina of all military forces of the United States. \* \* \*" while the proposed Mansfield amendment to this bill specifies that the date shall be no later than 6 months from the date of enactment of the bill. In other words, the Mansfield language in this bill seeks to set a unilateral date, not subject to negotiation with the other side.

Both amendments are weak in that neither is attached to a bill which carries with it any cut-off of authority for conduct of the war by the President. One is attached to the draft bill, and the other to a procurement bill, neither of which controls military operations or funds.

Second, since the debate on Nedzi-Whalen, the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Indochina has continued at an accelerated rate. By December 1, President Nixon will have withdrawn over two-thirds of the U.S. forces which were in Vietnam in January of 1969, the date of his inauguration. The troop level has been cut from 550,000 to 200,000, and it is scheduled to be reduced to 184,000 by December 1. The President's program of withdrawal has continued for 3 months beyond where it had progressed at the time of the Nedzi-Whalen debate in the House. It has been accomplished with considerable support among the people, and without substantially weakening the allied military position in Indochina.

The withdrawal program has also been accompanied by very significant reductions in U.S. combat casualties, although this has been somewhat clouded by an increasing problem of drug addiction and noncombat deaths and injuries among U.S. servicemen in Southeast Asia. Also, the withdrawals have not brought with them an accompanying reduction in the rate or tonnage of bombings conducted in Southeast Asia by either United States or South Vietnamese forces. On the other side, the North Vietnamese have made no reciprocal effort to reduce their military presence in the disputed areas of Indochina. They have continued under great military pressure to infiltrate into South Vietnam, and have accomplished significant buildups of forces in Laos and Cambodia.

Third, since the Nedzi-Whalen debate, the South Vietnamese have conducted a so-called election of their President, which is better described as a referendum on the sole candidacy of President Thieu. This election, and the events that preceded it fell far short of what Americans, including the President, had hoped



would be evidence of some political democracy in South Vietnam. For me, in any event, this electoral mockery strengthened my earlier statement that we can no longer consider any need to strengthen the South Vietnamese Government as a proper reason for keeping American troops in Vietnam. As I stated on June 8, we have two and only two reasons for pursuing our policy of withdrawals and negotiations—the release of our prisoners of war and the guarantee of safe withdrawal of our remaining forces.

Fourth. Most importantly, since the House debate on Nedzi-Whalen, the President has announced dramatic diplomatic initiatives involving the two major Communist powers. He has shattered the official isolation of the People's Republic of China with two significant and historic moves. He has announced that he will engage in a summit meeting with Chinese leaders in Peking within the next few months, and he has changed U.S. policy on the admission of the Peoples Republic of China into the United Nations by supporting the entrance of that country into both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

In addition, and of perhaps more importance, the President has announced that he will participate in a summit meeting in Moscow with Soviet leaders. This is particularly important in several respects. First, it is important because it may provide an opportunity to solidify and accelerate the considerable progress we have already made in negotiation with the Soviets in the SALT talks, and in other key areas. Such a meeting could also trigger significant progress toward settlement in the Middle East, toward the start of mutually-balanced force reductions in Europe, and, toward a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

It is significant that both summit meetings are likely to take place within the 6-month period specified in the language of the Mansfield amendment for a unilateral, publicly announced withdrawal date.

Very strong representations have been made here on the floor that adoption of the Mansfield amendment in its present form could seriously compromise the position of the President in negotiating with both the Chinese and the Russians. His hand will be strengthened at these summit talks by the fact that on November 15, the President will have made an announcement of even further troop withdrawals from Southeast Asia. But, by passing an amendment which limits his ability to negotiate an agreement for a date for total American withdrawal, the Congress would send him off to these summit meetings in the weakened position of having a divided government back home.

In addition to the weaknesses which I pointed out last summer, which apply to the Nedzi-Whalen amendment as well as to the Senate-passed Mansfield amendment to this bill, I find that the advent of the summit talks makes the language of this amendment even more unacceptable at this time. It is not a meaningful assumption by the Congress of decision-making powers over war and peace because it does not cut off any authority for the President to act. It does not con-

tain conditions hinged on guarantees for safe withdrawal of our remaining forces; it does not take account of the withdrawal of two-thirds of our forces, nor of the coming November 15 announcement of further withdrawals. It does not provide anywhere for the President to return to Congress to seek a change in the policy laid down by the amendment if later events would lead him to believe changes were necessary.

While the recent election sham in South Vietnam has made even more distasteful to Americans any lives or effort of support expended in support of the South Vietnamese, and while it tempts us even more strongly to believe that almost any kind of congressional expression at all on a withdrawal date will somehow make that date come true, will somehow simplify the complex morass that the Vietnam situation has become, and will somehow bring the troops home with the passage of an amendment, it is both unfair and misleading to add to the public perpetration of these myths.

It is also unwise in pursuing the belief that this amendment will cure the Vietnam situation, to risk the sacrifice of what may be the best opportunity since World War II to lay some foundations for lasting and peaceful relationships between the three greatest powers of the world, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the Peoples Republic of China.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I will vote to instruct the House conferees not to accept non-germane language in the Senate bill, including the language of the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I am terribly upset that the Members of this august body will not be given the opportunity to vote specifically on the Mansfield amendment. I will vote against the previous question in the hope that we will get a clearcut vote on the Mansfield amendment.

In that case, I will support the motion to instruct the conferees to accept the Mansfield amendment. This amendment would correctly reassert the constitutional authority of the Congress in legislating a definite end to this divisive war.

This is the second time we have been given the opportunity to vote on the Mansfield amendment. The amendment requires the ending of U.S. participation 6 months after enactment of this bill, subject only to the release of U.S. prisoners of war being held in Indochina.

The need for such a reassertion of congressional authority is obvious. The recent elections in South Vietnam are a further indication of the travesty that this war has become. Almost 55,000 dead American troops and untold billions of dollars have gone into this Southeast Asian conflict. The results of these great sacrifices have been totally unsatisfactory. Therefore, it is imperative that the Congress act in a constructive manner by legislating an end to this war.

I have at every opportunity voted for or supported efforts to end this tragic war. One of my first legislative actions was to cosponsor the Disengagement Act of 1971. Later, in the Democratic caucus, I voted to end the war by December 31, 1971. I, of course, support the earliest date for liquidation of U.S. participation in

this war, however, the Mansfield amendment offers a constructive vehicle for again asserting congressional responsibilities.

I urge support of the Mansfield amendment to end the war.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, many honorable persons have risen in this Chamber to explain their beliefs on the war in Southeast Asia. I now also rise in opposition to this senseless conflict which has cost this country dearly during the past decade. In this spirit, I voted yesterday to defeat the previous question on the Arends motion to instruct to permit an honest appraisal of the Mansfield amendment, which sets a specific date for the withdrawal of American forces.

Gentlemen, we have heard long and sometimes tedious arguments that this war is necessary to preserve democracy for the people of South Vietnam. Yet, recently, we saw an example of that democracy in action. A one-man election—a political farce would be a more appropriate term—took place at the cost of more than 45,000 American lives. This is a disgrace to every American who felt the cause of freedom was a just one and who sacrificed his life to preserve it.

I sincerely hope that those who justified this war in the past on the basis of pursuing democracy in Vietnam will now think twice about their position. Is this the just cause for which our country has been torn apart?

In the highest circles of this Government, it has been said that we must stay in Vietnam until our prisoners are released and those missing are accounted for. Gentlemen, I know of no war in which prisoners were released on a demand from the enemy while hostilities continued and I scarcely believe it will happen now.

We can only bring about a release of the prisoners if we set a specific date on which hostilities will cease. If we fail to do this, how can we explain our actions to the wives and families of those men who are listed as prisoners or missing? How can we tell them, in view of the recent election in South Vietnam, that we are acting on behalf of their loved ones? I would think it a difficult, if not impossible chore.

Another pitiful aspect of this devastating war is the trafficking in drugs by high officials in the South Vietnamese and Laotian Governments. These men created a market among our young soldiers in the field. It is ironic indeed that we have allied ourselves with these same leaders.

Our young men are returning with physical and psychological problems never before experienced by U.S. fighting men. It is our responsibility to provide counselling and rehabilitation programs which supply them with the tools to rectify their dilemma.

To those who say that the adoption of the Mansfield Amendment would tie the hands of the President, I would answer that only Congress has the constitutional power to declare war and it has never done so in this case. But we continue to remain silent; we condone this senseless waste of humanity and condemn following generations of Americans to live in the shame this war has caused.

What this war has cost us in terms of economic disruption is unnecessary to discuss at this time. We all know that inflation, unemployment and a decline in the balance of payments are results of war. Yet, some persist in saying we can have both guns and butter. Gentlemen, I refuse to accept that belief.

In a war, it is inevitable that one side win and one side lose, but this war has been a national misfortune. My colleagues, America has lost this war in more ways than can be explored here. We have lost the respect of our allies for whose purpose we say we have been fighting, we have additionally weakened the economic fiber of this country and more importantly we have lost the respect of the younger generation of leaders who will follow us in guiding this country, and all the rhetoric in the world cannot reclaim that for us.

I could go on and on about the manner in which this war has been conducted and for what purpose thousands of Americans have sacrificed their lives. I asked yesterday that we pause and think about the opportunity we then had before us. We had a responsibility and duty as Members of the U.S. Congress to see that this tragic chapter in our history was ended as soon as possible.

It was time to stand and say we cannot justify what we have done any longer, that we can no longer lay waste to a country to which we have no claim and that we can spare no more American lives in a tragedy which has left a scar on this country. It was time to lay aside parliamentary jargon and address ourselves to the real issue at hand.

The American people demanded an end to this war 4 years ago and it has not yet come. We are given only more promises by those who were elected with that mandate and who have failed. I cast my votes to modify the instruction to the conferees to accept the Mansfield amendment and thereby bring peace to this Nation so we can get on with the business of rebuilding this country.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I speak my feeling about this matter. I have been opposed to this war for many years and have so expressed myself in debate on the floor of the Congress for many years. I have not changed one iota in that respect. I think that is one issue that the American people expect this Congress to vote on, first, that we are going to vote on the Mansfield amendment.

I have a very deep feeling about the fact of the Republican Party having acted the way they have today deliberately denied the House the time issue.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the previous question is voted down.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, might I simply say in conclusion that I have endeavored to the best of my ability to see to it that those for and those against this proposition might be heard. I have attempted to diligently work out the allotted time so that there would be fairness in the presentations made here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of

the time remaining to my chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in our high emotionalism, which I can readily understand, we have wandered far afield as to what the issue is in the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois.

We are not discussing the merits of the so-called Mansfield amendment here today at all. We are discussing whether this House, as the gentleman from Michigan has said, is going to control its own destiny or have others tell us what to do.

I say to the gentleman from Michigan who made the observation that we do not meet at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue—and no, by God—we do not meet at the other end of this Capitol.

To my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me say if ever there was a bipartisan committee in this House of Representatives, it is the Committee on Armed Services. It does not bow to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party. It only bows to the will of the American people—under one Commander in Chief, one President—whether that man be a Democrat or a Republican or whether his name be Nixon, Eisenhower, Jones, Smith, or anything else.

There are not enough words in the dictionary to write into law or into an amendment on the floor of this body or of the other body—any language which will end the war. It is absolutely silly to even make such a statement. All this is an expression, in other words, of what we all want. Anybody in this House who does not want the war to end ought to have his head examined.

So what we are talking of is whether this House means what it says when it enacts rules. That is all. I am one individual who pleaded with you not to instruct me the last time and I thought I would come back with a good bill that we could accept and I asked that my hands not be tied. I frankly admitted that the rules were violated, but it was the only way we could get around it.

It is not a question of consideration being given to everything again, but it is a question merely of reinforcing the hand of your conferees, to back up what the rules of the House say.

There are some things that are not germane in this bill, which I might agree heartily to, such as the chromium amendment. I wish it were germane. I wish I could support that. But I recognize the fact that it is against the rules.

Now if you do not like the rules—then change the rules. But as long as you have the rules, then abide by them. There is nothing deceitful that is happening here today. There is nothing underhanded being done here today. The gentleman from Illinois has been eminently fair. He has divided his time and he has given everybody an opportunity to talk and in reality, if we had recordings, we would find the same things are being said that have been said many, many times.

The House has time and time again rejected the so-called Mansfield amendment after the same emotional arguments that have been brought forth. The rhetoric is weak; the facts are strong.

As I continually repeat and emphasize at the risk of redundancy, the issue is not on the Mansfield amendment or any other amendment. The issue is straight, cold, and clear. There is a Reorganization Act that was adopted by the Congress; both the Senate and the House participated. The rule adopted provides that we cannot consider anything that is not germane.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. On the point about what the rules say, is it not true that last year's Reorganization Act provides that a nongermane amendment can be considered by a separate vote, and that a separate vote is precisely what the opponents of the Vietnam war are seeking here today? The rule does not say a nongermane amendment to a bill cannot be considered.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman is misled to the extent that what the rules say is that a nongermane amendment can be considered if so instructed by the House to consider that amendment. That is what the rule says. Also there are certain rules and procedures set down, and not one of those rules and procedures has been violated to this moment here today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct contains the following language, "are hereby instructed not to agree to any portion of the text of the Senate amendment."

Mr. Speaker, I point out that this is singular, the Senate amendment. Now, there are two amendments involved. Before we go to a vote, I should like the Chair to state what amendment we are voting on.

The SPEAKER. The motion relates to the text of the Senate amendment. One amendment is to the title, the other to the text.

Mr. GROSS. There is also an amendment to the title of the bill. Are we voting on the amendment to the title of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The motion relates and states, as the Chair understands it, to the text of the Senate amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for that purpose.

Mr. MIKVA. If a Member favors the Mansfield amendment, then he should vote "no" on the previous question; is that correct?



Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is a parliamentary inquiry, but the gentleman made a nice statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is ordering the previous question on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 193, answered "present" 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]  
YEAS—215

Abbutt	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Abernethy	Frey	Neilsen
Anderson, Ill.	Fuqua	Nichols
Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	O'Konski
Archer	Goldwater	Passman
Arends	Goodling	Pelly
Ashley	Griffin	Pettis
Aspinall	Grover	Peyster
Baker	Gubser	Pickle
Baring	Haley	Pirnie
Belcher	Hall	Poage
Bell	Hammer-	Poff
Bennett	schmidt	Powell
Betts	Hansen, Idaho	Price, Ill.
Bevill	Harsha	Price, Tex.
Boggs	Hastings	Purcell
Bolling	Hays	Quill
Bow	Hébert	Quillen
Bray	Henderson	Randall
Brooks	Hillis	Rarick
Brookfield	Hogan	Rhodes
Brotzman	Hollifield	Roberts
Brown, Mich.	Horton	Robinson, Va.
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Ruth
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Sandman
Buchanan	Hunt	Satterfield
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Saylor
Burlison, Tex.	Jarman	Scherle
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeli
Byron	Jonas	Scott
Cabell	Jones, Ala.	Sebelius
Caffery	Kazen	Shoup
Camp	Keating	Shriver
Casey, Tex.	Kee	Sikes
Cederberg	Keith	Skubitz
Chamberlain	Kemp	Smith, Calif.
Chappell	King	Smith, N.Y.
Clancy	Kuykendall	Spence
Clark	Kyl	Springer
Clausen,	Landgrebe	Staggers
Don H.	Latta	Stanton,
Clawson, Del	Lennon	J. William
Cleveland	Lent	Steed
Collier	Lloyd	Steiger, Ariz.
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Steiger, Wis.
Colmer	McClory	Stratton
Conable	McClure	Stuckey
Coughlin	McCullister	Talcott
Crane	McCulloch	Teague, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	McDonald,	Terry
Davis, Ga.	Mich.	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, S.C.	McEwen	Thompson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McFall	Thone
de la Garza	McKay	Veyssey
Delaney	McKevitt	Waggonner
Dellenback	McKinney	Wampler
Dennis	McMillan	Ware
Devine	Mahon	Whalley
Dickinson	Maillard	White
Dowdy	Mann	Whitehurst
Downing	Martin	Whitten
Duncan	Mathias, Calif.	Wiggins
du Pont	Mayne	Williams
Edmondson	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Calif.	Winn
Erlenborn	Mills, Ark.	Wyatt
Eshleman	Mills, Md.	Wydler
Fish	Minshall	Wylie
Fisher	Mizell	Wyman
Flood	Mollohan	Young, Fla.
Flowers	Montgomery	Young, Tex.
Ford, Gerald R.	Morgan	Zablocki
Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.	Zion

NAYS—193

Abourezk	Andrews,	Biester
Abzug	N. Dak.	Bingham
Adams	Annunzio	Blackburn
Addabbo	Ashbrook	Blanton
Alexander	Aspin	Blatnik
Anderson,	Badillo	Eoland
Calif.	Begich	Brademas
Anderson,	Bergland	Brasco
Tenn.	Blaggi	Brinkley

Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Wash.	Pryor, Ark.
Burlison, Mo.	Harrington	Pucinski
Byrne, Pa.	Harvey	Rallsback
Carey, N.Y.	Hathaway	Rangel
Carney	Hechler, W. Va.	Rees
Burton	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Carter	Helstoski	Reuss
Celler	Hicks, Mass.	Riegle
Chisholm	Hicks, Wash.	Robison, N.Y.
Clay	Howard	Rodino
Collins, Ill.	Hungate	Roe
Conte	Jacobs	Rogers
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Roncalio
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cotter	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Culver	Karth	Rosenthal
Daniels, N.J.	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Danielson	Kluczynski	Roush
Dellums	Koch	Roy
Denholm	Kyros	Roybal
Dent	Landrum	Runnels
Dingell	Leggett	Ruppe
Donohue	Link	Ryan
Down	Long, Md.	St Germain
Drinan	McCloskey	Sarbanes
Dulski	McCormack	Scheuer
Dwyer	McDade	Schmitz
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald,	Schwengel
Eilberg	Mass.	Seiberling
Esch	Madden	Shipley
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Sisk
Evins, Tenn.	Mazzoli	Slack
Fascell	Meeds	Smith, Iowa
Findley	Melcher	Snyder
Foley	Metcalfe	Stanton,
Ford,	Mikva	James V.
William D.	Miller, Ohio	Steele
Forsythe	Minish	Stubblefield
Fraser	Mink	Sullivan
Frenzel	Mitchell	Symington
Fulton, Tenn.	Monagan	Taylor
Gallfanakis	Moorhead	Tiernan
Gallagher	Morse	Udall
Garmatz	Mosher	Ullman
Gaydos	Moss	Van Deerin
Giaino	Murphy, Ill.	Vander Jagt
Gibbons	Natcher	Vanik
Gonzalez	Nedzi	Vigorito
Grasso	Nibey	Waldie
Gray	O'By	Whalen
Green, Oreg.	O'Hara	Whidnal
Green, Pa.	O'Neill	Wilson,
Griffiths	Patten	Charles H.
Gross	Pepper	Wolf
Gude	Perkins	Yates
Hamilton	Pike	Yatron
Hanley	Podell	Zwach
Hanna	Preyer, N.C.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rousselot Wright

NOT VOTING—19

Barrett	Flynt	Patman
Broyhill, N.C.	Hagan	Stevens
Derwinski	Halpern	Stokes
Diggs	Hawkins	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Ichord	Thompson, N.J.
Eckhardt	Long, La.	
Edwards, La.	Mathis, Ga.	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rousselot for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Eckhardt against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Hogan for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Teague, of Texas for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Stevens with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have a

live pair with the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. ECKHARDT). Had he been present,

he would have voted "nay." I voted

"yea." I withdraw my vote and vote

"present."

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have

a live pair with the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON). Had he been

present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENT. Am I correct that if the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) should be in the negative and the motion should die, the conferees on the part of the House would then be able to go to the Senate un-instructed, and therefore all the issues would be alive in the conference?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot pass upon that at this time.

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

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 192, nays 216, answered "present" 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]  
YEAS—192

Abbutt	Frey	Minshall
Abernethy	Fuqua	Mizell
Anderson, Ill.	Gettys	Mollohan
Andrews, Ala.	Goldwater	Montgomery
Archer	Goodling	Morgan
Arends	Griffin	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Grover	Myers
Aspinall	Gubser	O'Konski
Baker	Haley	Passman
Baring	Hall	Pelly
Belcher	Hammer-	Pettis
Bell	schmidt	Peyster
Bennett	Hansen, Idaho	Pirnie
Betts	Harsha	Poage
Bevill	Hays	Poff
Blackburn	Hébert	Powell
Boggs	Henderson	Price, Ill.
Bolling	Hicks, Wash.	Price, Tex.
Bow	Hillis	Purcell
Bray	Hogan	Quillen
Brooks	Hollifield	Randall
Brotzman	Horton	Rhodes
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Roberts
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Robinson, Va.
Buchanan	Hunt	Ruth
Burke, Fla.	Jarman	Sandman
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Pa.	Satterfield
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Saylor
Byron	Jones, Ala.	Scherle
Caffery	Keating	Schneebeli
Camp	Kee	Scott
Casey, Tex.	Keith	Sebelius
Cederberg	Kemp	Shoup
Chamberlain	King	Shriver
Chappell	Kuykendall	Sikes
Clancy	Kyl	Skubitz
Clark	Landgrebe	Smith, Calif.
Clausen,	Latta	Smith, N.Y.
Don H.	Lennon	Spence
Clawson, Del	Lent	Springer
Cleveland	Lloyd	Staggers
Collier	Lujan	Stanton,
Colmer	McClory	J. William
Conable	McClure	Steed
Crane	McCullister	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Va.	McCulloch	Stratton
Davis, S.C.	McDade	Stuckey
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Talcott
de la Garza	McFall	Teague, Calif.
Delaney	McKay	Teague, Tex.
Dennis	McKevitt	Terry
Devine	McMillan	Thompson, Ga.
Dickinson	Mahon	Thompson, Wis.
Duncan	Maillard	Thone
du Pont	Martin	Veyssey
Edwards, Ala.	Mathias, Calif.	Waggonner
Eshleman	Mayne	Wampler
Fish	Michel	Ware
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Ford, Gerald R.	Mills, Ark.	Whitehurst
Frelinghuysen	Mills, Md.	

Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Winn  
Wright

Wyatt  
Wylder  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Young, Fla.

Young, Tex.  
Zablocki  
Zion

**NAYS—216**

Abourezk	Fountain	Nix
Abzug	Frasier	Obey
Adams	Frenzel	O'Hara
Addabbo	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Neill
Alexander	Gallifanakis	Patten
Anderson,	Gallagher	Pepper
Calif.	Garmatz	Perkins
Anderson,	Gaydos	Pickle
Tenn.	Gialmo	Pike
Andrews,	Gibbons	Podell
N. Dak.	Gonzalez	Preyer, N.C.
Annunzio	Grasso	Pryor, Ark.
Aspin	Gray	Pucinski
Badillo	Green, Oreg.	Qule
Baglich	Green, Pa.	Rallsback
Bergland	Griffiths	Rangel
Blaggi	Gross	Rarick
Blester	Gude	Rees
Bingham	Hamilton	Reid, N.Y.
Blanton	Hanley	Reuss
Blatnik	Hanna	Riegle
Boland	Hansen, Wash.	Robison, N.Y.
Brademas	Harrington	Rodino
Brasco	Harvey	Roe
Brinkley	Hastings	Rogers
Broomfield	Hathaway	Roncallo
Brown, Mich.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Burleson, Tex.	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Burlison, Mo.	Hicks, Mass.	Rostenkowski
Burton	Howard	Roush
Cabell	Hungate	Roussetot
Carey, N.Y.	Hutchinson	Roy
Carney	Jacobs	Royal
Carter	Johnson, Calif.	Runnels
Celler	Jones, N.C.	Ruppe
Chisholm	Jones, Tenn.	Ryan
Clay	Karh	St Germain
Collins, Ill.	Kastenmeier	Sarbanes
Collins, Tex.	Kazen	Scheuer
Conte	Kluczynski	Schwartz
Conyers	Koch	Schwengel
Corman	Kyros	Seiberling
Cotter	Landrum	Shipley
Coughlin	Leggett	Sisk
Culver	Link	Slack
Daniels, N.J.	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Danielson	McCloskey	Snyder
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Stanton,
Dellenback	McDonald,	James V.
Dellums	Mich.	Steele
Denholm	McKinney	Steiger, Wis.
Dent	Macdonald,	Stubblefield
Dingell	Mass.	Sullivan
Donohue	Madden	Symington
Dow	Mann	Taylor
Dowdy	Matsunaga	Tiernan
Downing	Mazzoli	Udall
Drinan	Meeds	Ullman
Dulski	Melcher	Van Deerlin
Dwyer	Metcalf	Vander Jagt
Edmondson	Mikva	Vank
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Ohio	Vigorito
Eilberg	Minish	Waldie
Erlenborn	Mink	Whalen
Esch	Mitchell	White
Evans, Colo.	Monagan	Whitten
Fascell	Moorhead	Widnall
Findley	Morse	Wilson,
Fisher	Mosher	Charles H.
Flowers	Moss	Wolff
Foley	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
Ford,	Natcher	Yatron
William D.	Nedzi	Zwach
Forsythe	Nelsen	

**ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2**

Ashbrook

**NOT VOTING—19**

Barrett	Evins, Tenn.	Mathis, Ga.
Broyhill, N.C.	Flynt	Patman
Derwinski	Hagan	Stephens
Diggs	Halpern	Stokes
Dorn	Hawkins	Thompson, N.J.
Eckhardt	Ichord	
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Eckhardt against.  
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Diggs against.  
Mr. Hagan for, with Mr. Barrett against.  
Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.  
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Mathis of Georgia.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT). Had he been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON). Had he been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HEBERT, PRICE of Illinois, FISHER, BENNETT, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, STRATTON, ARENDS, O'KONSKI, BRAY, BOB WILSON, and GUBSER.

**TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA TO THE CENTRAL DAKOTA NURSING HOME**

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 414) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the Central Dakota Nursing Home.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the reason for this action?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes. S. 414 is a bill identical to H.R. 1763, which was No. 97 on the Private Calendar and passed this afternoon.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object. I simply want to welcome to membership in the small club that has been trying for years to stop consideration in the House of nongermane Senate amendments among those to whom this amendment is extended are certain leaders of the House who became so interested this afternoon. I want to extend

them now a cordial invitation to join the club.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 414

An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the Central Dakota Nursing Home

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this Act, by quitclaim deed, to the Central Dakota Nursing Home, Jamestown, North Dakota, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands near Jamestown, North Dakota, together with all buildings and other improvements thereon:

A tract of land situated in the southwest quarter northeast quarter and the southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 24, township 140 north, range 64 west, 5th principal meridian more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the center of section 24, township 140 north, range 64 west, 5th principal meridian;

thence south 89 degrees 50 minutes east 771.5 feet;

thence north 00 degrees 21 minutes west 800.0 feet;

thence north 89 degrees 50 minutes west 1,065.8 feet;

thence south 23 degrees 52 minutes 30 seconds west 456.7 feet;

thence south 00 degrees 40 minutes 30 seconds east 385.8 feet;

thence north 89 degrees 44 minutes east 479.7 feet to the point of beginning and containing 22.1 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to the conditions that:

(1) The Central Dakota Nursing Home pay to the United States as consideration for the land authorized to be conveyed the amount of \$5,500;

(2) All minerals, including oil and gas, in such lands authorized to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United States;

(3) The lands, including buildings and other improvements thereon, authorized to be conveyed shall be used by the Central Dakota Nursing Home solely for health care facilities, and in the event that such lands, including such buildings and improvements, cease to be used for that purpose, title thereto shall immediately revert, without payment of consideration, to the United States;

(4) The Central Dakota Nursing Home (including its assignees and successors) agrees to waive any and all claims, arising on or before the date of any conveyance pursuant to this Act, which such home might have against the United States as a result of blown silt or other causes resulting from or in connection with the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Jamestown Dam and Reservoir; and

(5) All expenses for surveys and the preparation and execution of legal documents necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be paid by the Central Dakota Nursing Home.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1763) was laid upon the table.



**TO PROVIDE FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA**

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 74) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this is a situation similar to the previous one; is that correct?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct. Earlier this afternoon the House passed H.R. 8653, which was No. 99 on the Private Calendar. S. 74 is identical to that bill.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 74

An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota, that tract of land situated on the campus of the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks, North Dakota, which is a portion of a tract of land which was heretofore deeded to the United States by the University Memorial Corporation. The tract being hereby conveyed is more particularly described as follows:

That part of the south half of the southwest quarter of section 4 township 151 range 50 bounded as follows: Commencing at a point on the north boundary line of the Great Northern Railway right-of-way which is 913 feet east of the west line of said southwest quarter, thence east along said north boundary line a distance of 150 feet; thence north and parallel to the west line of said southwest quarter a distance of 376.10 feet; thence east a distance of 107 feet; thence north and parallel to the west line of said southwest quarter a distance of 350 feet; thence west a distance of 257 feet to a point 913 feet east of the west line of said southwest quarter and 726.10 feet north of the point of beginning; thence south to the true point of beginning.

The north boundary of the above described tract lies along a line which commences at the northeast corner of lot 20 in block 2 of the University Park Addition, Grand Forks City, according to the plat on file in the Office of the Register of Deeds, Grand Forks County, North Dakota, and recorded in book 87 of deeds, page 12, and which continues west along the south line of the alley in said block 2, extending to a point described above as the northwest corner of the tract.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time,

and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 8653) was laid upon the table.

**PROVIDING FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF LAND CLAIMS OF ALASKA NATIVES**

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 645 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 645

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10367) to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives, and for other purposes, and all points of order against sections 7 and 16 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 645 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10367, settlement of land claims of Alaska Natives. The resolution also provides that all points of order are waived against sections 7 and 16 for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XXI because of a transfer of funds.

The purpose of H.R. 10367 is to provide an equitable settlement of claims made by Alaska Natives.

The claims would be settled through a combination grant of land and money. They would receive 40 million acres of land, \$425 million from the U.S. Treasury over a period of 10 years, and \$500 million from mineral revenues that would otherwise go to the State. The \$500 million would be paid as the revenues are received on a schedule and under conditions set out in the bill.

The State will be divided into 12 regions and a Native regional corporation will be organized in each region under State laws. Each native in the region will receive 100 shares of stock. The assets of the 12 corporations will be the \$925 million cash settlement—\$500 million of which will come from the State—the mineral estate, fee title to approximately 22 million acres of land patented

to the corporation, and income from the investment of the cash and management of the property.

The legislation contains a number of provisions regarding a time limitation for court contests, surveys of land, rules and regulations, a separability clause, timber sale contracts, and so forth.

Appropriations are authorized as necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas has explained the rule, and in the interest of saving time, I will not repeat any of the statements he has made. I agree with the statements he did make in connection with the bill and the explanation of the rule.

May I add further than upon the bill, as I understand it, the Natives in the State of Alaska will be divided into 12 regions, each incorporated. These 12 Native corporations will each receive lands and cash payments. Of the 40 million acres granted to the Natives by the settlement, 18 million will be lands around the Native villages. The remaining 22 million acres will be selected by the Natives after the State of Alaska has selected its lands from among those held by the Government, as provided by the Statehood Act of 1958, and the Government has reserved those lands it wishes to retain.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) has filed a dissenting view. He supports a fair settlement of Alaskan Native claims, but does not believe that sufficient proof has been presented to justify the settlement embodied in this bill. He opposes the bill because it does not contain provisions for long-term land use planning. He believes such a policy is necessary to insure wise use of Alaskan resources, and to insure that the Natives are not cheated out of their land by unscrupulous land dealers.

Mr. Speaker, I understand other Members have several amendments to offer. Whether or not they are germane will be for the chair to determine when we go into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Texas, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the question of settling the Alaska Native land claims is not new. This issue has been with us since Alaska was ceded by treaty to the United States in 1867, for \$7.2 million in gold. On an acreage basis, the people of the United States paid approximately 2 cents per acre for 375 million acres of land and inland waters.

This bill, H.R. 10367, proposes that the people of the United States give 40 million acres of land and \$925 million to approximately 55,000 Alaska Natives in settlement of their claims based upon abo-

original use and occupancy by their ancestors.

Up until this time, the Alaska Natives have been pressing their claims for many years with very little success. The record is replete with arguments for settlement of the Alaska Native land claims throughout territorial days and the battle for Alaska statehood. But, settlement of these claims did not achieve such a high priority status until there was confirmation of large oil reserves on the Alaska North Slope. The resultant lobbying by oil interests and other considerations has generated pressure legislation practically mandating its passage and enactment.

In the past, and up until approximately 90 days ago, I found myself in complete agreement with the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, that a legislative settlement proposing a combination grant of 40 million acres of land and \$1 billion was entirely outside the realm of possibility.

Now that may sound strange coming from a cosponsor of the administration's proposal, but I can state here, as I have repeatedly in the consideration of this legislation, that I cosponsored the administration proposal only for the purpose of having that position before the committee and intended to compromise at a much lower figure on both the land and money. Such a position, as I understood it, was consistent with the position of the committee leadership and the general consensus of the committee as we discussed the matter. Thereafter, without consultation or a token approach of cooperation, I was advised that an agreement had been made to report a bill granting 40 million acres of land and \$925 million.

If we want to be realistic, H.R. 10367, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is not a commonsense approach to a solution of the Alaska Native land claims issue. It must be kept in mind that at a maximum, of the 375 million acres of land and waters in Alaska, only one-third, or approximately 125 million acres can be used for extended human habitation. This is because only the lands below the 1,000-foot elevation in Alaska are customarily used and hospitable to the establishment of city and village life, farming, and other normal human uses. It goes without saying that given a choice, the Natives, the regional corporation and the State will be wanting to select the best lands available and they will not choose the mountaintops or lands above the 1,000-foot elevation. This being so, and without attempting to protect the Federal interest or values in these 125 million acres, simple mathematics illustrate the fact that there is only 22 million acres practically available for settlement, if the State is given the right to select its grant of 103 million acres under the Alaska Statehood Act. The committee, in its wisdom, evidently did not bother to consider the amount of lands practically available for settlements of the Alaska Native land claims, nor the impact of its

action upon the existing federally withdrawn lands.

H.R. 10367, also proposes a cash settlement grant of \$925 million to an estimated 55,000 Alaska Natives. This amounts to a grant of approximately \$16,818.18 per Native. The committee report in support of this legislation on page 5 states that—

These acreage and dollar figures represent a carefully considered judgment on the part of the committee of what would be fair. . . .

And on the same page of the committee report the committee states—

The \$925,000,000 figure is an arbitrary one. It is not intended to be related to the value of the lands claimed by the Natives under the doctrine of aboriginal title.

This evidently is an example of how the committee arrived at the legislative compromise embodied in this bill.

Yet, the committee rejected an amendment which indicates that the total money grant in settlement of these claims should be not more than \$500 million. This amendment is based upon the average amount the Indian Claims Commission has paid per acre on all Indian land claims which averages 78 cents per acre. If offsets are taken into consideration, the average drops to 73 cents per acre. If calculated on the basis of claims already settled in Alaska, the average amount paid per acre is 42 cents. For the sake of providing some basis for such a monetary grant, the committee should have accepted the average of 73 cents on claims paid by the Indian Claims Commission, offset the 40 million acre grant and by simple multiplication, arrive at a money grant of \$244,550,000, and in the interests of equity and justice rounded off that figure to \$500 million. It becomes quite clear that H.R. 10367, as reported, has no basis in fact for the expenditure of \$925,000,000 in public funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to a practical, fair, and equitable settlement of the Alaska Native land claims. I think they are entitled to a just settlement of their claims and a settlement which is fair to the Natives, fair to the State of Alaska, and one which is fair to all Americans and protects the national interests in the significant and valuable resources of this sister State.

But, H.R. 10367 does not protect this national interest and this is why I have cosponsored H.R. 11254, which contains the Saylor-Udall national interest amendment. The Saylor-Udall amendment protects the national interest in the lands and resources of Alaska by: First, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw a limited amount of land of national significance—but not to exceed 50 million acres—and to designate these as "national interest study areas"; second, designating five additional areas of national significance which are already withdrawn and need further study in protection of the national interest; third, directing the Secretary of the Interior to review within 5 years each of the withdrawn national interest study areas, and forward specific recommendations on each to the Congress for future status

designation as national parks, wildlife, refuges, wilderness, wild or scenic rivers, and so forth—or—returning all or part of these withdrawn areas to the status of unreserved public lands.

The Saylor-Udall amendment will not interfere with the Native selections under the bill. Even in the national interest study areas the selection process goes forward except that actual patent and title is not conveyed until Congress acts on the designation of these areas.

The Saylor-Udall amendment protects the national interest in a fourth way by providing for the establishment of a Temporary Joint Federal-State Natural Resources and Land-Use Planning Commission for Alaska. This 14-member Commission will recommend which Federal lands should be disposed of and which should be retained, it will review and advise in the land selection process under the bill, and prepare land-use plans for the lands selected. The Temporary Planning Commission will perform a task which must be done immediately and until proper statewide land-use planning and local zoning is established.

I earnestly ask my colleagues to support the Saylor-Udall amendment to this bill, H.R. 10367, as fairness and justice require you to consider and protect the overriding national interest. If this legislation cannot be amended to provide a practical solution to settlement of the Alaska Native land claims and/or protect the national interest, I shall be constrained to vote against the bill on final passage and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the rule it may be noted that when this bill was finally voted out of the committee there were 36 members of the committee present and the final vote was a voice vote. I did not hear one voice raised against the bill. There may have been, and in fairness I must say that, but it should suffice to say that the majority of the committee, by a wide margin voted that this bill, as written, should come to the floor of the House and should become law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10367) to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives, and for other purposes.

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 con-



sideration of the bill H.R. 10367, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) will be recognized for 1 hour.

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested that this is one of the most important bills to come out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 92d Congress he was correct. This bill settles land claims for the natives of Alaska.

When the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested that he had been working on this for a long time, he is again correct, because he and I have been working on this matter for at least 23 years and others were working on it before he and I came to the Congress.

However, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggests that there has been an agreement signed in blood about amendments, the gentleman is incorrect, because out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs there is never reported to the House of Representatives a bill which perhaps could not be perfected.

The House of Representatives, especially when sitting as a Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, has the right to work its will on legislation. We do not think there is any amendment that can perfect this bill, but if amendments are shown which are germane and which are in accordance with the purposes of this bill, then most certainly the members who are handling this legislation are going to be thoughtful of the wishes expressed in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman for yielding, because I think it is timely and noteworthy to point out to the members of the committee that 14 of 17 members of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs have joined as coauthors of this bill. And, although they joined as coauthors of the bill, after the bill had been reported by the subcommittee, they did accept in the full committee amendments to the bill. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) himself joined in voting for one of those amendments.

So, the bill certainly had perfecting action in the full committee after 14 members had joined in its introduction.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank my friend from Oklahoma for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a

somewhat detailed statement as to what is involved in this legislation. Because of that, I will refer to my manuscript and I shall do so just as quickly as I can.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10367 is one of the most important bills the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will handle in the 92d Congress. The bill settles the land claims of the Natives in Alaska.

When the United States acquired the Territory of Alaska from Russia in 1867, Congress reserved for future legislation the terms and conditions under which the Natives could acquire title to the land which they used and occupied. Congress has never passed that legislation.

The lack of legislation was not a problem at first, because the remoteness of the area, the harsh climate, and the small population resulted in no population pressure on the physical resources. There was enough room for everyone.

Nevertheless, bills to settle the Native land claims were introduced in Congress intermittently over the past 25 years or so, but not one of them was enacted.

The Natives originally comprised about 99 percent of the population. Today they are about 20 percent of the population. The growth of the non-Native population and the economic development of the State now make it urgent to settle the Native land claims. Uncertainty over the extent to which the claims will be recognized is threatening the economy of the State, and is interfering with the improvement of Native living conditions, which are the worst in the United States.

Aboriginal title is based on use and occupancy by aboriginal peoples. It is not a compensable title protected by the due process clause of the Constitution, but is a title held subject to the will of the sovereign. The sovereign has the authority to convert the aboriginal title into a full fee title, in whole or in part, or to extinguish the aboriginal title either with or without monetary or other consideration.

Historically, it has been the consistent policy of the U.S. Government in its dealings with Indian tribes to grant to them title to a portion of the lands which they occupied, to extinguish the aboriginal title to the remainder of the lands by placing such lands in the public domain, and to pay their fair value of the titles extinguished. This procedure was initiated by treaties in the earlier part of our history, and was completed by the enactment of the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946. That act permitted the Indian tribes to recover from the United States the fair value of the aboriginal titles to lands taken by the United States—by cession or otherwise—if the full value had not previously been paid.

The Indian Claims Commission has not been available to most of the Natives in Alaska, because the great bulk of the aboriginal titles claimed by the Natives has not been taken or extinguished by the United States. The United States has simply not acted. Lack of access to the Indian Claims Commission is a fact,

notwithstanding the contrary assertion in the dissenting view attached to the committee's report.

The extent to which the Natives in Alaska could prove their claims of aboriginal title is not known. Native leaders have asserted that the Natives have in the past used and occupied most of Alaska. Use and occupancy patterns have changed over the years, however, and lands used and occupied in the past may not be used and occupied now. Moreover, with development of the State, many Natives no longer get their subsistence from the land.

The pending bill does not purport to determine the number of acres to which the Natives might be able to prove an aboriginal title. If the tests developed in the courts with respect to Indian tribes were applied in Alaska, the probability is that the acreage would be large—but how large no one knows. A settlement on this basis, by means of litigation if a judicial forum were to be provided, would take many years, would involve great administrative expense, and would involve a Federal liability of an undeterminable amount.

It is a consensus of the executive branch, the Natives, the State, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House that a legislative rather than a judicial settlement is the only practical course to follow. The enactment of H.R. 10367 would provide this legislative settlement.

The committee found no principle in law or history, or in simple fairness, which provides clear guidance as to where the line should be drawn for the purpose of confirming or denying title to public lands in Alaska to the Alaskan Natives. The lands are public lands of the United States. The Natives have a claim to some of the lands. They ask that their claim be settled by conveying to them title to some of the lands, and by paying them for the extinguishment of their claim to the balance.

As a matter of equity, there are two additional factors that must be considered. When the State of Alaska was admitted into the Union in 1958, the new State was authorized to select and obtain title to more than 104,000,000 acres of the public lands. These lands were regarded as essential to the economic viability of the State. The conflicting interests of the Natives and the State in the selection of these lands need to be reconciled. The discovery of oil on the North Slope intensified this conflict.

A second factor is the interest of all of the people of the Nation in the wise use of the public lands. This involves a judgment about how much of the public lands in Alaska should be transferred to private ownership, and how much should be retained in the public domain.

The settlement in the pending bill provides for a conveyance to the Natives of 40,000,000 acres of land, for the payment of \$425,000,000 from the U.S. Treasury in installments over a period of 10 years, and for the payment of \$50,000,000 for mineral revenues that otherwise would go to the State of Alaska.

These acreage and dollar figures represent a carefully considered judgment on the part of the committee of what would be fair to the Natives, fair to the State of Alaska, and fair to all of the people of the United States, in the light of present day conditions. When determining the amount of land to be granted to the Natives, the committee took into consideration the land needed for ordinary village sites and village expansion, the land needed for a subsistence hunting and fishing economy by many of the Natives, and the land needed by the Natives as a form of capital for economic development.

The 40,000,000 acres is a generous grant by the United States when judged by almost any standard. The number of Natives is estimated to be about 55,000, but less than 40,000 of them live in Native villages. The rest of them live in cities in Alaska or live outside the State of Alaska. The acreage occupied by villages and needed for normal village expansion is less than 1,000,000 acres. While some of the remaining 39,000,000 acres may be selected by the Natives because of its subsistence use, most of it will be selected for its economic potential. The land selected is not required to be related to prior use and occupancy, which is the basis for a claim of aboriginal title. Moreover, there will be little incentive for the Natives to select lands for subsistence use because during the foreseeable future the Natives will be able to continue their present subsistence uses regardless of whether the lands are in Federal or State ownership.

In 1967, and again in 1968, the Department of the Interior recommended that the Natives be granted not to exceed 50,000 acres around each village, which would total less than 10 million acres. In 1969, the Department of the Interior recommended that the Natives be granted between 14 and 16 million acres of land, excluding leasable minerals which would be retained by the United States. In 1971, the Department of the Interior recommended a grant of 40 million acres, including all minerals.

The 40,000,000-acre grant to the Natives that is provided in the pending bill should be considered in the context of the total area in the State. Alaska contains 375,296,000 acres of land and inland water areas. Of that total, the State is entitled to select 104,569,251 acres, and the pending bill would allow the Natives to select 40,000,000 acres. An additional 5,065,712 acres have already been patented to individuals and corporations. This will leave a total of 225,661,037 acres in Federal ownership, including about 73,000,000 acres that are withdrawn for specific Federal programs, such as national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, defense needs, and so forth.

Not only will the United States retain 225 million acres; it has already exercised a first choice for 73,000,000 acres, and under the pending bill the United States can withdraw any additional lands it needs in advance of either State or Native selections. I think the Federal interest is therefore adequately protected.

As the original inhabitants of the territory, the Natives should be allowed to retain enough land to permit them to share in the economic development of the State. The retention of 40 million acres out of 375 million acres is not unreasonable.

The argument has been made that only 125 million acres lie below the 1,000 foot elevation line, that these are the only lands suitable for human habitation, and that this is not enough land to give the State and the Natives the acreage contemplated. A short answer to this argument is that both the State and the Natives can be expected to select lands above the 1,000 foot elevation; those lands have an economic potential.

The \$925,000,000 figure in the bill is an arbitrary one. It is not intended to be related to the value of the lands claimed by the Natives under the doctrine of aboriginal title. The Natives are not a single organized group. They belong to many different clans and villages. The lands claimed by the Natives are claimed in separate parcels by these many different groups. The validity of the Native claims has not been determined, and it is not practical to determine them. The committee recognizes, however, that the Natives do have valid claims to some lands, undetermined in quantity and in value.

The dollar figure recommended by the Department of the Interior in recent years has ranged from about \$7.2 million—the estimated value of all Alaska on the date it was acquired from Russia, to \$180 million—but not to exceed \$3,000 per capita, to \$500 million—based on an estimated \$10,000 per capita, to \$1 billion to be paid jointly by the Federal and State governments.

The figure chosen by the committee, \$925,000,000, over half of which will come from the State, is based on the following considerations: the extreme poverty and underprivileged status of the Natives generally, and the need for adequate resources to permit the Natives to help themselves economically. The Natives constitute about one-fifth of the total population of the State, but they are almost completely lacking in the capital needed to compete with the non-Native population and to raise their standard of living through their own efforts. The money grant in this bill is intended to provide that capital.

I want to emphasize the fact that the State will contribute \$500 million of the \$925 million. The Governor of Alaska has indicated that the State is willing to do this. The State contribution comes about in the following way. In all future patents to the State under the Statehood Act, a 2-percent mineral royalty will be reserved for the Natives. If this reservation were not made, all of the mineral revenues would go to the State. Furthermore, the State now gets 90 percent of all mineral revenues that are received by the United States from Federal lands in Alaska, and under the pending bill 2 percent will first go to the Natives. The net result is that the \$500 million paid to the Natives will come almost entirely from

revenues that are diverted from the State.

The pending bill is the product of many different views and compromises. It has the endorsement of the leaders of the Alaska Federation of Natives, the Governor of Alaska, and the Department of the Interior. The bill was ordered to be reported by the committee by a voice vote, with only one dissent. The President has urged the enactment of a Native Claims Settlement bill.

I want to read for the information of the Members excerpts from a memorandum, dated September 27, 1971, from the Governor of Alaska which states forcefully the Governor's endorsement of the proposed legislation:

The settlement proposed by the subcommittee enjoys wide acceptance among Alaskans, and we urge the Congress to adopt it in its present form.

We feel that the bill strikes a fair balance between the nation's debt to the Native people of Alaska and its obligations to the citizens of Alaska implicit in the passage of the Alaska Statehood Act and the solemn entry of Alaska into the Union. It gives recognition to the claims of Alaska's Native people, and at the same time allows the State effective jurisdiction and access to resources to carry out equitably and effectively its responsibility to provide needed services to all its citizens. It seeks to avoid the creation of circumstances that may cause the State to develop into a segregated society with divergent interests.

We recognize that the legislative process involves compromise, and, overall, this bill represents a highly satisfactory solution to competing policy interests.

The bill which you have passed from the Committee meets the criteria of fairness and justice to all the people of Alaska, as well as to the Native people, whose heart and soul are engaged in these claims. We thank you for your action.

Next, I want to put the issue of land use planning in its proper perspective. One of the amendments adopted by the committee withdraws all unreserved public lands in Alaska that have not been classified by the Secretary of the Interior. The withdrawal is from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws. The Secretary may terminate the withdrawal at any time with respect to a particular tract of land when he determines that it should be open to disposition and use under the public land laws.

This provision will not affect Native selections under the bill, or State selections under the Alaska Statehood Act, or the right of the Secretary of the Interior to administer the lands and to grant easements, and so forth, under the general law.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit Native selections and State selections to proceed, but to stop all other dispositions of the public lands, unless the Secretary determines otherwise in specific cases. This is not a land-use planning provision, but it anticipates that land-use planning will be authorized. Legislation providing for such land-use planning is now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and some hearings have been held.



When the bill was before the full committee, the committee was urged to expand this amendment so that it would freeze all public land transactions in Alaska, other than Native land selections, until after the State land-use plan has been prepared and approved by Congress. The purpose and effect of such action would be to stop further State selections and to stop the grant of a right-of-way for the proposed trans-Alaska oil pipeline. The committee disapproved this proposal for the following compelling reasons:

First, the proposal is not germane to a bill whose only purpose is to settle Native land claims. The proposed freeze would not apply to Native land selections and would not be relevant to any provision of the bill. Assuming the need for land-use planning, if Native selections are to proceed in advance of the plan, as seems to be agreed, there is no justification for tacking the planning provision on to the Native bill. In other words, settlement of the Native claims should not be made contingent upon a freeze of State selections and pipeline easements, which are completely unrelated subjects.

Second, the proposal was offered for the first time in full committee, it was not considered in the subcommittee, and it was not the subject of any hearings. A subject of such importance should not be rushed through Congress in such manner.

Third, bills to provide for comprehensive land-use planning, and to delay the grant of a pipeline right-of-way, are pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee action on the bills has not been completed. Those bills should be considered on their merits and in an orderly manner.

I am, of course, aware of an intense letter-writing campaign designed to stop all public land transactions in Alaska, including Native land selections, until a land-use plan has been approved. The proposal to stop Native land selections was so lacking in merit that it was not even presented in committee, and the other public land transactions are extraneous to the purposes of this bill.

In conclusion, I want to summarize the following points:

First. With respect to land-use planning, the bill does not terminate abruptly, as has been alleged, the existing land freeze. On the contrary, it replaces an administrative land freeze with a statutory one.

Second. Also with respect to land-use planning, at no time while the bill was in either subcommittee or full committee did anyone propose that the conveyance to the Natives contain a restriction requiring the land to be used by the Natives in accordance with a land-use plan that has not yet been prepared. Quite the contrary. The only planning amendment offered, and it was offered after the bill reached the full committee, would not have applied to Native selections. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) was mistaken when he said in his dissenting view that the committee

rejected an amendment that would have subjected the Native land to the planning requirement. No such amendment was offered.

Third. Also with respect to land-use planning, any attempt to subject State selections to Federal planning restrictions, which is another way of saying Federal zoning, would amount to a substantial modification of the Statehood Act, which the State vociferously opposes, and would raise many problems.

Fourth. A grant of land to the Natives should not be delayed until a land-use plan has been prepared. The need for a settlement of Native claims is urgent. Planning legislation should be considered separately and on its own merits. Bills for that purpose are pending.

Fifth. Forty million acres are a reasonable grant to the Natives when considered in the light of a total area of 375 million acres, and the need of the Natives for land as a capital asset for future economic development.

Sixth. \$935 million, over half from the State, is a reasonable payment for the extinguishment of Native claims of aboriginal title to most of the State. Bonus payments for one group of oil sales on the North Slope have already brought in \$900 million, with production royalties yet to come.

Seventh. This is a fair bill, fair to all parties concerned, and I urge its enactment.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the committee has just been referring to the fact that certain lands will be excluded from this turnover including certain lands related to the national defense.

I want on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services to ask a particular question of the gentleman with regard to the effect of this legislation on petroleum reserve No. 4 in Alaska.

There are at least three Native villages located on that reserve.

As the gentleman knows, on page 34, subsection 11(h) of this bill, there is a requirement that village approval would be needed to explore, develop, and remove subsurface minerals from within the boundaries of these villages.

My question is whether that provision means that such villages would have to approve the exploration, development or removal of these subsurface minerals within their boundaries insofar as those boundaries are located within naval petroleum reserve No. 4?

In other words, does this village approval proviso of subsection 11(h) apply to the Government's subsurface estate in petroleum reserve No. 4?

Mr. ASPINALL. My answer is "No."

Let me explain. Subsection 11(h) was not intended to apply to the subsurface estate in petroleum 4 lands, and I believe that it does not. The subsection provides that when the surface estate in land selected by a village is conveyed to the village, the subsurface estate in that land

shall be conveyed to the regional corporation, except in the case of petroleum 4 land where the subsurface estate is reserved to the United States. Only the subsurface estate conveyed to the regional corporation is subject to the proviso requiring village consent to the removal of minerals. The proviso does not apply to the subsurface estate in petroleum 4 land that is reserved to the United States.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement with regard to this matter and am glad to have it included in the RECORD and in the legislative history of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 10367 as reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Natives of Alaska have just and legal land claims of long standing. These claims can only be met by favorable action on the legislation before this body today.

While I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs which had original jurisdiction over this measure, I have a great deal of interest in the entire Native claims question and I have followed developments closely.

By any means of measurement, the members of the subcommittee must be complimented for their efforts to present to the House the kind of compromise that provides for the interests and protection of the Natives of Alaska.

As is true of any legislative proposal before the Congress, a wide range of competing and diverse viewpoints have been presented on this issue. These viewpoints must be brought together in one bill that can encompass the needs of all concerned.

Nearly everyone who has been closely involved in the development of this legislation agrees that H.R. 10367 embodies the best attainable legislative language.

Equally important with the need to write a broadly acceptable bill is the need to move promptly toward enactment of the proposal. The Natives of Alaska have been living in great uncertainty while awaiting the resolution of this issue.

There is no judicial recourse for these Natives and the outcome of their land claims rest solely with a determination by the Congress as to the extent of the land grant and the monetary payment.

The quest for economic strength by Alaskans has been somewhat in limbo pending the outcome of this congressional action. The Congress has an obligation to assist in insuring the social and economic development of Alaska and enactment of this bill will meet that goal.

Representatives of fish and wildlife organizations and conservation organizations contacted me prior to consideration by the full Interior Committee of the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. These groups

were concerned about the bill's treatment of the wildlife refuges in Alaska.

The objections to the deletion of the wildlife refuges were noted during the full committee's deliberations on the bill and an amendment was adopted that will permit the Secretary of the Interior to replace lands selected from wildlife refuges and which will retain for the United States the mineral rights to any such lands that are selected.

Another question about the bill has arisen regarding land use planning in Alaska. I strongly support the concept of prior planning for our public lands as recommended by the Public Land Law Review Commission and I have introduced legislation to achieve this goal.

I cannot, however, support the proposed amendment to the Alaska Native claims bill for the following reasons:

First, it is neither appropriate nor fair to settle the natives claims on a strings attached basis. It is not appropriate for the Congress to assume that these Native Alaskans will immediately begin to desecrate a land which has given them their livelihood for tens of thousands of years and whose very existence is keyed to wise usage of its natural resources. It is not fair for the Congress to settle a claim, supposedly in full, with a partial payment—which would be the case of restrictions are added to the settlement after the proper amount has been determined.

Second, any land use planning amendment must have the cooperation and coordination of the State and native people if it is to be successful in preserving Alaska's ecological integrity. Comprehensive land use planning proposals are currently before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and I am the co-author of legislation directed toward the establishment of a national land use policy. Such a program must be enacted into law.

We are studying these measures very carefully to insure that an effective national land use planning program is created. No such indepth study has been given the proposed amendment which will be offered to the pending bill.

When a law is finally enacted, undoubtedly before the selection of Alaskan lands is completed, it will provide realistically for land use planning, in concert with the natives and the State of Alaska, that will permit continued economic growth and prosperity in their States while protecting the environment and the quality of native life. This law will apply equally to Alaska as to the other 49 States.

Third, in my visits to many sections of Alaska and my talks with many concerned natives, I am convinced that they are quite capable of making decisions on issues facing them—including issues relating to the protection and enhancement of the environment. They who live so close to the land, certainly recognize the importance of environmental and ecological factors.

To deprive the Alaskan Natives of a leading role in determining policies that affect them or to allow them less than a

full share of the responsibilities of self-government is to impose on the native Alaskans the same paternalistic care from the Federal Government that has deprived the American Indian of any opportunity for self-determination and created, in many instances, a dependence on others for his decisionmaking.

Just as this paternalism must be ended in regard to the Indians, we must not permit it to begin for the Alaska Natives.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have a good bill before us that will provide a fair and just settlement for the Alaska Natives. It is long overdue and I urge its approval by this body.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the district that I represent includes much of the Port of Seattle. In Seattle we view ourselves as the gateway to Alaska, and we always say that anything that is good for Alaska is good for Seattle. At the moment we are looking for the North Slope oil under proper safeguards to help Alaska and also to help us. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona if there is anything in this legislation which would retard the development of the North Slope oil and prevent it from being brought out, as I said, under proper safeguards to help the economy of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I will tell the gentleman from Washington that, quite to the contrary, this bill is designed to eliminate some of the problems now facing the implementation of the transport of that oil.

The bill as it is written does make a final determination as to the claims of the Alaskan Natives and there is nothing in the legislation as it is written that would impede the progress of the pipeline designed to remove the oil from the North Slope. There is an amendment which is going to be offered, authored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) that, in my view, presents a most serious threat to that pipeline, but I am sure we can deal with that at the proper time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I will stay and listen very carefully, because I want to do my best to represent the area that is in my legislative district. We are now in a desperate economic situation. More than 70 years ago the gold from Alaska was the cause of our original growth and development as a great city and a great port. Now I rather think many of us believe the Alaskan oil could do the same.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just said that in his opinion the amendment I will offer is a direct threat to the construction of the pipeline. As the

author of the proposed amendment, I will state it has nothing to do with the pipeline. It is not intended to halt the pipeline. It is my intention to leave the Secretary of the Interior with whatever power he has before the adoption of the amendment to authorize that pipeline, to do the same after my amendment as he would have before my amendment.

If the gentleman will take the time to show me where in my amendment it authorizes a delay of the pipeline or infringes upon that pipeline, I will be glad to have that information and to offer an amendment to nail it down beyond any doubt. I want this issue to be set aside, if I can possibly achieve that, in the discussion of my amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. At the proper time I shall be happy to demonstrate the cause of my concern.

Mr. Chairman, I can only tell the Members it is my opinion, having worked very closely with the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee on this matter for several years now, that the chairman of the full committee has stated exactly what is in the bill. He has stated it succinctly and well, and what I think he has done is minimize the role he and the chairman of the subcommittee have played. I suspect that is not really very essential to us now.

I will only tell the Members this bill was arrived at after some of the most painful negotiations I suspect have ever been experienced in this particular body. We were dealing with specific amounts of land, and we are dealing with specific amounts of money. We were dealing with some very sensitive moods and situations. We were very concerned about the future of the entire State of Alaska. We were all convinced that the Alaskan Natives were entitled to a settlement that would permit them to continue on with whatever progress they wish to make in whatever direction they wish to go.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are aware of my interest in this legislation have asked me almost unanimously why such a large settlement, why we ended up with a bill providing a settlement for the Alaskan Natives as large as this.

The reasons are very simple. The entire committee recognized that the Alaskan Natives were entitled to a settlement either via the courts or via legislation. The intensity of that belief and the amount of that settlement were, of course, matters for the individuals to determine, but everybody agreed that there was, indeed, a matter to be settled and that justice dictated that a settlement be made with the Alaskan Natives.

As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY), the chairman of the subcommittee, had stated, at the time of Alaska's entry into statehood, that what ought to be resolved prior to their entry into statehood was the matter of a settlement with the Alaskan Natives. The gentleman from Florida was not heeded at that time. Therein lies a clue to the size of the settlement.



A very interesting thing happened: A great deal of oil was discovered in Alaska.

It became apparent that the lands involved were more valuable than they were at the time a settlement was first considered. So there is nothing mysterious about it. The values are there. The need for a settlement is there. The justice that calls for a settlement is there.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. VIGORITO) has told me he is going to offer an amendment that would reduce the amount of the acreage. I will tell you I am sure he will do it with the best of intentions. I will also tell you it is my firm conviction he is in error and he is not aware of the great lengths to which the negotiators went in these specific negotiations.

The State of Alaska has been under a land freeze since January 17, 1969. The land freeze was based on the need to make a settlement with the Alaskan Natives. This bill will make that settlement.

Secretary Morton has continued the land freeze until December of this year or until there is a settlement made with the Alaskan Natives.

This does not only affect the pipeline; this affects the entire State of Alaska. Therein, I believe, is the next phase that should be most interesting to all of my colleagues.

Members will be informed by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) it is in the national interest to impose a land plan 5-year freeze on an additional 50 million acres—in the national interest. I submit it is my view if we further impede the progress of the State of Alaska by any device, however well meaning that device, we are going to place a burden on the remaining 208 million people of this country which will become a tremendous burden.

We are dealing with some 300,000 plus people in the State of Alaska, Native and nonnative, who have not been permitted to make the economic gains they are entitled to because of the arbitrary land freeze which was imposed January 17, 1969.

Does my colleague from Iowa wish to comment at this point?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado first mentioned the amount of Federal land already withdrawn from Alaska, and the gentleman from Arizona has repeated some of those statements.

I believe it would be of value to the Members of the House to know a couple of essential figures, when we talk about how much land should be withdrawn for public purposes.

We have a great national park system in the 50 States. We are all proud of that great national park system in the 50 States. One-third of all the national park acreage today is in the State of Alaska. That is already reserved. Today 20 million acres of Alaska are set aside in wildlife refuges.

I would not want any Member here to

think that we have been somehow negligent as to setting aside valuable areas of Alaska for public purposes such as parks, scenic areas, and for wildlife.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear, because I feel some of our colleagues are going to be concerned about the size of this settlement. There will be those of our colleagues who feel this is an excessive settlement. I want to state, very personally, I have been involved, I believe, in every negotiating session with all factions. There were many factions. We had the Natives themselves. We had the State authorities. We had people in business in Alaska. We had people from the neighboring States, the gateway States such as Washington. We had people on the committee with differing ideas. The Department had a specific idea. The White House had a specific idea.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

I will simply tell the Members if they can imagine the most arduous negotiations they have undergone in this matter in the past, if they will simply double the intensity of that difficulty they will arrive at something like what we went through to produce this particular bill.

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) and all of these people played an active role because of their very active interest.

We arrived at the figures through compromise and not through science, as you will be told later by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR). I will simply tell you that everybody was agreed we had to arrive at a settlement, and we did. We had to permit the State of Alaska to progress, and this will permit that. We have to remove Alaska as a burden to the taxpayers of the rest of the country because of fairness to the rest of the country.

Those who are concerned that somehow we will despoil the remaining undeveloped lands of Alaska have simply been led astray and were told a half truth or a deliberate lie. I will simply tell you that it is the view of this Member and of the overwhelming majority of the committee, regardless of partisan affiliations, that the bill does what it is intended to do; namely, it settles the Alaskan Native land claims for all time and permits them the maximum latitude for advancement.

It does one thing of great significance with regard to them. It does not place their lands in trust under the parental guidance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the smothering bureaucracy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which is an editorial, but it does permit them to function on their own and achieve that level of life which they wish to achieve.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. I am a complete outsider in this matter.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. That is true.

Mr. DENNIS. The gentleman will recognize this. But I can see that this is a very important bill. I will admit the size of the settlement gives me some concern but not so much the size as the fact that from a reading of everything I have been able to read, including your report, the recommended size has quadrupled itself from 1 year to the next, from about 10 million acres to 40 million acres. That may be correct, but I would like to know the rationale for that a little bit. I must confess from what I have read I have not found it yet.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I recognize the gentleman's penetrating mind is able to encompass in a matter of several minutes reading what it took the committee a matter of years to do.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I will not yield any further.

Mr. DENNIS. The gentleman made a rather personal remark.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refused to yield. The gentleman from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I will reiterate what I have now repeated three or four times in my dialog or monolog.

These figures were arrived at not through any scientific selection or yardstick of specific need or any yardstick of measurable value but, rather, through negotiations in which all interested parties, the Government, the administration, and the Bureau and the Indians of the State of Alaska, have all participated. With all of the interests represented, that was the result. This crucible produced these figures. These figures can be disputed by anybody, I will freely admit, but I also urge those of you who are so willing to dispute them to recognize that they have not been entered into lightly and they are the result of a great deal of intensive negotiation. I cannot say anything plainer than that.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. In further response to the gentleman from Indiana, these figures are not simply a matter that is plucked from the air. The request for land settlement, as a matter of fact, went far above this figure that was arrived at, but when one considers the number of acres of land which have been utilized for subsistence by the Natives, this figure approximates the acreage which they have indeed used. This is probably the closest logical basis that we can offer in answer to your question. However, there is more involved, too, because of the philosophy here.

I do not know of any member of the committee who wanted anything to do with setting up a reservation system in

the State of Alaska similar to that which we have in the lower 48 States. Our experience with reservations has just been so tragic and has resulted in such a futile paternalistic system that we wanted to avoid that completely.

Now, then, if we want to give these Natives of Alaska a subsistence based on their operation in their traditional manner, this figure is the figure we determined it should be.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is, as I have stated repeatedly, a very generous bill insofar as moneys and acreages are concerned. But, after all, in arriving at a settlement you have to take into consideration the matters involved—the land areas, for instance. No one knows how much of this land the Indians, the Eskimos and the Aleuts have used over hundreds and hundreds of years. As the gentleman who just left the well of the House said, I wanted to settle this matter prior to statehood. To me it was very, very plain as to what could happen. Here we were sitting on supposedly one of the greatest deposits of oil in the world. So, naturally, the people of Alaska—and you cannot blame them because they could see the prospects on the North Slope—felt they were entitled to more when for a few hundred thousand acres of land they received \$900 million, the price went up.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the product of many hours, days, and weeks of work by many people. The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs held extended hearings both in this Congress and in the last Congress. The subcommittee went to Alaska. We listened to the people, and we visited many of the villages in which the Natives live. We took extended testimony from the Natives, from the State officials, from the business community, and from the conservation organizations. I made a sincere and honest effort to hear every person who wanted to be heard, and I think I succeeded. No one who wanted to testify was refused.

As you would expect, the bill is a compromise. It had to be a compromise in order to protect fairly the interests of three different groups. First, there is the interest of the Natives. They were the original occupants of Alaska. They are still the only occupants of large areas of the State. Land is essential to their survival. More than that, however, land is their only capital asset. It is the only means by which they can participate in the economic development of the State. They must have enough land for that purpose, and they must have enough money, in return for the land claims they relinquish, to let them compete with the other citizens in the State.

Second, there is the interest of the State. Under the Alaska Statehood Act the State is entitled to select and get patents to about 104½ million acres of land. This is a large amount, and it was granted by Congress because the State needed the land as a capital asset to use in developing the State's economy. The

State needs the 104½ million acres for development of the public economy, and the Natives need the 40 million acres provided in this bill for the development of the Native's private economy. While the State and the Native interests are in many ways complementary, in other ways, they conflict. Each, of course, would like to select the most valuable land.

Third, there is the interest of the 200 million citizens living in the other 49 States. Their interest is in the wise use of the public land.

When these three different interests were evaluated by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, it became apparent that the State should participate in the settlement of the Native claims in a meaningful way. The State agreed, and H.R. 10367 reflects that agreement. The State will participate in the land part of the settlement by allowing the Natives to get some of the land near their villages which the State has already selected under the Statehood Act. In addition, the Natives will be allowed to select part of their land before the State makes any further selections under the Statehood Act.

The State will participate in the money part of the settlement by permitting mineral revenues that would otherwise go to the State to go to the Natives. Most of these revenues will come from lands patented to the State under the Statehood Act. A small amount will come from lands in Alaska that are retained by the United States. Under present law the State gets 90 percent of the mineral revenues from those Federal lands. Instead of getting its usual 12½-percent royalty, the State will get a 10½-percent royalty and the Natives will get a 2-percent royalty. Instead of keeping all of the bonus and rental revenues, the State will get 98 percent and the Natives will get 2 percent. This arrangement will continue until the Natives have received \$500 million, which should take about 15 years. After the Natives get their \$500 million the revenues will all go to the State.

This part of the bill is an important and significant recognition by the State of its responsibility to share in the Natives settlement.

The Federal Government will share in the settlement by giving the Natives 40 million acres of public land, and by paying them \$425 million over a 10-year period for the relinquishment of the Native claims to the rest of the land in the State.

The 40 million acres should be considered in the following light. There are about 375 million acres in Alaska. After this settlement is completed, the Natives will own 40 million acres, the State will own 104½ million acres, the United States will own 225 million acres, and others will own 5 million acres. Of the Federal lands, 73½ million acres are already reserved for parks, forests, wildlife refuges, defense, and other purposes. The United States had the first choice of these lands. The remainder of the Federal lands will be what is left after the State and the Natives select what they want.

The \$500 million which the State will

pay, and the \$425 million which the United States will pay should be regarded as money which is needed to improve the economy of the most poverty stricken people in the United States. This money will not be paid out per capita to each Native. On the contrary, it will be used for programs that improve health, education, and create jobs. There is an urgent need for this kind of financial assistance.

I believe this bill represents a sound and balanced approach to a complicated problem, and that the bill deals fairly with the Natives, the State, and the people of the United States.

My final comment relates to the subject of land-use planning. This bill does not deal with the subject, and it should not. Planning should be provided for in separate legislation, and planning proposals are now pending before Congress.

The biggest block of land that should be subject to planning is the 104½ million acres which the State will receive under the Statehood Act. Any proposal to convey those 104½ million acres to the State subject to use restrictions would amount to an amendment of the Statehood Act, and the proposal should be considered separately. It has no place in this bill to settle Native land claims.

The 40 million acres that will be patented to the Natives will become private land. If land-use restrictions are imposed on private landowners, the restrictions will apply to the Natives. The Natives should not be singled out in advance, however, for restrictions that do not apply to others.

In short, land-use planning legislation should be the subject of a separate bill. It has no place in this one.

I urge the enactment of H.R. 10367. The Native claims should have been settled prior to statehood. I said so in 1958, and I still believe it. The failure to settle the claims then, however, only makes the need for a settlement now more urgent.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has spoken about the various provisions concerning the land in Alaska, and the fact that the Natives are in serious economic straits. I do not know what the figure happens to be, positively, at this time, so I would say to the gentleman it is not correct as of today, as of this moment, that 96.328 percent of all the land in Alaska is owned by the Federal Government, and is not available for Indian development?

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman is so right.

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

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, there is a desire to know about these moneys which are to be appropriated, of course.

Let me reply to any inquiry that any one has. There are about 650,000 Indians in the United States. There are 55,000 Indians or Natives in Alaska.

Each year the General Treasury of the U.S. Government has been called to furnish about \$700 million to take care of



Indians, mostly in the lower 48 States. Shortly, that amount will undoubtedly be \$1 billion.

What do we propose in this bill? For one-twelfth of the total Indian—including Alaskan Natives—population we propose in this bill that the Natives of Alaska the first year they receive \$25 million and the next 9 years they get \$44,445,445 annually.

If anyone wants to understand what these figures mean so far as the relative burden of taking care of Indians under the reservation system, and what we propose in Alaska—one-twelfth of \$720 million (which we are appropriating annually for reservation Indians at the present time, would be \$60 million. Under no circumstances do we approach this amount to take care of Natives in Alaska. At the end of the 10-year period the annual payments to Alaska Natives, under the provisions of the legislative, will cease. Does the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. HALEY. I agree with the gentleman—yes.

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

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida for the statement he has made and the leadership that he has for many years given in this House for the cause of justice for American Indians and Alaskan Natives.

I think the gentlemen from Florida has probably been the uncrowned champion of that cause for many years and he is completely in keeping with his record, I believe, in bringing this bill to the floor today and asking the House of Representatives to approve it.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to correct an impression created by a United Press news release a couple of weeks ago on the subject of the Native claim bill.

This is a release of the UPI which appeared in an Oklahoma newspaper. It says:

Ed Edmondson, Democrat-Oklahoma, won House Interior Committee approval Wednesday of an amendment to permit Alaska's 55,000 natives to settle their historic land claims by picking lands in wildlife refuges.

The gentleman from Florida was there when that amendment was adopted. The gentleman from Florida knows that the bill which came out of the subcommittee authorized natives who had villages located within wildlife refuges to make initial land selections within those wildlife refuges. It did not authorize anybody else except those with villages within wildlife refuges to do that.

The gentleman from Florida also knows that the amendment which the gentleman from Oklahoma offered as a substitute for the amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania had offered provided that when a native group did exercise that right under the bill, the land would be replaced in the total wildlife refuge estate within Alaska by other

public lands within that State. So the effect of the amendment which is discussed in this article erroneously was to assure that the total estate dedicated to wildlife refuges would not be reduced in any way by Native selections. Is that not correct?

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct in that respect; yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to point out to the House his concern understandably about our wildlife refuges that the total acreage and wildlife refuges in the State of Alaska is 19,905,820, an acreage which is 3 million acres greater than the combined total area of the State of Maryland, the State of New Jersey, and the State of New Hampshire. So in terms of wildlife refuges, the State of Alaska has a pretty good estate already dedicated to that purpose. That does not mean we should not have more, but certainly this bill has done nothing to reduce that estate.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER or Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to write a little record so that some day in the future some of the people in Alaska who think they are getting a good or great deal by this proposition will be able to look at their children or their grandchildren and say, "At least, somebody down in Washington was thinking of us."

There are a lot of people in Alaska who have been led to believe, and a lot of Natives who have been led to believe that by this settlement they are going to get something. Very frankly, I think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) and the chairman of the full committee put their finger right on the pulse and reason for this settlement. The reason the Office of Management and Budget has approved this legislation and the figures that we now have in this bill is because the Federal Government is going to get rid of a tremendous burden which we have. That burden is every year maintaining the facilities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska. The amount of Federal money now being spent each year in Alaska on the BIA program is approximately \$40 million.

You heard the chairman of the full committee say that \$700 million is now being spent by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and we spend about 10 percent of it in Alaska. And, very shortly it might get up to \$1 billion. So the \$100 million which we might spend in Alaska every year on Bureau of Indian Affairs programs for the benefit of the Natives they just will not get.

Let me remind you who are wondering whether or not this is a movement of generosity on behalf of the American people, to look at what the Congress did to two tribes of Indians under a policy

of termination. We took the two finest tribes in America, as far as their economic development is concerned and as far as their financial resources were concerned, namely, the Menominee, and the Klamath, and we terminated our trustee relationship with regard to their status. I will include at this point remarks which I made and can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 13, together with the article by Mr. William Greider:

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will bring a bill to the floor which is ill-advised on numerous counts. House Resolution 10367, to provide for the settlement of land claims of Alaskan natives, though needed and long overdue, is not the vehicle to achieve justice and equity for the Alaskan natives.

At the proper time I will elaborate on my dissenting views from the committee's report on the legislation but this afternoon, I would like to bring to your attention a part of the bill that has been scrupulously understated by the drafters.

In spite of shining language that glows through the legal obscurities, H.R. 10367 gives life to the thoroughly discredited policy of Indian "termination." We have been through this battle many times in the past 20 years, but in the scramble for Alaska's natural resources, the rights and future of the Alaskan natives have been trod underfoot. The bill to redress legitimate native grievances is, in fact, a bill to terminate native cultural existence.

In the 1950's, the Federal Government, Congress concurring, decided to play at the game of social engineering. The result was passage of House Concurrent Resolution 108 of August 1953 which said in brief, the wardship status of Indian tribes will be ended as rapidly as possible. The rapid result of that policy has been the rapid deterioration of the Indian communities throughout the Nation.

A perfect example of how the "termination policy" works against the Indians it was supposed to help was recently brought to light by William Greider, writing in the Washington Post. In an article, "The Menominee: Victims of Experiment," he graphically portrays the death throes of the Menominee Tribe.

Due to poor legislative guidelines in House Concurrent Resolution 108, unfeeling bureaucrats and overzealous social engineers in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the illusory goal of "Indian corporate self-determination," the shock of community responsibility in terms of taxes and services, and the blandishments of rapacious land developers, the Menominee Tribe has been forced, literally, to the point of cultural extinction.

A copy of Mr. Greider's article is appended to my remarks as a lesson we would do well to consider in light of H.R. 10367.

There are over 55,000 reasons for rejecting the "solution" to the Alaskan native claim problem suggested in H.R. 10367. Were that bill to gain approval of this Congress, the Alaskan native population would face the same fate as the Menominee Indians. No matter what the price, no matter what the formula as to land-versus-cash, no matter what the economic imperatives, the Congress of the United States has no right and no business conducting cultural genocide. Perpetuation of the Indian termination policy as implicitly expressed in section 6 of H.R. 10367 is the road to cultural genocide.

Had the bill been considered with human and cultural priorities ahead of the oil priority, had the bill been considered with less haste, had the drafters acknowledged their own obligation to end the termination

policy, H.R. 10367 would never have seen the light of day in its present form.

Of course, if the Congress had acted on my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 95, the problem of "termination" with respect to the Alaskan natives need never have been considered by the Interior Committee. That resolution states in part:

"The termination policy declared in H. Con. Res. 108 has created among American Indians and Alaska Natives apprehension that the United States may not in the future honor its trustee obligation, and uncertainty as to the survival of Indian tribal communities, which apprehension and uncertainty has severely limited the ability or willingness of Indian tribes to develop fully the human and economic potential of their communities in accord with their cultural values . . ."

The purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 95 is to repeal, revoke, and repudiate a policy that has led to the decimation of our Indian communities. Because termination is embodied in H.R. 10367, we must oppose this new manifestation of that discredited policy. There are other reasons for opposing H.R. 10367 outlined in my "dissenting views" in House Report No. 92-523, but termination of the termination policy is one of the chief reasons for defeating or substantially amending H.R. 10367.

The article on the Menominee Indian Tribe follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1971]

**"TERMINATED" TRIBE FIGHTING DISASTER—  
THE MEMOINNEE: VICTIMS OF EXPERIMENT**  
(By William Greider)

Moon Weso of Keshena, Wis., told them it was wrong. He told them in English and he told them in Menominee, an ancient Algonquin tongue once common in the Great Lakes forests, confined now to one small county in Wisconsin.

"I was quoted in the Congressional Record," Weso, an old man now, said, mixing pride and bitterness with his memories. "I got a copy somewhere I can show you. I was one of the delegates and I objected."

Nick Dodge, who belongs to a younger generation of the same tribal blood, agrees it was a terrible mistake but he doubts that it can ever be undone.

"Based on our experience with Congress—damn—they just don't repeal what they do," Dodge said. "It takes practically the whole country rising up."

In their own small way, the Menominee are rising up. A band of them set out yesterday for a two-week march from their tribal homeland along the Wolf River to the Wisconsin state capital in Madison. They hope their demonstration will jog the government's memory and, perhaps, the nation's conscience.

A decade ago, the Menominee people were the "guinea pigs" in a social experiment loaded with good intentions. When the experiment failed, however, the government turned to other policies while the 3,200 Indians lived on with the results—disastrous results, most everyone now agrees.

The Menominee were "terminated" as a tribe, a grim but bloodless expression which means that the federal government, by act of Congress, ended the responsibilities for protection and aid which it assumed, by treaty with the tribe, a century before. The reservation became a county, the tribal council became a corporation, the tribal rolls were closed and the Bureau of Indian Affairs withdrew.

"We are much worse off now as the 72d county of Wisconsin than we ever were as a reservation," said Mrs. Georgiana Ignace, a young doctor's wife and a leader of the march. "We have more to lose now. We're losing our land, our assets, our people. We

hope the march will make known exactly what is happening in Menominee County."

Mrs. Ignace and an organization called DRUMS ("Determination of Rights and Unity of Menominee Stockholders") want to reverse "termination" and restore their federal status—their tribal land held again in trust by the government and protected from predatory interests; their tribal membership re-opened to Menominee children; federal health, welfare and education aid restored.

Other Menominee, especially men like Dodge who run the tribal corporation, agree that "termination" was ill-considered but they think "un-terminating" is an impossible goal and perhaps not a desirable one. They want federal aid restored without the old paternalism. "The last thing we need now," said Dodge, "is a bunch of federal officials running around telling us what to do."

The result is bitter tribal factionalism. DRUMS organizers like Mrs. Ignace, a college graduate who lives in Milwaukee while her husband completes his hospital residency, are denounced as "outside agitators." The Indians who run Menominee Enterprises Inc. (MEI), the tribal corporation, are portrayed as a "small clique" conspiring with powerful white interests to destroy the Menominee.

The recent evidence is that DRUMS has wide support among the people, despite the charge that most of its organizers are college-educated emigrants who no longer live there. In April they defeated, the MEI directors in a nasty proxy fight. Last month, the corporation held an advisory referendum to see if the Menominee want to sell the shoreline of their wild and beautiful Wolf River to the National Park Service. The proposal was rejected by 98.6 per cent of the vote.

The DRUMS leaders charge that, under pressure to stay afloat, the tribal corporation is converting the Menominee into a tourist playground for Milwaukee and Chicago. "Outvoted, out-numbered, our most valuable land gone, our survival as an Indian community will be doomed," the organization warns.

"It's like selling your furniture to pay the rent," complained Jim White, a DRUMS leader who works as a mental health consultant in Chicago. "We are selling our land to keep up with the taxes."

"The saying is," Mrs. Ignace said, "that the Wolf River is the heart of the Menominee and, when you take that away, the Menominee dies. They say they want to keep the Wolf River wild. That's a farce. In a few years, it will be just as polluted as other rivers."

Nick Dodge, who is manager of resource development for the tribal corporation agrees with her on the Wolf River park proposal. But he insists that the previous sale of 5,100 acres for a tourist development was a wise step toward solvency.

"Legend Lake," as it is called, already has added substantially to the tax base of the impoverished county where the cost of schools and local government has rested almost solely on the tribal corporation, Dodge said. So far, 1,700 lots have been sold mainly to non-Indians and MEI's proportion of the tax base has dropped from 83 per cent two years ago to 62 per cent in 1971.

Even so, Dodge doesn't argue strenuously with DRUMS' dire predictions. He too fears that future pressures could lead to more land sales and the eventual demise of the Menominee.

"That's been going on," he said dryly, "since the first Jesuit came and he'd give us religion, then he'd take our land. If I had the magic answer to that, I'd come up with it right now. All you can do is forestall and hope you avoid more losses. This is the story of Indian land through the whole industry."

When the Indian treaties of the 19th century established reservations, federal trust protection was intended to shield Indian

land from the pressures of the larger economy, speculators and developers and tax collectors. What's often forgotten is that most tribes, like the Menominee in the Wolf River Treaty of 1854, gave up huge areas of their territory in exchange for the promises of federal protection and aid. Many have criticized the quality of the federal stewardship over Indian lands, but most tribes have a deep fear of losing it—and falling prey to the same pressures facing the Menominee.

In its most benevolent expression, "termination," as a policy developed in the Eisenhower Administration, was intended to "free" Indians from government paternalism and the limited economic opportunities of reservation life so they could become assimilated with the mainstream. It was tried with a few reservations and abandoned. Paternalism was succeeded by economic chaos; Indians did not want to stop being Indians. To them, their land means their best hope for survival as a people.

When President Nixon took office, tribal leaders feared that Republicans would revive the old doctrine. Instead, he renounced "termination" and proposed new forms of government aid which would give Indians more control without severing the federal relationship. Ironically, as the Menominee seek to undo their terminated status, Congress this year is just getting around to enacting a resolution which would formally drop the old policy, the one they are still living with.

When termination was first proposed in 1954, the Menominee were among the most prosperous of the reservations, though still poor compared to most Wisconsin neighbors. They owned their own forest and sawmill, the reservation's principal employer. They even paid the federal government for many of its services.

Among other things, the transition meant converting the community-owned Menominee land to private title held by the corporation.

Many Indian families had to re-buy their own homesites. The government's hospital and school were closed (both rated substandard by the state).

The newly-established county government had to contract with neighboring counties for basic services such as jails and judges. Menominee children, no longer with legal status as Indians, went to school with children from an adjoining county and, according to DRUMS, the drop-out rate climbed. The county has no health facilities now.

Faced with property taxes for the first time, some low-income families lost their newly-purchased land through delinquency. Others on state welfare had to sign over to the state bonds issued them by the tribal corporation, thus losing their annual dividends from the forest products, a subsistence income for many. The mill and forest, the bedrock of the tribes' chances, ran into economic setbacks unforeseen by the federal planners.

During the 1960s millions of dollars in special federal aid were directed to the county by the War-On-Poverty and other programs, but even this belated assistance did not alter the tribes' basic social and economic problems.

Gary Orfield, a political science professor at Princeton who studied the "termination" experiment, notes that the transition to self-government and economic independence, ill-conceived as it was, stopped short of the real thing.

"Tribal members have received all the responsibilities of ownership but few of its advantages," he wrote, describing the layers of directors and trustees, including many non-Indians, which separated the Menominee from major decisions.

When the corporation began selling Menominee land three years ago, it stim-



ulated the beginning of the current protest. Since the several DRUMS members have won seats on the 11-member Voting Trust which controls the land sales, but they are still a long way from command. This April, even though they out-voted the corporate managers, 119,000 to 118,000 shares, DRUMS failed to abolish the trustee arrangement because the group did not get 51 per cent of the total outstanding shares.

White and Mrs. Ignace claim they would have won stockholder control of the corporation's affairs if it had not been for the First Wisconsin Trust Co. of Milwaukee which votes a block of 48,000 shares for minors and incompetents. The trust company voted with MEI management and, in the process, became a target for DRUMS picketing.

Catherine Cleary, president of the trust company, defended the vote. "Our feeling is that the group trying to run the corporation deserves support," she said. "They've made progress and the Voting Trust keeps the control of this thing from being fragmented where no one could run it."

The bank, Miss Cleary said, could have cast its votes proportionately with the way the Indians themselves voted—which also would have kept DRUMS from a 51 per cent majority. "This is a fight between two blocks of Menominee and we're an easy sitting duck," she said.

Nevertheless, it is a strange arrangement for a people supposedly granted self-determination 10 years ago. They can elect local government officials, but the local government depends almost entirely on the corporation, which is managed by the trustees and directors, not by the people who own it. Trustees are elected—one each year.

Unlike some of his fellow directors, Dodge agrees that it is an undesirable arrangement and he believes that the Menominee people will be given a larger voice in company affairs.

Like the DRUMS leaders, Dodge fears the 1974 deadline when Menominee shareholders will be able to sell their stock in the tribal corporation, a step which poverty or disenchantment might encourage, especially among those who have moved away.

"If there is a run by Menominee to sell their shares," said Dodge, "then all we've done has been for nothing. It's not just losing the land. In less than three years, the whole thing could fall into the hands of someone else—not Menominee."

In the meantime, DRUMS is fighting MEI on every level, from lawsuits to picketing the Legend Lake sales office.

Dodge acknowledges that their protests and the publicity have hurt sales. "People come in to purchase property," he said, "then they go home to Milwaukee and hear about what DRUMS is doing. In a while, we get a letter that says, 'gosh, in view of the way the Indian people feel, they'd like to get out.'"

Moon Weso, who is 68 and knows the old stories and songs, is more optimistic than the young corporate manager. He believes that the Menominee are beginning to demand the changes which they should have fought for long ago.

"Thinking about it in an Indian way," he said, "it seems like the spirit of Indian is reviving all over. It's hard to explain that, but you see it. Certainly, we could feel it here again."

Jim White puts it more fiercely:

"What's incredible is that all this crap is still going on. We read about it, the stealing from the Indians and all, and we think that happened 100 years ago. The hell it did. It's happening right today. If we could just show our people that they don't have to take this lying down."

If the Members want to find poverty, if they want to find distress, all they have to do is to go to either of those two reservations. If they want to find

the Indians who have had everything taken from them by the really smart operators, just go to those two places.

If the Members want to find out what is going to happen in Alaska, go there just a few years from now and see what has happened. No one has talked about the 12 corporations we are going to set up by this bill. What are we going to give to the Natives? We are going to give them stock in the corporations. I do not know whether Members have ever been to any of the Alaskan native villages, but if you have not, then you should go and see the needs of these people. I want to tell the Members, if you think in 20 years or 30 years from now we are going to find one of those stock certificates—we will not be able to do it, because they will not be in the hands of the Natives, but in the hands of a bunch of sharp operators that are going to come out of New York and other places to take advantage of these people, just as they have taken advantage of the Klamath and Menominee Indians. That is what is going to happen to the native people in Alaska. These are the people some Members say we are trying to take care of in this bill.

I would like to add to the response to a question asked by the gentleman from New York of the chairman of the full committee about the rights in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, often called Pet Four. The Government has set up in Pet Four a naval petroleum reserve to take care of the needs for our defense and national security. This bill—even though I tried to get the Natives not to select any surface rights to lands in that area—allows them to select these surface rights. As much as 90-some thousand acres right in the middle of Pet Four can be selected by native villages—and there is nothing in this bill or anything we are going to put in right now that will prevent them from drilling on the surface, drilling to get the oil we have tried to set up as reserves for our national defense and security.

No, the committee did not want to look at that issue. They blindly closed their eyes to it and went ahead and said that since we are only giving them the surface, it will not make any difference. How would Members here like to obtain such surface rights without restriction on the permission to drill in Pet Four which is supposed to belong to all the people in the United States?

No, my friends, what is happening here today is not doing a favor or something for the Natives, or the people of Alaska. Do the Members want to know whether or not we should have land planning? It is said that land use planning should be in a different bill. Let me refer the Members to the testimony of the Governor of Alaska before our committee. He said when he appeared before our committee, in his direct testimony, that we should have and there should be land use planning in Alaska.

The amendment which the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) will offer at the proper time and when the bill is

read for amendment, provides for land use planning. What does it include? It withdraws the remaining unreserved public lands in Alaska and provides for land use planning. It includes the Federal Government. It includes the State of Alaska as requested by the Governor, and we include the native people, and every group in Alaska. We have included the interests of the 200-odd million American people that those Members who live in the rest of the country represent.

The gentleman has said we should not have all this, because it is going to affect the proposed oil pipeline.

Here is a map of Alaska. By the way, before we put that one up, take a look at this one. If Members want to see the villages already in Pet Four, they can see that the natives are entitled to take land out of that—reserve for our national defense.

Here is a map of the areas which have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior—present and past Secretaries of the Interior—as areas they would like to set aside for study by the Federal Government.

This area right here is where they discovered the oil.

Here is the route and point where they would like to bring the oil out.

There is absolutely nothing in any of these areas that will prevent that oil pipeline from being built. These are the areas which should be studied by the Federal Government. These are the areas which should possibly be set aside. I do not know whether they should be, but at least they should be studied not just for the people of Alaska but for all the people of the United States.

It is about time the Members of Congress realized they represent not just the people of Alaska but 200 million Americans. This is their responsibility.

Members of Congress have a responsibility to take care of two things in this legislation. One is the Native claims, which is a moral right and not a legal right. The second is the legal responsibility to take care of all the citizens of this country.

I will agree with my colleague from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, that it might have been well if this issue had been settled long before.

I just want to say to my colleague from Indiana, who asked the question as to how they arrived at the figures of 40 million acres of land and \$925 million, nobody can tell him how they arrived at those figures. They said they made an agreement.

I believe I put in my dissenting views how this thing has grown. The Natives originally wanted only a small amount of land. Originally, when this legislation came up in 1967, they wanted about 10 million acres of land for 50,000 people. In 1968 they still only wanted 10 million acres of land. In 1969 the administration, with a Secretary of the Interior who came from Alaska, sent a bill to the Congress and asked for some 14 million to 16 million acres of land. Now we have a request to settle for 40 million acres of land. What is 40 million acres? Forty million acres is equal to the total area of

the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia and approximately one-half of the State of Maine.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, since one of the important parts of this bill will be the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), I would sincerely hope that the Members will pay particular attention when he addresses the House as to the purpose of his amendment. Its purpose is to see that the interests of our constituents are taken care of. The thrust of his amendment, is to see to it that there is proper land use planning.

Members have heard the argument advanced that it should be taken care of in another bill. Let me say this, Alaska is the only place left under the American flag where we can plan before the land has been ruined. If we do not it now and allow the land to be developed without proper land use planning we will be faced in the future with the same situation we are facing today in the lower 48 States.

I sincerely hope because of the fact that the bill itself calls for certain types of land use planning that this amendment will be ruled germane to the bill and that Members will be able to vote on it and expand upon the planning already in the bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Was the amendment which the gentleman is championing here today offered in the subcommittee?

Mr. SAYLOR. One which was very similar to it was offered in the full committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. One similar to the Udall land use amendment was offered in the subcommittee?

Mr. SAYLOR. Absolutely, in the full committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. By whom?

Mr. SAYLOR. I offered it. It was voted down, but I offered it. I could not have offered it in the subcommittee, because when the subcommittee met by the arrangement I referred to in my separate and dissenting views I was in the Bethesda Naval Hospital as a patient.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Forty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 309]

Abbott	Anderson,	Barrett
Abourezk	Tenn.	Belcher
Alexander	Badillo	Blanton

Broyhill, N.C.  
Buchanan  
Celler  
Clark  
Clay  
Conable  
Corman  
Culver  
Dent  
Derwinski  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Drinan  
Eckhardt  
Edwards, La.  
Ellberg  
Evins, Tenn.

Flynt  
Fraser  
Gettys  
Gibbons  
Griffiths  
Gubser  
Hagan  
Halpern  
Hawkins  
Hébert  
Hicks, Mass.  
Holifield  
Ichord  
Jacobs  
Long, La.  
Mathis, Ga.  
Mills, Ark.

Minshall  
Patman  
Pirnie  
Roybal  
Satterfield  
Scheuer  
Schneebell  
Staggers  
Stephens  
Stokes  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Ullman  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Yatron

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 10367, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 372 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, if you stay here for another 10 years—now, mark my words very carefully—you will not cast a more important conservation vote than you will be asked to cast on the amendment that I am offering with the support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

You ought to ponder very carefully what is involved in this amendment. You ought to know what the amendment does and what it does not do.

I regret the amount of misinformation and confusion we have had about this, because we are dealing here with the fate of an area that is twice as big as Texas and as big as four Californias. We are going to seal the fate of this area and the wise or unwise use of its land when we vote on this amendment.

First, what does my amendment not do? I am for the Natives of the State of Alaska. I want a settlement with them, and I support the committee terms of the settlement.

I honor the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Colorado who hammered out this agreement. I will vote for it whether or not my amendment passes today.

My amendment does not reduce the payment to the Natives of Alaska by a single dollar. My amendment does not delay for 1 hour their right to select lands in Alaska. It may delay the final payments in some few instances, but it does not reduce by 1 acre or 1 square foot the amount of land that the Natives of Alaska will receive under the terms of the committee bill. So let there be no misunderstanding about that.

The committee bill is fair to the State of Alaska. It says to the people of Alaska it is time you got off dead center. We owe you some decisions and we ought to end this freeze so that you can begin the orderly development of your State.

My amendment does not disturb that commitment in one respect. The Natives

will get all of the land that they would receive under the committee bill. My amendment does not touch that. The Natives and State will not be delayed by an hour or a day in their selection of land. At long last we will give them a chance to go forward economically.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about that pipeline and what affect my amendment will or will not have. If you do not understand anything else, I want you to know that my amendment has no bearing whatsoever on the pipeline. Just as in the committee bill, the Secretary can authorize its construction, and I suspect that he will do it. The oil companies, after all, are involved in legitimate industry. We make great demands on them. And the resource is there. If I had my druthers, I would probably slow down the pipeline a little bit and study its potential for environmental damage a little bit longer, but I suspect that this bill will be viewed as a green light. I do not intend to fight that fight here and now. I repeat, my amendment does not slow down the pipeline in any way, shape, or form. You can be for the pipeline and this amendment with perfect consistency.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

I think this is the nitty-gritty of the gentleman's entire amendment, and we can resolve this and probably achieve what he is after. You asked me before about the areas of concern I had on your amendment with respect to the battle of the pipeline. I point out on page 2, starting at line 13, section 4, in which you outline or specify the four or five specific areas that would be withdrawn subject to the approval of an act of Congress on the withdrawal. Three of those lie in the approximate path of the pipeline. I say to you, what is there in this amendment of yours that would mitigate the threat to the pipeline posed by these three areas?

Mr. UDALL. I have asked the best lawyers I can find and the staff of our committee if anything in my proposed amendment would prevent the Secretary of the Interior from approving any pipeline tomorrow just as quickly as he could approve it today and they say there is not.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want this to be an issue. It is an important matter but it should not clutter up this particular legislation which is so deserving of consideration.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the legislation before us today, there is not one but three settlements to be made. The first is with the State of Alaska—to fulfill our commitment to that fledgling State to turn over 104 million acres of Federal land as a trust fund to help secure their economic future. We have



given them lands equal in size to the State of California, and in this respect we have been far more generous with Alaskans than with the citizens of any other State. Second, we are writing a settlement today with the 55,000 Natives and extinguishing their aboriginal claims—legitimate claims, I believe. We are turning over to them 40 million acres of land and a billion dollars, and I doubt that anyone can argue seriously that this is not a generous settlement. But third, is a forgotten settlement, a settlement with the American public whose lands are being given away forever. As we prepare today to relinquish their lands, what protections are we writing into this law to make sure that a reasonable number of those beautiful lakes, scenic rivers, glaciers, wildlife refuges, and potential parks are not forever lost? None, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

My amendment does not attempt to make this third settlement. It simply lays the groundwork by setting aside—for a short time—a reasonable amount of prime land whose future Congress must decide. The amendment says, in effect, why not while we are in the process of letting everyone paw over Alaska and pick out the valuable lands, why not pick out some for 205 million Americans and for their grandchildren to be used in the form of national parks, scenic rivers, and wildlife refuges?

Stated as simply and briefly as I can, the amendment does two things.

First, it directs the Secretary of the Interior to get busy and take a look at those lands already classified—and therefore unavailable for selection, anyway—and to reserve up to 50 million acres of them for study and action by Congress. I am talking about the breathtaking peaks and valleys in the Brooks Range, the untouched stretches of the Yukon River, the natural wildlife refuges for rare species, and so on. Surely in those areas are some we will want to protect and save for future generations. The amendment would also direct the Secretary to take a look at new and unreserved lands—up to a maximum limit of 50 million acres—for possible inclusion within parks, wilderness, and other conservation uses. Within 5 years the Secretary would have to come to Congress and justify these selections in order to keep them in public ownership. I have written this language, however, to assure that the first round of Native selections—18 million acres—can be made even within these lands which the Secretary wants to keep for the public. By the time the second round begins in 1984, Congress will have decided which of these precious lands to keep in public ownership and which to discard. There would be little or no conflict between the Natives and Congress on this score.

If we do not take the time now to set aside potential national interest lands

now—and study them—we will be buying them back in 20 years for parks from the land speculators. And 20 years from now, we would not be able to close up the mining scars and gouging. There is no cosmetic or medicine for that—only preventive.

On that score, I want to quote from the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission, on which I served under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL). On page 249, the report concludes, and I quote—

The important facet, in connection with Alaska, is that impediments to state selection be removed and that no further obstructions be employed by the Federal Government. The first step to minimize the effect on state selection is for the public land management agencies to identify and recommend to Congress as soon as possible, the lands considered to have national significance warranting retention by the Federal Government.

That is the precise purpose of the first part of my amendment.

Second, I propose—as did the Public Land Law Review Commission, and the State of Alaska—that a Joint Federal-State Temporary Planning Commission be established. It would have two purposes: To help guide and advice on land selections and to provide temporary zoning authority until local boards, which do not presently exist, are established.

As I said, the purpose of the commission is temporary. You do not turn over 100 million acres of Federal land to the Natives and State and say: Okay, boys, every other property owner in the country is subjected to zoning laws, but you are not.

The commission is made up of 14 members, and, if anything, is weighted on the side of the State and Natives—not the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, as I said when I began, if we stay in this House for another 10 years, we will not have a more important conservation vote. And, by voting for this amendment, we can honestly face the Natives and say: We have done nothing to harm your justice, nothing to disturb the fair settlement worked out by the committee. I think we owe this to the Natives and the American public.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), a member of the committee.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, before debate closes today I wanted to respond to some very careless things that have been said here this afternoon.

A previous speaker, for instance, pointed out how the Natives would lose their rights under this bill, how some of this bill called for terminations of the rights of Alaskan citizens. I do not want to dwell on that. I simply call attention of the Members to the provisions on page 2 of the bill which comes from the committee and which says, and I quote:

No provision of this Act is intended to replace or diminish any right, privilege, or obligation of Alaska natives as citizens of

the United States or of Alaska, or to relieve, replace, or diminish any obligation of the United States or the State of Alaska to protect and promote the rights or welfare of Alaska natives as citizens of the United States or of Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is as clear as any language could be written.

Now, the claim has been made that within a matter of months these vile natives from New York and elsewhere were going to rush to Alaska and steal all this money from the Alaskans, the Eskimos and the Aleuts.

May I point out that the bill again is completely specific.

This bill says that the stock which goes to the Natives from the corporation may not be sold for a period of 20 years—not 2 months, not 6 months, but a period of 20 years after the date of the enactment of this act and that the stock and any dividends paid or distributions made with respect thereto may not be sold, pledged, subjected to a lien or judgment execution, assigned in present or future, or otherwise alienated.

And, even the estate provisions are protected in this bill. Could any language be more clear in this respect?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think along this same line that it is important that the gentleman point out, since it has not already been pointed out before, the significance of the million-dollar limitation in payments to the members of the bar who might associate themselves with the various causes, causes in the interest of protecting the new wealth we are giving to the natives. If the gentleman would cover that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. KYL. I think this bill goes further to prevent any exploitation by those who deal in law, legally or otherwise, than in any piece of legislation that this committee has ever brought forth to this point.

It was also said, and this gets to reductio ad absurdum, it gets absolutely ridiculous. The natives in the subsistence lands have the right to the surface, to the surface estate. The mineral values are reserved to the Federal Government.

And then we have this ridiculous statement that some Indian, because the U.S. marshal is not watching him, is going to put a drilling rig on his property because of his surface rights.

These native citizens of Alaska are not stupid. They are not going to spend money to put a drilling rig somewhere when they know they cannot drill. Why put a drilling rig on a piece of property if you cannot drill? The mineral rights belong to the United States.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) who just preceded me, said why not give us the right—meaning the Federal Government—to select some lands? And I repeat again, we have in the United States a tremendous national park system. It is a tremendous system, and everyone is proud of the national park system. One-third of all the national park acreage in the 50 States is in Alaska now. Have we been niggardly in our regard for conservation? 20 million acres—and I said 20 million acres—in

Alaska today is in wildlife refuges. I might be wrong about this figure, but I believe that is over half of the acreage of our wildlife acreages in the 50 States. Have we closed our eyes to conservation in Alaska?

The Federal Government has withdrawn for these conservation purposes 73 million acres of land in Alaska.

The gentleman from Arizona was very careful. He said his amendment would not delay for 1 hour the selection of lands, and he is right. But he uses that word carefully. He says "selection." That is not what we are interested in at this point, we are talking about "use" of lands. The selection of lands puts no money in anyone's pocket, nor for the plus 20-percent unemployed in the State of Alaska today.

The other day, Mr. Chairman, when the bill was before the Committee on Rules, one of the members of that committee asked this. He said:

How does this situation in Alaska compare with that in the United States?

Now, I know that gentleman, who is very knowledgeable, was guilty of a slip of the tongue, but, nonetheless, this would be a very good line for a cartoon in some Alaskan newspaper.

In 1958 the Congress passed a law making Alaska the 50th State of the Union, with provisions in the law that would enable Alaska to become a full partner in this Union of ours. Alaska was to select 104 million acres of land, not with all kinds of provisions thrown in, to select 104 million acres of land.

Why is Alaska in economic trouble today? Because Uncle Sam owns 96.328 percent of all of Alaska. Selection means nothing. "Use" is the word we should put in the context of this bill. We have to provide this. Some of you people might be interested in this matter, too, because of previous comments. We are talking about what the Natives should get, and in their use of the land this should not be withheld. You see, the use clause goes on, but the use is denied. We say we are going to give them the use of the land, but.

So by trying to do something we did not have sense enough to do in the lower 48 States, we say the Natives should have maximum participation in decisions having to do with the rights of the property, and that philosophy is right.

We have had enough of Uncle Sam's paternalism in dealing with the Indians. We have to give these people a right—not with provisions saying you can use it only if Uncle Sam says you can use it, when he says you can use it, and how he says you can use it. We have had enough of that.

What else do we say in this bill? The bill says:

There shall be maximum participation by natives in decisions affecting their rights and property, without establishing any permanent racially defined institutions, rights, privileges, or obligations, without creating a reservation system or lengthy wardship or trusteeship.

These philosophies are right. When you say that the Natives can select their lands—that is right. But when it comes to

using the lands, this is where the thing begins to pinch. The committee says we have had enough of this paternalism—to tell the Indians—you can do this but you have to do it our way.

In 1958, Mr. Chairman, we passed the statehood act. We called it the statehood act.

To this afternoon we have never permitted the State of Alaska to become a State. This bill which we are debating today and which we will complete tomorrow is the statehood act for the State of Alaska. If it does not pass—if the State is encumbered in its selections and its use of these lands, then all these promises that we have made to that State and to the citizens of that State and to those who are Natives of that State and other citizens and to the citizens of the United States—all those promises are fraudulent promises.

The State has rights and this bill seeks to implement those rights. This Nation is the only nation in history—the only one in history, which has offered to its aboriginal citizens some payment for what we have taken from them.

This afternoon some Members have asked me rather callously—Why do we owe these people anything? The answer to that question is the simple fact that the United States is different from any other nation that has ever existed.

We paid the Indians of the lower 48 States through their Indian Claims Commission. We did not have to. We did not owe them a thing maybe. Except that the United States and the philosophy of this great Nation said, "Oh, yes, we should pay them."

Why do we offer anything to the natives in the State of Alaska? Because the philosophy which is underlying this great Nation of ours says that we have an obligation to take care of. It is as simple as that. If we want to do that job in full, with justice and with equity, and at the same time help the State of Alaska and protect the rights of the United States and of all the 50 States, this bill must be enacted into law and it must be enacted in the form in which it comes to the House this afternoon.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. The gentleman will recall that in the dialog by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) he mentioned the vagueness with which the 50 million acres accrued to the Natives in this bill was arrived at.

I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) has any suggestions as to how the 50 million acres in the Udall-Saylor amendment for additional study were set in light of your revelation. There are now 73 million acres under Federal control. How do you suppose that 50 million acres was arrived at?

Mr. KYL. To tell you the truth, I do not know, I might respond to the gentleman. Our friend, the gentleman from

Arizona, says that there has been a lot of misunderstanding about his amendment. The gentleman is to blame and nobody else, for this misunderstanding.

We got communications from around the United States to support the Saylor amendment which had not yet been written.

Then we had an amendment in committee.

Then we had it introduced as legislation on the floor.

Then that amendment was further revised.

Actually, I have to admit I have had a hard time and enough trouble getting copies of all these things day by day.

We had a letter from the Sierra Club last week saying that we should set aside 150 million acres for park and similar conservation purposes.

The 150 million acres of land which with the 73 million acres of land we already own would make every acre of Federal land into some kind of preservation.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. I merely wish to call to the attention of the members of the committee the fact that after everybody has withdrawn every acre of land provided for in this bill, the Federal Government is getting 73-and-some-odd million acres withdrawn—we will have 152 million acres of land in the public domain in Alaska.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the pending legislation, and hope the House will concur with the committee that it is not only our moral but our legal responsibility to enact this piece of legislation to provide for the final settlement of the land claims of the Alaska Natives. I think it is very difficult for many Members of this House to put themselves into the position of the Alaska Natives who have seen their lands taken by the State and the Federal Government without just compensation, with full knowledge that they are American citizens and entitled to the protection of the Constitution, where the due process clause has not been fully implemented in their regard.

The purpose of this legislation is to meet this responsibility which we have failed to meet as a Nation and which we have waited 13 years since Alaska became a State to address ourselves to. What we are asking you to do is only fair and just for the people who originally owned the lands of Alaska, and who have never been compensated for the lands which have been taken from them. Please note that the bill meets an immediate need, one that has already been delayed too long. It does not impose any restrictions, any limitations, or any delays on the immediate claims by the natives of land that is theirs as a matter of right.



In adopting this legislation we are recognizing the validity finally of the Natives' claims that the land is theirs. How unfair it would be if, in the same breath, we virtually removed that recognized right by the adoption of the many pending amendments which have been discussed this afternoon.

The bill as reported by our committee provides that the Natives will get their land with no strings attached. That is clear and unequivocal. There are no reserved areas, no "national interest study areas," no delays. The Natives get their land and that is that. The monetary payments are not at issue.

Under the committee bill we will be conveying full fee title to the lands now held only by aboriginal title. It would be a deception of tragic proportions to tell the Natives that the land is theirs, but that clear title will be held in abeyance until a later Congress may sometime make a further determination as their right of ownership.

As the bill now stands, the Natives select their final 22 million acres after the State of Alaska. Under the amendment to be offered the Native claims will be subordinate to the Federal interest in 50 million acres to be set aside. As with much of Indian lands, this in reality means that all the best lands will be gone before the Natives have their final selection.

That will truly be a great degradation of the rights of the Natives, which we have found to be valid and to be binding upon this Nation.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now actively considering changes in our national land use policies which can protect the interests of the public and this Nation in all our national lands. I fail to see why one particular State should be singled out today for policy changes, especially when this conflicts with the essential purpose of meeting our obligation to the Native peoples of Alaska and to the State of Alaska under the Statehood Act.

This is not an environmental issue. This is a moral issue. We seek a legislative judgment on a matter of equity that has been delayed for many years.

Adoption of this legislation does not mean that there will be no new national parks or other public uses of land in Alaska. These areas can be provided in Alaska just as now they are provided for in your State and mine through the adoption of legislation and through citizen action.

What we are recognizing first and foremost is the duty of Congress to reach a fair, final, and equitable solution to this most complex problem. This cardinal principle will be brutally violated if we take away with one hand what we are morally and legally required to grant.

I agree that the environment of Alaska, just as the environment of other areas of this Nation, has great tremendous natural beauty, and should be protected, but we are dealing today basically with human beings who have placed their trust and confidence in us and to whom we owe a deep moral obligation. I urge

this House to affirm clearly and unequivocally the claim of the people and the State of Alaska to their native lands. Let us not further delay and betray the trust which has been placed in us as we so often have in the past.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCURE) a member of the committee.

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time, and I shall be as brief as possible, to bring up a few points which have not been mentioned or have not been clarified in the debate to this point.

One of the questions I had raised in the debate in the full committee during deliberations of this bill was the question of the hunting and fishing rights of the native peoples of Alaska. I was told at that time there was no need to have any provision written into the bill, but that some reference would be made in the report concerning hunting and fishing rights of these people. But I think it needs to be pointed out, as the language which appears in the report on page 5 so clearly points out, the philosophy that is behind this settlement with the native peoples of Alaska. The settlement of this acreage of land is in lieu of other rights, and the bill in specific terms removes hunting and fishing rights. The subsistence lands that may be selected, after the village lands are selected and after the statehood lands are selected, are in lieu of subsistence hunting and fishing rights, and the only hunting and fishing rights they will have are in connection with whatever lands are selected by them under the provisions of the bill.

There is a kind of generalization that they need not be concerned about their hunting and fishing rights on other lands in Alaska. Let me read from page 5 of the report:

Moreover, there will be little incentive for the Natives to select lands for subsistence use because during the foreseeable future the Natives will be able to continue their present subsistence uses regardless of whether the lands are in Federal or State ownership.

I would say to the Members, let us understand there is no guarantee, that is true, but the guarantee is only in the language of the bill which says their rights are extinguished except so far as they select lands for ownership. The rights for hunting and fishing will be not rights, but whatever is granted to them as a matter of charity or a matter of generosity on the part of the State or the Federal Government. I think we should know that is one of the reasons why the acreage that is granted is as large as it is.

But let us remember too—or rather, let us reject the notion that we are going to try to maintain the native peoples in their existing subsistence economy. The philosophy of the bill is that we shall not. The desire of the natives is that they not be held in that condition, but that they be allowed to change. I think the philosophy expressed in this bill is consistent with that kind of improved living condition on the part of the people of Alaska. I think it is absolutely neces-

sary that we do make this distinction and that we do not mislead anyone.

I want to state at this time that I was disappointed in one action of the committee in turning down an amendment which I authored, which would have guaranteed the integrity of the wildlife refuges. And while the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Michigan in regard to the integrity of these refuges does not go as far as mine—if it is offered in the form in which it was submitted to me. In fairness to the Natives who demand and need some solution of their problem and in order to keep faith with the people of Alaska who have been waiting for years for some answer to the problem, we should arrive at a solution with this legislation and allow them to make the selections from the public domain.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

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

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Udall amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support both the proposal to set aside temporarily a portion of the public domain in Alaska for study as to its future use, and also the proposal to establish a temporary land-use planning commission for Alaska.

The purpose of these proposals is to protect major interests of the public at large while Congress is acting in the particular interest of the Alaska Natives.

I am sure everyone wants to see justice done to Alaska Natives. But in our eagerness to resolve fairly the question of native land claims, we must not overlook our national responsibilities. We are trustees not only for the Alaska Natives but for all Americans. It would not be fair to the public at large, and to future generations, to let millions of acres of public domain pass out of the public's hands without first considering carefully what may be done to these lands and whether certain of them, in the public interest, should be reserved for the benefit of all citizens.

There is now only one national park in Alaska. Only a small portion of this vast new State has been set aside in national wildlife refuges. Yet, except in Alaska, the opportunity no longer exists for establishing major new national parks or national wildlife refuges. To miss this last opportunity would be tragic. It would mean missing the chance to save for the benefit of countless future Americans some of the most beautiful and awe-inspiring landscape on our entire continent.

The provision which I have joined the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and other colleagues in sponsoring would give the executive branch and Congress time to consider portions of the present public domain in Alaska for possible designation as national parks and other Federal reservations before

Alaska's impending development ends the opportunity. In effect, we would establish a temporary public land-bank.

I would like to cite an example of the value of looking ahead in this way. When New York's Central Park was being advocated by Frederic Law Olmsted, the great landscape architect, it was labeled by some "Olmsted's Folly." But what would the heart of Manhattan be like today if it lacked this beautiful expanse of open green space, and what chance would there be of creating it after a century of growth and geometric escalation of land values? Similarly, once the public domain lands of Alaska have gone out of the public's hands, there will be little chance of retrieving them for the public benefit. Even if they remained unspoiled, the cost would undoubtedly be prohibitive.

Our proposal also includes the establishment of a temporary joint Federal-State planning commission. The commission would help to chart the initial course of development and land use on those lands to be selected from the public domain by the Natives and by the State of Alaska. Provision for land-use planning is needed urgently, because no one has yet made any Alaska land plan or provided controls essential to prevent careless resource exploitation and other unwise actions.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the desire of the gentleman from Alaska and of the Alaska Native groups to see Congress settle the claims question quickly and justly. I also recognize the understandable eagerness of development interests to proceed with their plans once a claims settlement has cleared the way. However, I am convinced that the claims legislation would be incomplete, and would fail to do justice to the interests of millions of other Americans, if it became law without provision for adequately safeguarding Alaska's most significant public lands and without provision for planning Alaska's development soundly.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we will debate the Udall amendment tomorrow, and I hope to be involved in that. I believe prior to that time it is necessary to make a kind of critical determination on this House. That determination is whether we think we are giving the Natives a dole or a gift or whether indeed they are entitled to it.

I want to say most unequivocally it seems to me that the Alaska Natives have a potential claim to vast areas of Alaska. It would be the greatest mistake we could make to assume that this is some kind of a gift or that they are asking for a dole. That is not the case.

This land claim is based on the doctrine of aboriginal title, which this Nation has recognized since the Northwest Ordinance. We are one of the few countries to do so, but we have done so, and I see no reason why we should change at this late date in history.

What have we done in recognizing aboriginal title? This sounds like a lot of acreage, 40 million acres and \$925 million. So far in the United States, through treaties and through the Indian

Claims Commission, in the lower 48 States we have recognized aboriginal title to approximately 225 million acres just in the lower 48, much of which land we purchased from France in the Louisiana Purchase. We have set aside some 55 million acres in the lower 48 States in reservations. To date we have adjudicated some \$825 million through the Court of Claims and through other settlements we have made with the Indians of the lower 48 States. Almost all of this is predicated upon the doctrine of aboriginal title.

It is true the sovereign can extinguish aboriginal title and not pay a cent for it, but, as I said before, we have never done so. We could extinguish it and pay for it, which is what this bill provides. Or we could make judicial machinery available to the Alaska Natives so their claims could be compensated after judicial hearing.

The first of these alternatives is totally unacceptable to me. I do not believe in perhaps the last major dealings we are going to have with these Native people we should extinguish their title and compensate them nothing.

The second matter entails years and years of uncertainty and litigation in the court.

I believe if we can come to a legislative settlement, as we attempt to do here today, that is the logical and best way to do it.

Now, what about the legislative settlement? The legislative settlement must bear some reasonable relationship to the potential claim.

People have been asking on the floor today why we started 3 years ago with 1 million acres and today we are up to 40 million acres. I will state very simply it is because the Alaska Natives simply felt they were not being properly compensated for their claims. I do not believe they were, either. I would have preferred this be for 60 million acres. Indeed, I had a bill, with some 30 cosponsors on it, asking for 60 million acres.

But this is a compromise which does bear some reasonable relationship to the value of their claim and, most importantly, it is supported by the Natives. They are the people being compensated for giving up the aboriginal title. So that is the important thing attached to this bill.

This bill without major amendments represents a fair settlement of that claim.

There have been questions asked here today about why should the Natives be entitled to money? Why should they be entitled to so much land?

Now, let me just give you some idea. Aboriginal title is extinguished and value paid at the time of the taking. The time of the taking is now by this legislation, if that is the way we do it. Just recently 400,000 acres in the Prudhoe Bay area, just the leasehold interest in it, sold for \$900 million. That is 400,000 acres which I have no doubt the Alaskan Natives and the Eskimos could have established aboriginal title to. That gives you some idea of the value.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to speak briefly about the administration

of this, because I believe it is very important. Every one of the bills in our committee and the bills in the other body, all of them, eschew the reservation or trust concept. For far too long we in America have been making the Natives' mistakes for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEIGER (of Arizona). Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, these bills fully recognize that the Alaskan Natives are capable of taking care of their own affairs and set up regional corporations which will hold title, surveys, and issue stock to them and invest funds and develop programs to improve their health, education, and welfare and to distribute the income.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a legislative settlement which bears a reasonable relationship to the claim which has the Native support and provides for their participation is the best solution to the 104-year-old enigma.

Our dealings with the native people of this continent have not always been just. While there is no point here in reciting our sins, there is clearly no point in repeating them.

Settlement of these claims is the last major claim with people from whom we have taken the continent. Enactment of this legislation properly to compensate the Alaskan Natives will mean the final chapter in our Government's dealings with the land rights of the original Americans was written with justice and honor.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. VIGORITO).

Mr. VIGORITO. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I will not take the full 4 minutes, but I think I ought to be getting up and speaking as one who is against this bill.

I do not for one moment believe the natives have any claim to Alaska. If they have a claim, they have a claim to all of it and not just what we decide they have a claim to. They do not have any more claim to Alaska than the Indians have in the United States, and we have not treated the Indians the same way we expect to treat the Alaskan Natives.

I, for one, have voted for all of the legislation on health, education, and welfare in the last 7 years that I have been here, and they benefit the Alaskan Natives just as much as they do the American citizens in the lower 48 States.

Tomorrow I know the bill will pass by a large margin, but nevertheless I have to get up and object and speak my opposition to it. I will vote against the bill on final passage.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH).

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Chairman, it is my great pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 10367, the Alaska Native land claims bill. It is a privilege to associate myself with the articulate explanation of this legislation made by the gentleman from Colorado (Chairman ASPINALL) and I



want to compliment him for his leadership in the preparation of this legislation.

There are many others here today who have given much time and effort on this legislation, and I want my distinguished colleagues to be aware of their contribution to one of the finest Indian rights bills ever to come before Congress. A long list would include every member of the House Interior Committee, with special credit to all members of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, 14 of whom bring this bill before you today.

At the top of the list is the gentleman from Florida (Chairman HALEY) who adds another credit to an already lengthy list of contributions he has made to the cause of Indian rights. Similar credit and gratitude must go to the gentlemen from Washington (Mr. MEEDE), and Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON). Across the aisle, I extend admiration and gratitude to the gentlemen from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) and Iowa (Mr. KYL).

The effort of all these men, and many more, on behalf of the Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and all other Alaskans has made it possible to bring a bill before you today which is truly bipartisan and representative.

I feel a special responsibility to the Members of the House because I am Alaska's only Congressman. I want to speak as an Alaskan, for all Alaskans on a day which stands second only to Alaska's attainment of statehood in 1958. Many Members may be aware of the special significance of this particular day, since it was 104 years ago yesterday that the Alaska purchase from Russia was completed.

The importance of this legislation, and its immediate passage, cannot be overstated. Both for the State of Alaska and its 55,000 Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians, this is the legislation for the seventies. As early as the Alaska purchase from Russia in 1867, the United States undertook a solemn responsibility to protect Alaska Native lands. Although this responsibility has been recognized by Congress many times since, it has not been resolved, and it is a commitment over 100 years old which is before us today.

In 1971, these longstanding claims are matched by incredible needs on the part of all Alaskan Natives. These people, one-fifth of the population of my State, have a life expectancy of less than 35 years. In rural areas, the median Native income is below \$1,000. In the rural areas, 90 percent of Native housing is so substandard as to demand immediate replacement. Similarly shocking statements can be made in the areas of employment, education, and many others. The elaborations of all these needs are endless. In spite of the best efforts of the State of Alaska, the Federal Government, and the Natives themselves, these serious problems have not been solved.

H.R. 10367, before the House today, offers a unique opportunity to us all. It is a chance to recognize important rights which have existed for over 100 years, and to do so in a way which will permit one of this Nation's least known and most deprived minorities to gain the tools with which it can construct its own

destiny in partnership with one of the Nation's youngest and most exciting States.

In my view, H.R. 10367 is a bill which fulfills this opportunity in a superior way. As Mr. ASPINALL has pointed out, Congress has grappled with this issue for 25 years without success. It is all the more important, then, that the present bill has the support of nearly every interest concerned with protecting Indian rights.

The bill has the support of the Alaska Federation of Natives, which is the statewide Native Organization in Alaska.

The bill has the support of the administration, which has made important contributions to the substance of the bill.

The bill has the support of the State of Alaska through Gov. William A. Egan. In addition, the State has agreed to contribute nearly \$500 million, to contribute certain lands it has previously selected, and to work to reconstruct certain State laws and statutes which will facilitate the settlement.

The bill has the support of organized labor, most national Indian organizations, and numerous other groups interested in human rights.

Last year, and in years past, no such statement of widespread support would have been possible. It is no accident that H.R. 10367 is able to command such broad support. It is a bill which bears the mark of great deliberation, and the contributions of many diverse ideas. From my own viewpoint as Alaska's Congressman, several aspects of the bill stand out, in which I believe my distinguished colleagues will be interested.

First, H.R. 10367 is a bill which is, in all respects, equitable toward Alaska's Natives. The amount and type of land included in the bill, the amount and distribution of money, and the administrative structure established, are fair in quantity and sensitive to the present and future needs of all Alaskan Natives.

The bill is sensitive to the heritage and culture of Alaska's Natives and does not impose either conditions or structures which require abandonment of a proud past. The family and the village, which are the cornerstones of the culture, are protected and enhanced by this bill.

It is a bill which will unify all Alaskans, rather than divide them. In every respect, the benefits which are directed primarily to Alaskan Natives will benefit all Alaskans generally.

It is a bill which meshes into the Statehood Act with due regard both for the Alaska Natives and the State of Alaska. It is legislation which has received the cooperation of both the State of Alaska and its people. I believe it will bring a new era to my State.

Perhaps most important of all, the bill is one of self-determination. In every respect, it is a bill which minimizes external control of any kind over the terms of the settlement, and maximizes the independence of people who are willing and able to exercise it in the interest of an entire State.

I know my distinguished colleagues know of Helen Hunt Jackson's book, "Age of Dishonor," which depicts that chapter in American history concerning

the treatment of American Indians during the 19th and early 20th centuries. Today, we are rewriting that sordid chapter in our history by taking the actions necessary to restore lost honor. Even though Alaska is the largest state in the Nation, it has only one Congressman. I am asking that 434 other Congressmen join me in restoring this honor by passing this important bill.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. I think that, while credit is being given to others, it should be said, although I do not agree with the gentleman from Alaska on my own amendment, but nevertheless during my service in the House of Representatives have I seen such dedication, diligence, and hard work toward the accomplishment of an objective as has the gentleman from Alaska demonstrated in connection with this legislation.

The people of Alaska owe the gentleman a tremendous debt of gratitude. I think this bill will be passed and signed sometime this year and it will end this long unresolved question. I think the people of Alaska can never thank the gentleman enough for the leadership which he has displayed in connection with this legislation.

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

Mr. BEGICH. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to join the gentleman from Arizona and the members of the committee in the statement he has made about the industry and energy and capability and desire which has been displayed by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) to bring forth a harmonious conclusion on this legislation. The gentleman has exemplified through his ability and desire that a good and effective piece of legislation must be passed in order to accomplish his objectives.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the effectiveness of the gentleman from Alaska.

I just hope that we can move along, and as the gentleman from Arizona suggests, pass this bill tomorrow, because then I will be able to get the gentleman from Alaska off my back and get this bill passed through the House and over to the other body. Let us move ahead here.

I want to thank the gentleman for the wonderful tribute which he has paid to me as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse the Alaskan Natives settlement bill.

Faced on the one hand with the increasing development of the Alaskan frontier and on the other with a struggle to maintain a livelihood from their lands, these Natives are faced with a most desperate dilemma. Over the years, they and their ancestors have estab-

lished an indisputable claim to these lands. Their claims extend far beyond our purchase of Alaska and even before the discovery of the new world.

Therefore, they have both a legal and moral right to some form of reimbursement for the loss of their traditional hunting lands. I feel very strongly that this measure is fair because it gives the Natives money as well as land. While the latter is necessary in order for them to sustain their life style, the money will provide them with the capital not only to survive but to actually improve their living conditions.

The poverty of these people has been well documented. Numbering approximately 55,000, most live on what could be best described as a subsistence income. Over one-half of them have an education below the sixth grade level and their average life expectancy is under 35 years.

Mr. Chairman, these sobering statistics are sharply contrasted by the fantastic economic potential of Alaska. Without this bill, not only would their lands be appropriated without any compensation, but the very lives of these people would be periled. Alaskan Natives deserve fair and proper protection and for that reason I recommend the passage of this measure.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act".*

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 10367) to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Alaska Native land claims bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8630, NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1971

Mr. ROGERS on behalf of Mr. STAGGERS, filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8630) to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training increased numbers of nurses.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the Senate for today, pages 36793 to 36801.)

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8629, COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING ACT OF 1971

Mr. ROGERS (on behalf of Mr. STAGGERS) filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8629) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes.

[For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the Senate for today, pages 36790 to 36773.]

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6, CLOSING OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS AND CLINICS AND TRANSFERS OF CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTERS

Mr. ROGERS (on behalf of Mr. STAGGERS) filed the following conference report and statement on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to express the sense of Congress relative to certain activities of Public Health Service hospitals and outpatient clinics:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-579)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to express the sense of Congress relative to certain activities of Public Health Service hospitals and outpatient clinics, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
PAUL G. ROGERS,  
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,  
ANCHER NELSEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EDWARD KENNEDY,  
H. A. WILLIAMS,  
GAYLORD NELSON,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
ALAN CRANSTON,  
HAROLD E. HUGHES,  
CLAIBORNE PELL,  
WALTER F. MONDALE,  
PETER H. DOMINICK,  
J. K. JAVITS,  
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,  
BOB PACKWOOD,  
ROBERT TAFT,  
J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

##### JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to express the sense of Congress relative to certain activities of Public Health Service hospitals and outpatient clinics, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

The Senate Resolution provides that the Public Health Service Hospitals and outpatient clinics should not be closed at this time, but should be funded and staffed through fiscal year 1972, during which time the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Congress should determine the future disposition of these facilities.

The House adopted the Senate passed

resolution, with an amendment to include the Clinical Research Centers at Fort Worth and Lexington among the facilities to which the resolution applies.

The Conference failed to reach agreement on the House amendments concerning the Clinical Research Center at Fort Worth, nor could any mutually agreeable compromises be reached.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
PAUL G. ROGERS,  
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,  
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,  
ANCHER NELSEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
H. A. WILLIAMS,  
GAYLORD NELSON,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
ALAN CRANSTON,  
HAROLD E. HUGHES,  
CLAIBORNE PELL,  
WALTER F. MONDALE,  
PETER H. DOMINICK,  
J. K. JAVITS,  
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,  
BOB PACKWOOD,  
ROBERT TAFT,  
J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 18 on rollcall No. 303 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### HUGH T. MURRAY FAMILY

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

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay special tribute to the Hugh T. Murray family of West Point, Utah, for special achievement in the field of Scouting. The Murrays have set an outstanding example for all of us with each of the family's six sons achieving the Eagle Scout award and with the four youngest receiving this award on the same night at a special court of honor.

Dean, 19; Paul, 17; and Joel, 13, were presented with their Eagle awards on the night of June 27 of this year with two older Eagle Scout brothers, John, 25, and Thomas, 23, participating in the special ceremony. In this day and age of the dropout, it is heartening to see young men who still care—young men who see value in religion, family life and in serving their community. I pay tribute to the Murray family and to the scouting program for the sense of responsibility it provides for young men in America today.

The Murrays have been blessed with eight fine children including two daughters, Mabel Ann and Julie Kay. It was a goal of the entire family to see that all six sons become Eagle Scouts and this goal was reached when the four youngest sons received their individual Eagle awards at the same time.

The six Eagle Scouts of the Murray family have all been actively engaged in school, church, and community activities. Twenty-five-year-old John recently received his master's degree in electrical engineering from Brigham Young University. He was a member of the National



Honor Society, a high school athlete and has served a mission for his church. He is married to Bonnie Hart and has a year old son.

Twenty-three-year-old Thomas is a senior at Weber State College. He too has served a mission for his church and has served in student government while in college. He is leader of an Explorer Post and took his young men to the National Explorer Olympics where they won the basketball title.

Nineteen-year-old Dean is now serving on a mission for the Latter-day Saints Church and was attending Weber State College prior to that church call. He participated in athletics in high school and in college and has worked with young men in scouting and athletics. He played on the Explorer Olympics national champion basketball team.

Seventeen-year-old Paul is now a senior at Clearfield High School where he lettered in wrestling and track. He has been active in scouting and church work. He also played on the National Explorer Olympics basketball championship team.

Sixteen-year-old Davis is a junior at Clearfield High School where he is actively engaged in sports. He has also been a leader in church activities and in scouting and was also on the Explorer Olympics national champion basketball team. He has been president of his Venturer and Explorer posts.

Thirteen-year-old Joel is the youngest of the six brothers and a ninth grader at North Davis Junior High School. He enjoys sports and scouting and is now a patrol leader. He has been an active leader in his church and has won several awards.

I am happy to call to the attention of the Members of the House the accomplishments of the Murray family. I would like to commend Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Murray for the outstanding example they have set, as parents, for all of us. And I also commend the Murray sons and daughters for their genuine interest and involvement in church, school, and community.

#### SEWAGE TREATMENT PROBLEMS OF THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I have been encouraged lately by the progress that is being made in solving the sewage treatment problems of the Washington metropolitan area.

The primary roadblocks have involved the operations of the Blue Plains treatment facility. This plant's capacity has been consistently exceeded in recent years with the result that much waste has been passed untreated directly into the Potomac River. Agreement has nearly been reached, however, to institute a temporary chemical treatment process. Thus, all sewage coming to Blue Plains will soon receive at least partial treatment. This should be on-line by May of 1972, if the progress toward cooperative agreement continues in the present manner.

Another problem at Blue Plains involved the disposal of the sludge that was a byproduct of the treatment process. This sludge, up to now, has also simply been dumped into the Potomac. Now, however, Maryland has offered the use of some of its land as a disposal area for the sludge which, as used on depleted land areas, will turn out to be a valuable organic resource.

This progress, as I noted, is encouraging. The need for long-range planning and areawide coordination, however, is as great as ever. The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments—COG—has now officially gone on record in support of a regional authority to handle the entire sewage treatment and water supply problem.

In a resolution passed by its board of directors, COG advocated achieving coordinated planning and implementation through the strengthening of existing institutions subject to direct control of the electorate, rather than by the creation of new institutions. It also recommended that, as the coordinator of local government planning for the area, the role of COG be strengthened.

Finally it was resolved by COG that any agency created to handle regional waste operations be governed by local government officials and that its plans and programs be consistent with those of COG.

I am entirely in agreement with this resolution, and feel strongly that control of area sewage and water programs should be in the hands of locally elected officials. Perhaps this can be accomplished through presently operating institutions, such as COG, but in any event greater regional planning and coordination is a must and cannot be put off any longer.

#### THE EIGHTH VIETNAM ROLL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am listing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of those who have died as a result of hostile action in Vietnam in the first 6 months of 1971. I do so now because this RECORD will likely report action of this body on the Mansfield amendment. No more eloquent plea for a prompt and complete U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam can be made than the listing of those who have paid the supreme sacrifice in recent months.

The price of our continued involvement in Vietnam, even at the sharply reduced level President Nixon has wisely directed, has been frightfully high. In the first half of this year, 1,173 men died in Vietnam as a result of hostile action. When added to the previous listings, this brings the total number who have died in combat in Vietnam since the beginning of the war to 45,951 men. Of these, 14,572 have died since President Nixon assumed office on January 20, 1969, and began withdrawing troops several months thereafter.

The price of peace for America has been high indeed. In part, the high price

can be attributed to a certain ambivalence on the part of the Congress—and the American people—over the manner in which the war should be conducted. The cries to end the war have often been muted by the pleas of those who would see the war prosecuted to a military victory.

For almost 7 long years, the only congressional statement of policy on the Vietnam war was the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which one former Cabinet official described as "the functional equivalent of a declaration of war." This infamous resolution was not finally repealed until January 12, 1971, only 9 short months ago.

Then, for more than 8 months, the Congress could not bring itself to say anything at all about the Vietnam war. Although no other issue so punctured the peace and tranquility of the decade of the 1960's, the Congress remained mute until last month, when on September 28, 1971, the conference report on the draft act was finally approved by the Congress and signed into law by the President.

The act, approved by the House on a vote of 297 to 108, contained an endorsement of total withdrawal from Vietnam, as follows:

It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that the United States terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations of the United States in Indochina, and provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all United States military forces at a date certain subject to the release of all American prisoners-of-war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such government.

This was a fundamental reversal of U.S. policy from the functional declaration of war repealed only a few months earlier.

Now, once again, the Congress is called upon to address itself to Vietnam policy.

Surely, at this late date, there can be no doubt as to the course upon which President Nixon has set our Nation. Surely, at this late date, no one seriously contemplates a military solution in Vietnam.

It is time for the American people—through their elected representatives in Washington—to speak with a united voice in favor of ending our role in Vietnam.

It is time for the Congress to set a final date as a goal for terminating our involvement in Vietnam. What that date should be is a matter of some debate. Whether it should be expressed in the binding language of a statute requiring Presidential concurrence, or in the form of a sense of the Congress resolution, is open to question.

In my view, the Mansfield language now in the Senate version of the Military Procurement bill, like its predecessor in the draft act, can be improved.

While I have long felt that the President should have a specific date, and an early one, by which to accomplish total withdrawal, I also believe it would be imprudent for him to disclose it publicly. At the least, the disclosure would invite serious complications in Vietnam. It would also weaken the President's

bargaining position when he journeys to Peking and Moscow.

At the same time, the Congress has the right to fix its own withdrawal deadline and report it to the President.

As presently constructed, the Mansfield amendment poses a difficult dilemma to the President. By signing a bill containing it he would publicly announce the 6-month deadline as his own. A veto would be confusing. By it he would appear to reject the 6-month deadline, when actually the deadline he privately holds may be just exactly that.

I have discussed with several prospective conferees ways to resolve the dilemma. One is to make the deadline a "sense of Congress" expression. Thus, Congress could be on record as calling for withdrawal by a specific date without forcing the President to acknowledge publicly that the date specified by Congress was his own.

For this reason, I shall vote to table the motion to instruct the House conferees, confident that a strong, meaningful, and progressive amendment will be developed by the conference committee.

America's ambivalence over Vietnam policy—and that of the Congress—are at an end. It is time for the Congress to help write the final chapter to this too long story. For the men honored here, and in seven previous issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the final chapter comes too late. Compared with their great sacrifice, words pale to naught. Only the lives of those to come—those who might be spared—can give meaning to our belated efforts to bring an end to the Vietnam war.

List of names follows:

DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM FROM JULY THROUGH DECEMBER 1970

- CALIFORNIA
  - Army
    - Bowers, Richard Alan, Long Beach.
    - Hernandez, Frank Sanchez, Fresno.
  - Marine Corps
    - Ramos, Luis, San Bernardino.
- CONNECTICUT
  - Air Force
    - Dauten, Frederick W. Jr., Gullford.
- FLORIDA
  - Army
    - Lakes, Carl John, Clearwater.
- GEORGIA
  - Army
    - Boles, Robert Madison, Columbus.
    - Braswell, Donny Joe, Lawrenceville.
    - Browning, Bill Gwinn, Lyerly.
    - Bryant, David Eugene, Warner Robins.
    - Burgess, Cleatis Lynn, Meigs.
    - Carter, Larry Reaumaine, Monticello.
    - Cordle, Donald Calvin, Milledgeville.
    - Crumpton, Eugene Hayward, Macon.
    - Davis, Larry Franklin, Ellijay.
    - Duncan, Onnie David, Vidalia.
    - Graves, Randolph Edwin, Cataula.
    - Grimes, Lloyd Harold, II, East Point.
    - Hayes, David Barto, Columbus.
    - Hembree, James Thomas, Jr., Commerce.
    - Holmes, Harold Anthony, Pine View.
    - Ivey, Herman Fred, Lenox.
    - Jones, Mitchell, Jr. Thomasville.
    - Kille, John Terrence, Millen.
    - Mercer, Jimmy Henry, Hazelhurst.
    - Olson, Steven Allan, Chamblee.
    - Shannon, Earl Edwin, Milledgeville.
    - Toler, Robert Wilber, Jr., Hazelhurst.
    - Vaughn, Joseph Douglas, Savannah.

- Walker, Walter Lewis, Stapleton.
- Warren, John Owen, Augusta.
- Marine Corps
  - Faust, Timothy Ray, Atlanta.
  - Gray Clifford, Macon.
- ILLINOIS
  - Army
    - Inboden, Steve Lee, Springerton.
- IOWA
  - Army
    - Johnson, Steven Charles, Alford.
    - McKibben, William Russell, Marshalltown.
- Air Force
  - Klein, Russell Leo, Marengo.
- Marine Corps
  - Clark, William Martin, Runnells.
- KANSAS
  - Air Force
    - Train, Steve Warren, Lindsborg.
- KENTUCKY
  - Army
    - Pedigo, Charles Daniel, Lexington.
- LOUISIANA
  - Army
    - Calhoun, Durl Gene, Leesville.
- MASSACHUSETTS
  - Army
    - Brault, Dennis James, Worcester.
- MINNESOTA
  - Marine Corps
    - Wilbrecht, Kurt Michael, St. Paul.
- NEBRASKA
  - Army
    - Hamilton, Gerald Louis, Spencer.
- NEW MEXICO
  - Army
    - Galbreath, Terrell Robert, Albuquerque.
    - Pierce, Robert Livingston, Albuquerque.
- NEW YORK
  - Army
    - Coons, Robert Wayne, Johnstown.
    - Haight, Stephen Harold, Cazenovia.
    - Preiss, Robert Francis, Jr., Cornwall.
    - Trimm, Archie Edward, Colton.
  - Air Force
    - Gray, James Anthony, New York.
- NORTH CAROLINA
  - Marine Corps
    - Peddie, Michael Ray, Winston-Salem.
    - Tucker, Donny Lynn, Stanfield.
- OHIO
  - Army
    - Adkins, Norman Dale, Bedford.
    - Gumbert, Robert William, Jr., New Richmond.
    - Hamilton, Marcus James, Logan.
- OKLAHOMA
  - Army
    - Green, James Arvil, Boynton.
- PENNSYLVANIA
  - Marine Corps
    - Bugman, David Charles, Fairview.
- SOUTH CAROLINA
  - Army
    - Dover, Johnny Lewis, Jr., Gaffney.
- SOUTH DAKOTA
  - Army
    - Layton, Donald Dean, Aberdeen.
- TEXAS
  - Army
    - Little, Danny Leonard, Abilene.
- WASHINGTON
  - Army
    - Smith, Gus, Jr., Oso.

- WEST VIRGINIA
    - Army
      - Shannon, Garry Monzel, Mable.
  - WISCONSIN
    - Marine Corps
      - Scrifer, James Michael, Kenosha.
- DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM FROM JANUARY THROUGH MARCH 1971
- ALABAMA
    - Army
      - Bobo, Charles Glen, Guntersville.
      - Brooks, Jessie Michael, Irvington.
      - Gardner, Willie, Jr., Brent.
      - Hankins, Joel Richard, Huntsville.
      - Lamb, Howard Sidney, Gadsden.
      - Matthews, Charles Toney, Huntsville.
      - Prince, Harry Gordon, Jr., Salem.
      - Pryear, Johnnie Lee, Mobile.
      - Ruff, Ronald Calvin, Notasulga.
      - Sablan, Frank Aguan, Phenix City.
      - Schooley, James Daniel, Daphne.
      - Seaborn, William Herman, Jr., Birmingham.
      - Williams, Bobbie Lee, Parrish.
    - Marine Corps
      - Barton, David Allen, Montgomery.
      - Stracner, William Ellis, Sterrett.
    - Navy
      - Bradley, Tyrone Carlos, Mobile.
  - ALASKA
    - Army
      - Cox, Daniel Franklin, Elmendorf Air Force Base.
  - ARIZONA
    - Army
      - Adikai, Alvin, Jr., Window Rock.
      - Bayne, Michael John, Phoenix.
      - Bond, David Arthur, Phoenix.
      - Brown, Rick Samuel, Mesa.
      - Darling, Dennis Thomas, Phoenix.
      - Johnson, Rog, Phoenix.
      - Stockett, Richard Lee, Mesa.
    - Navy
      - Borg, Michael Royce, Tucson.
  - ARKANSAS
    - Army
      - Burton, Horace Lee, Texarkana.
      - Harris, Randall Lynn, West Memphis.
      - Latimer, Wilbur Dale, Searcy.
      - Palmer, Laymon, Little Rock.
    - Marine Corps
      - Allen, James Harlen, Perryville.
  - CALIFORNIA
    - Army
      - Bauer, Curtis Dean, Carson.
      - Bosworth, Terry Lee, Whitmore.
      - Carter, Greg Roy, Fresno.
      - Celano, Frank Anthony, Los Banos.
      - Chaudoin, Robert Conn, San Marino.
      - Clay, Russell Leland, Los Angeles.
      - Collazo, Raphael Lorenzo, Gardena.
      - Covert, Richard Dean, Jr., Pleasanton.
      - Dalenta, Zbigniew Joseph, Huntington Beach.
      - Damon, Michael Patrick, Sunnymead.
      - Davis, Alan Eunice, Tulare.
      - DeCelle, Robert Eugene, II, Alameda.
      - Halliday, Gary Dean, Atascadero.
      - Harris, Michael Leo, Vallejo.
      - Henderson, Tommy Ray, Los Angeles.
      - Johnson, William John, Santa Maria.
      - Kirkpatrick, William W., Torrance.
      - Krug, Stephen Paul, San Mateo.
      - Lara, Sabino, Jr., West Covina.
      - Larrabee, Steven Michael, Irvine.
      - Lopez, Peter Mitchell, Jr., Spring Valley.
      - Lyons, Chester George, San Jose.
      - Marlar, Olin Dewey, III, Santa Ana.
      - McLemore, John Wilson, Jr., Fresno.
      - Mendoza, David Ramirez, San Fernando.
      - Meyer, Kenneth Allen, Hayward.
      - Mills, Carroll Ray, Sunnyvale.
      - Nacca, Carl, Jr., Bakersfield.



Nakashimo, Masashi, Santa Barbara.  
 Padilla, Gary Teofilio, Sacramento.  
 Quintanilla, Jeffrey I., San Diego.  
 Ramos, Bernardo Kealoha, Watsonville.  
 Reis, Lucio Jon, Arroyo Grande.  
 Revis, Ronald James, Sacramento.  
 Rhodes, William Barton, Oakhurst.  
 Robertson, John Ernest, San Diego.  
 Rose, Leo James, Los Angeles.  
 Saldana, Richard David, Oxnard.  
 Schultz, Gary A., San Diego.  
 Shannon, Guy Gene, Jr., Sacramento.  
 Shaw, James Robert, Clovis.  
 Smith, David Hugh, Los Angeles.  
 Sokolof, Harvey Gerald, Los Angeles.  
 Stafford, James Hubert, Oakland.  
 Stone, Gregory Martin, Torrance.  
 Stone, Joseph Lamar, Desert Hot Springs.  
 Sysak, Craig Alan, San Pedro.  
 Taylor, David Thornton, Five Points.  
 Tivis, Johnny Earl, Rosemond.  
 Trester, David Alexander, Weaverville.  
 Tricker, Charles Rupert, La Mirada.  
 Troyano, Roland Dean, Newport Beach.  
 Voget, Donald Gustav, Bishop.  
 Ward, James Craig, McKinleyville.  
 Watterson, Dennis Ray, Oildale.  
 Yell, Glen Howard, Oakland.

*Marine Corps*

Denny, Jackie Lee, Buena Park.  
 Estrada, Maximino, Chico.  
 Pierce, William Earvin, Azusa.  
 Six, Christopher James Roy, Covina.

*Navy*

Collins, Michael Raymond, Martinez.

## COLORADO

*Army*

Doody, Thomas Patrick, Grand Junction.  
 Hertz, Robert Dale, Denver.  
 Howell, Duane George, Pueblo.  
 Johnson, David Charles, Grand Junction.  
 Mitchell, Larry Gene, Colorado Springs.  
 Osborn, Donald Keith, Loveland.  
 Sandoval, Jose Ramon, Fort Lupton.  
 Thorne, Robert Walter, Denver.  
 Vigil, Frederick Anthony, Thornton.

## CONNECTICUT

*Army*

Ayers, Douglas Edward, Plainville.  
 Meeker, Marc Jeffery, Durham.  
 Mixer, David Ives, Darien.  
 Vollhardt, Philipp R., West Redding.

## DELAWARE

*Army*

Anderson, Charles Richard, Newark.  
 Bailey, Donald Ray, Willow Grove.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

*Army*

Butler, Winston, Jr., Washington.  
 Fells, William Henry, Washington.  
 Warren, Manasseh Brock, Washington

## FLORIDA

*Army*

Black, Robert Dennis, Jr., Tallahassee.  
 Carter, James Basil, Orlando.  
 Fishbeck, Jay John, Coral Gables.  
 Gentry, Robert Barry, Orlando.  
 Gjcowski, Stephen Douglas, Fort Myers.  
 Hernandez, Noel Barbaro, Miami.  
 Ivey, Tommy Hubert, Auburndale.  
 Knight, Richard Vincent, Jr., Ormond Beach.

McKay, Eugene Henry, III, Orlando.  
 McKellips, Randolph Burns, Cocoa Beach.  
 Mead, Dale Walter, Bradenton.  
 Mjllen, Daniel Jerry, Gulf Breeze.  
 Nixon, Jesse Ernest, Mulberry.  
 Rigsby, Randy Marvin, Maitland.  
 Travers, Louis Wesley, Jacksonville.  
 Ward, Johnny Newton, Jr., Sarasota.

*Air Force*

Scrivener, Stephen Russell, Tampa.

*Marine Corps*

Rigdon, Ronald Michael, Waldo.

*Navy*

Thames, James Franklin, Ponte Vedra Beach.

## GEORGIA

*Army*

Brown, Albert Lee, Monticello.  
 Duncan, Benjamin Wayne, Baconton.  
 Eberhart, Samuel Houston, Atlanta.  
 Fields, Bobby Jene, Dahlonega.  
 Hiscock, Stephen Mayo, Atlanta.  
 Holtzclaw, Philip Bruce, Omaha.  
 Luse, Michael John, Atlanta.  
 Michael, James Albert, Gainesville.  
 Patterson, Wayne O'Neal, Columbus.  
 Pritchett, Carl Wayne, Forest Park.  
 Royal, William Earl, Screven.  
 Rushing, Kenneth Roger, Baxley.

*Marine Corps*

Potts, Bartow Wesley, Jr., Macon.

## HAWAII

*Army*

Gaa, Joseph William, Jr., Kealakekua.  
 Kong, Brian Wallace, Honolulu.  
 Naki, William, III, Kaneohe.  
 Opperman, Hugh Daniel, Honolulu.  
 Pakele, Fred Dale, Honolulu.

*Marine Corps*

Malabey, Benjamin Keali'i, Maili.

## ILLINOIS

*Army*

Buckles, Richard Dean, Bloomington.  
 Callif, James Patrick, Northlake.  
 Carson, Richard Ray, Tuscola.  
 Creech, William Owen, Jr., Palls.  
 Danay, Jerry Lee, Rock Island.  
 Easton, David Everett, Norman.  
 Farrell, Daniel Francis, Danville.  
 Gasperich, Frank John, Jr., Joliet.  
 Gray, Allen Ray, Belleville.  
 Jamrock, Philip Robert, Burnham.  
 Leroy, Jerome Edward, Kankakee.  
 Ljcechi, Aerio Joseph, Jr., Nokomis.  
 Milam, Calvin Edward, Elgin.  
 Milco, William John, Chicago.  
 Mozdzen, Dale Michael, Chicago.  
 Myers, Harold Edwin, Rockport.  
 Newbould, William George, Chicago.  
 Peffer, Gregory Lee, North Aurora.  
 Porter, Delbert Ray, Louisville.  
 Siddons, James Garland, Chicago.  
 Asper, Ivan Richard, Jr., Mishawaka.

## INDIANA

*Army*

Austin, James Earl, South Bend.  
 Benton, Arnold Ray, Odon.  
 Brinegar, Barry Lynn, Patriot.  
 Brown, Dewitt Wilcox, III, Indianapolis.  
 Clodfelter, Darrel Jay, Indianapolis.  
 Crawford, Gordon Lee, Fort Wayne.  
 Green, George Curtis, Jr., Attica.  
 Molhern, Michael Shea, Gary.  
 Medjesky, Vincent Joseph, Indianapolis.  
 Neal William Edward, Martinsville.  
 Renner, Matthew Mark, Crown Point.  
 Smith, Lyle Elton, South Whitley.  
 Thompson, Randall Alan, Evansville.  
 Vogelpohl, Rex Alan, Butler.  
 White, Steven Rudolph, Washington.

*Air Force*

Engle, Charles Edwin, Carlos.  
 Harris, James Craig, Liberty Center.

## IOWA

*Army*

Austin, Larry Dean, Des Moines.  
 Bergantzel, Albion Joe, Henderson.  
 Boots, Stephen Eldon, Des Moines.  
 Bowers, Richard Saulers, Pleasantville.  
 Cutting, Jerry Woodrow, Davenport.  
 Fricke, Patrick Loyal, Le Claire.  
 Lawson, Michael Carter, Cincinnati.  
 Ljerken, Marvin Allen, Central City.  
 Maloney, Michael Kevin, Davenport.  
 McCutcheon, Frank S., III, Des Moines.

McDowell, Steven Douglas, Keokuk.  
 Meyer, David Lee, Charles City.  
 Olsen, Cecil Chancey, Rowley.  
 Tjcker, Kenneth Wayne, Marshalltown.

*Navy*

Birky, Harold Edwin, South English.

## KANSAS

*Army*

Ast, Steven Vincent, Emporia.  
 Corr, Clifford Wayne, Viola.  
 Hageman, Joel Thomas, Wichita.  
 Head, David Neil, Arkansas City.  
 Kramer, Kevin Clinton, Wichita.  
 Peel, Lawrence R., Kansas City.  
 Smith, Stephen Lee, Ottawa.

*Air Force*

Ramsey, Milton Hardin, Kansas City.

*Marine Corps*

Raimey, Christopher Lag, Topeka.

## KENTUCKY

*Army*

Champlin, John Robert, Hebron.  
 Coffey, Robert Daniel, Sturgis.  
 Cox, William Gayle, Louisville.  
 Doan, Terry Wayne, Elizabethtown.  
 Graham, John Meigs, Owensboro.  
 Johnson, Larry Patrick, Louisville.  
 King, Harry Carlton, Louisville.  
 Langnehs, Michael William, Shively.  
 Marshall, Clifford Wayne, Richmond.  
 Miley, Joseph Wayne, Covington.  
 Simon, James Martin, West Louisville.  
 Southerland, Cecil Wayne, Moreland.  
 St. Clair, Charles David, Coxs Creek.  
 Thompson, George, Jr., Harlan.

## LOUISIANA

*Army*

Anthony, Joseph Roy, Lafayette.  
 Coker, David Langston, Jr., Alexandria.  
 Craig, James Larry, Baton Rouge.  
 Darby, Paul, New Orleans.  
 Hart, Randolph Guy, Jr., Monroe.  
 Hayward, David Roy, Natchitoches.  
 Petty, Michael Harris, Des Allemands.  
 Pichon, Herman Edward, New Orleans.  
 Rainey, Vernon Edward, Metairie.  
 Smith, William David, Lafayette.  
 Higgins, Thomas Wayne, Lake Providence.

*Marine Corps*

Lindsay, Stephen Lee, Shreveport.

*Navy*

Lupo, Francis Davis, Lake Charles.

## MAINE

*Army*

Diphillipo, Rocco, Portland.  
 Soule, Charles Howard, Lewiston.  
 Tibbetts, Gordon Edmund, Boothbay.

## MARYLAND

*Army*

Berger, Barry Howard, Hyattsville.  
 Davis, John English, Baltimore.  
 Johnson, William Frank, Bel Air.  
 Monnett, Leonard Allen, Cumberland.  
 Molkey, Herbert Eugene, Jr., Mount Airy  
 Payne, Louis, Sr., Mount Ranier.  
 Pearson, Norman James, Herron.  
 Potts, Robert James, Baltimore.  
 Robertson, George Lord, Salisbury.  
 Rollins, Wade Hampton, Waldorf.  
 Selak, John Raymond, Baltimore.  
 Steinkirchner, Kenneth M., Baltimore.

*Marine Corps*

Woodburn, Larry Albert, Silver Spring.

## MASSACHUSETTS

*Army*

Austin, Michael Paul, Belchertown.  
 Babin, Jacob Benedict, Jr., Malden.  
 Ellison, Richard Wright, Granby.  
 Erlanson, Daniel Kenneth, Tewksbury.  
 Flood, William James, Jr., Randolph.  
 Jones, Bennie Frank, Brighton.  
 Kinsman, Gerald Francis, Foxboro.  
 Moore, Curtis Wayne, Templeton.  
 Rinehart, Richard Bennett, Natick.

*Marine Corps*

Marsden, Robert Paul, Randolph.

## MICHIGAN

*Army*

Barill, Peter Lino, Birmingham.  
 Beardsley, William Burdon, Bath.  
 Bovinette, Charles E., Jr., Lansing.  
 Bradley, Robert Timothy, Detroit.  
 Caccia, Carl Henry, Detroit.  
 Casino, Joseph Walter, Dafter.  
 Dalton, Robert Lloyd, Grand Rapids.  
 Enos, Robert Raymond, Jr., Warren.  
 Garten, James Ray, Detroit.  
 Hall, Dayle Raymond, Alma.  
 Holloway, Michael Scott, Wyoming.  
 Johnson, Willie, Jr., Jackson.  
 Maes, Daniel John, Jackson.  
 Marshall, Joseph Henry, III, Almont.  
 McGee, Carl Barry, Detroit.  
 Paul, James Lee, Riverview.  
 Randolph, Richard Dale, Saint Johns.  
 Ritsema, Warren Peter, Fremont.  
 Robison, Gary Herbert, Adrian.  
 Rushlow, Richard Leonard, Lincoln Park.  
 Stoakley, Gordon Alan, Detroit.  
 Stotts, Donald Maurice, Fenton.  
 Thelen, Robert Joseph, Fowler.  
 Traver, Crawford Henry, Montrose.  
 Van Dam, Bruce Allan, Holland.  
 Walerzak, William Thomas, Detroit.  
 Waszkiewicz, Dennis Lavern, Mikado.  
 Wunder, Robert Lee, Trenton.

*Air Force*

Somers, Richard Keith, Northville.

*Marine Corps*

Hrisoulis, Robert, Detroit.

*Navy*

Walker, Dale Allen, Livonia.

## MINNESOTA

*Army*

Baker, Raymond John, Minneapolis.  
 Bangert, Byron Allen, Albert Lea.  
 Blackburn, Richard Vincent, Minneapolis.  
 Brickman, Dewaine Lawrence, Brownsville.  
 Edwards, Charles Harold, Jr., Minneapolis.  
 Gulseth, Sheldon Lee, Strathcona.  
 Harper, Timothy Vaughn, Ceylon.  
 Karau, Ronald Dean, Lewisville.  
 Maki, Roger Lee, Duluth.  
 Nabben, Arthur S., Minneapolis.  
 Nelson, Russel Courtney, Minneapolis.  
 Olson, Thomas Percy, Minneapolis.  
 Plath, Steven Dale, St. Louis Park.  
 Stoen, Marcus Sherwin, Pelican Rapids.

*Marine Corps*

Boeck, Gary Raymond, Braham.  
 Christensen, Bruce Arden, St. Paul.  
 Karger, Gregory Scott, Duluth.  
 Saathoff, Raymond Joseph, Blaine.  
 Wagner, Kenneth James, St. Paul.

## MISSISSIPPI

*Army*

Avant, Joe Lynn, Water Valley.  
 Shingler, Roy Dell, Vicksburg.  
 Stuart, Lee Davis, Jr., Hattiesburg.  
 Weathersby, James Earl, Prentiss.

## MISSOURI

*Army*

Biglieni, Charles Robert, Republic.  
 Coleman, Lonald Ray, De Soto.  
 Crowder, Neal Steven, Bourbon.  
 Duff, Robert Darrel, Cainville.  
 Fish, Gordon Alidean, St. Joseph.  
 Gible, Donald Gene, Mayview.  
 Horn, Douglas Lee, Kansas City.  
 Karnes, Leslie Leroy, Sikeston.  
 Lukitsch, Frank Joseph, Jr., St. Louis.  
 Marshall, Larry Hunter, Ilmo.  
 Ruff, Gilbert Oliver, Jr., Florissant.  
 Seawel, Warren Paul, Sainte Genevieve.  
 Testorff, Thomas Edward, Kansas City.  
 Walters, Robert Daniel, St. Louis.  
 Webb, Wallis Wayne, Grovespring.

## MONTANA

*Army*

Frazier, Richard Beryl, Lincoln.

## NEBRASKA

*Army*

Heinz, John Dietrich, Lincoln.

## NEVADA

*Army*

Gomez, Joseph James, Las Vegas.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

*Army*

Cass, Frank Lee, Plymouth.  
 Hogan, John Lawrence, Exeter.  
 Malenfant, William Arthur, Nashua.  
 Roberge, Edmund Edward, Manchester.

*Marine Corps*

Porter, Richard Charles, Hanover.

## NEW JERSEY

*Army*

Czarnota, Christopher Zeno, Perth Amboy.  
 Hashagen, William Louis, Blairstown.  
 Jackson, Keith Michael, Cresskill.  
 Johnson, William Thomas, Atlantic City.  
 Mauro, Vincent Carmen, Jr., Trenton.  
 Miller, Thomas Craig, Pennsauken.  
 Serven, Paul Elliott, Ramsey.  
 Sterling, Charles Wesley, Ocean City.  
 Warner, Stephen Henry, Skillman.  
 Williams, William Lynn, Bernardsville.  
 Wohlrab, Bruce, Bergen.

*Air Force*

Mirrer, Robert Henry, Newark.

*Marine Corps*

Bingenheimer, James, Atlantic City.  
 Ford, Douglas Oakley, Glen Rock.  
 Ram, Cornelius Herbert, Jersey City.

## NEW MEXICO

*Army*

Bilbrey, Edmond David, Albuquerque.  
 Flores, Jerry, Las Vegas.  
 Klein, Jerome Don, Hollywood.  
 Marquez, Julian Ernest, Albuquerque.  
 Sandoval, Phillip James, Santa Fe.  
 Toledo, Thomas Ambrose, Jemez Pueblo.

## NEW YORK

*Army*

Ahrens, Russell George, Selden.  
 Allen, Eugene, New York.  
 Caracello, Anthony J., Jr., New York.  
 Clore, Lee William, Westchester.  
 Coon, David William, Fredonia.  
 Crawford, Douglas Jay, Bay Shore.  
 Curry, Francis Michael, Patchogue.  
 Druzinski, Karl Walter, New York.  
 Dupree, Wilbert Shelby, Jr., Jamaica.  
 Field, Gary Edgar, Columbia.  
 Foley, Brian Robert, Clarence.  
 Foti, Paul John, Long Island City.  
 Fox, David Nelson, Dryden.  
 Hammer, William John, Nassau.  
 Hart, Joseph Brendan, Richmond Hill.  
 Johnson, Edward A., Jr., Rockaway.  
 Johnson, Gerald, New York.  
 Kupkowski, John Valter, Bladell.  
 Lewis, Gary, New York.  
 Lockhart, John Thomas, Peekskill.  
 Mackey, Donald Andrew, Chenango Bridge.  
 McIntyre, James Anthony, New York.  
 Moran, David Alfred, Cold Brook.  
 Parmelee, Jeffrey Mathew, New York.  
 Picarazzi, James Vincent, Selkirk.  
 Randall, James Laverne, Addison.  
 Russell, Brian Patrick, New York.  
 Semmler, David Albert, Webster.  
 Shepherd, Thomas Christ, Sr., Ilion.  
 Silon, Joseph Arthur, Jr., Far Rockaway.  
 Spence, George Anthony, New York.  
 Studier, Richard Erwin, Clay.  
 Tworek, Gerald John, Buffalo.  
 Valerio, Thomas, New York.  
 Warren, Stephen Edward, Rochester.  
 Williams, James Thomas, Jr., New York.  
 Wolfenden, Harry, Syracuse.

*Air Force*

Davis, Aaron, Jr., Rochester.  
 Wissig, Edward Simon, Lake Ronkonkoma.

*Marine Corps*

Brito, Alfonso Antonio, New York.

## NORTH CAROLINA

*Army*

Abernethy, Reginald Joe, Maiden.  
 Anderson, Billy Ray, Winston-Salem.  
 Bagnal, Luther Nettles, III, Winston-Salem.  
 Burleson, Garney, Jr., Asheville.  
 Frazelle, Donald Jerome, Raleigh.  
 Hamrick, Donald Ralph, Shelby.  
 Harrell, Samuel Morgan, Indian Trail.  
 Price, Charles Mitchell, Monroe.  
 Rhash, Barry Arthur, Asheville.  
 Sarvis, Richard Lee, Durham.  
 Teeter, Roger Lynn, Salisbury.  
 Thigpen, William Hassell, Tarboro.  
 Whisenant, Stephen Lee, Charlotte.  
 Wright, Harvey Wayne, Laurinburg.

## NORTH DAKOTA

*Army*

Boehm, Richard John, Mandan.  
 Johnson, Myron Blaine, Mandaree.  
 Marthe, Randolph Lee, Esmond.

*Marine Corps*

Schossow, Dennis Robert, Sheldon.

## OHIO

*Army*

Baker, Frankie Guy, McAlester.  
 Becksted, Ronald James, Cleveland.  
 Bench, Clifford Eugene, Cambridge.  
 Bennett, Donald Casper, New Lexington.  
 Bennett, Victor Raymond, Jr., Haskins.  
 Brandon, Phillip Michael, Beallsville.  
 Bright, Paul Glen, Columbus.  
 Canas, Roberto Luis, Toledo.  
 Downey, Edward Francis, Jr., Cleveland.  
 First, Michael Bruce, Dowagiac.  
 Fisher, Ronald Jay, Akron.  
 Garrison, Ronald Millard, Canton.  
 Glenn, William Stuart, Akron.  
 Hill, Gerald William, Milford.  
 Hinson, Herbert Stephen, Cincinnati.  
 Hohman, Daniel John, Caldwell.  
 Hunter, John Clark, New Philadelphia.  
 Hutson, George Glenn, Cleveland.  
 Jackson, Ronald, Cincinnati.  
 Keetle, Jeffrey Charles, Ashland.  
 Lovelace, Kenneth, Bellefontaine.  
 Martin, Richard Lee, Cleveland.  
 McKee, Larry William, Delaware.  
 Pepper, Larry James, Jeffersonville.  
 Price, Billy Ray, Jr., Huntsville.  
 Ryan, Joseph Robert, Jr., Bedford.  
 Schmaltz, Douglas Ralph, Parma.  
 Schoenhoff, Robert John, Cincinnati.  
 Scott, Edward Earl, Jr., Parma.  
 Sgambati, Paul Anthony, Girard.  
 Smith, Dennis Arthur, Akron.  
 Thorne, Kevin Garner, Englewood.  
 Vencel, Albert Allen, Warren.  
 Weldon, Terrence Wayne, Cincinnati.

*Air Force*

Neill, John Mautz, Hiram.  
 Seeley, Douglas Milton, Marietta.

## OKLAHOMA

*Army*

Carney, Joshua Ell, McAlester.  
 Cowan, Darrell Wayne, Fairfax.  
 Crockett, Stanley Gene, Poteau.  
 James, Ricky Lynn, Sapulpa.  
 Peck, Steven Russell, Enid.  
 Sawney, Jackie Lee, Tulsa.  
 Shawnee, Clark Vernon, Lawton.  
 Truesdell, John Leroy, Enid.  
 White, Gary Sidney, Perry.

## OREGON

*Army*

Blocher, Russell, Glen, Dallas.  
 Brown, Joseph Gordon, Portland.  
 Dahl, Larry Gilbert, Portland.



Schumacher, Robert James, Lebanon.  
 Sharpe, Robert Ernest, Lake Oswego.  
 Sheer, Paul Arthur, Lakeview.  
 Spearman, Gordon Keith, Jr., Hermiston.  
 Strauser, John Charles, Coos Bay.  
 Tubb, James Calvin, Jr., Myrtle Point.  
 Wirth, Gordon Lee, Jr., Boring.

*Marine Corps*

Klein, Glen Charles, Pendleton.

## PENNSYLVANIA

*Army*

Albertson, Bernard George, Pittsburgh.  
 Barger, Kenneth Allen, Petrolia.  
 Beatty, Frederick Lee, Mapleton Depot.  
 Blackmon, William B., Jr., Philadelphia.  
 Bjrgdorfer, Stephen Walter, Vane.  
 Collins, James Frew, Vandergrift.  
 Comber, David Wayne, Philadelphia.  
 David, Gary Charles, Pottstown.  
 Easter, Denny Ray, Brownsville.  
 Geiger, Gary George, New Ringgold.  
 Holler, Roger Guy, Buffalo Mills.  
 Joyce, Van John, Philadelphia.  
 Kapusta, Edward John, Philadelphia.  
 Kinder, William Arthur, Pittsburgh.  
 Kiser, Robert Thomas, West Mifflin.  
 Kjlwicki, Richard Stanley, Pittsburgh.  
 Markey, James Paul, Jr., Warminster.  
 Mason, Theodore Raymond, Atglen.  
 Montross, Charles Paul, Warminster.  
 Park, Richard Lewis, Burnt Cabins.  
 Peace, Charles Lamont, Sharon Hill.  
 Redmon, Stanley Eugene, Philadelphia.  
 Stahl, Roger William, Somerset.  
 Stephenson, Ronald Dee, Monroeville.  
 Valente, Glenn Curtis, Coatesville.  
 Walker, Robert Lamont, Jr., Vandergrift.  
 Wright, Michael Dale, Duncannon.  
 Young, Frederick Anthony, Clarksburg.

*Marine Corps*

Baldauf, Frederick William, Pittsburgh.  
 Miller, John Russell, Gettysburg.

*Navy*

Barnett, Samuel Hoyt, Washington.  
 Vasey, William Charles, Doylestown.

## RHODE ISLAND

*Army*

Carroll, Raymond Frank, Providence.  
 Lebrun, Robert Normand, Woonsocket.  
 Lilley, David William, Coventry.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

*Army*

Coleman, Olan Dan, Buffalo.  
 Foster, James Byrd, Jr., Greenville.  
 Geddings, John Hughie, Sumter.  
 King, Thomas Pickett Byrd, Hartsville.  
 Mullinax, James Carlton, Jr., Greenville.  
 Pace, Gary Lynn, Easley.  
 Phillips, Lawrence, Greenwood.  
 Williams, Harris Lee, Mullins.  
 Woods, William Stephen, Mauldin.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

*Army*

Thormodsgard, Arvid Palmer, Alcester.  
 Zeigler, Thomas Lee, Hamill.

*Air Force*

Uhlis, Willis Grant, Spearfish.

## TENNESSEE

*Army*

Carr, Harold Edward, Nashville.  
 Coffey, William Louis, Oneida.  
 Elam, John, Jr., Tiptonville.  
 Hollowell, Dale Mitchell, Henderson.  
 Howell, John William, Bolivar.  
 Kallaber, Charles P., Memphis.  
 Kennedy, Thomas Martin, Knoxville.  
 Leamon, Larry Dewayne, Harrison.  
 Loden, Larry David, Memphis.  
 Martin, Joseph Venson, Etowah.  
 Robinson, Dallas Dean, Trade.  
 Woodard, Michael David, Nashville.

## TEXAS

*Army*

Allen, Daniel Webster, Jr., Fort Worth.  
 Barnwell, Jackie Wayne, El Paso.

Bass, George Clinger, San Antonio.  
 Boykin, Kenneth Lee, Andrews.  
 Calhoun, Edwin Gerald, Duncanville.  
 Cleveland, Melvin Ray, San Leon.  
 Coble, Clyde Wayne, El Paso.  
 Coronado, Robert, Dallas.  
 Crossley, Michael Lee, Houston.  
 Delgado, Carlos Martinez, San Antonio.  
 Dobroski, John Lee, Houston.  
 Dodd, Eddie Leroy, Lubbock.  
 Edgemon, James Edward, Bellevue.  
 Elizondo, David, Corpus Christi.  
 Fernandez, William M., Houston.  
 Garza, Genaro, San Benito.  
 Kincer, Alfred Lemuel, III, San Antonio.  
 Koschke, Michael Edward, Darrouzett.  
 Leary, Paul Edward, Jr., Abilene.  
 Malone, William Walter, Waco.  
 McCarthy, Glenn Weldon, Texas City.  
 Oliver, Robert Lynn, Cleveland.  
 Ortega, Joe Lucio, Jr., San Antonio.  
 Owen, Samuel Taylor, Fort Worth.  
 Parnell, Billy Ray, Winnie.  
 Plaster, Billy Joe, Jr., Alvin.  
 Quintanilla, Francisco, Jr., Mission.  
 Salinas, Roy Rodriguez, Edinburg.  
 Simpson, Morris Alfred, Richland Hills.  
 Smith, Roy Milton, Houston.  
 Taff, George Thomas, Jr., College Station.  
 Tucker, James Edward, Jr., Houston.  
 Whirlow, Roger Dale, Odessa.

*Air Force*

Campbell, Clyde William, Longview.  
 Hull, James Larry, Lubbock.  
 Tijerina, Albert, Jr., San Angelo.

*Marine Corps*

Alaniz, Amado, Jr., Pawnee.  
 Brumley, Merrell Eugene, Jr., Terrell.  
 Sony, Thomas Anthony, Houston.

*Navy*

Newcomb, Clifton Curtis, Brownfield.

## UTAH

*Army*

Keller, Bruce M., West Jordan.  
 Kimber, Terrell Olin, Brigham City.  
 Nielsen, Terry Lee, Salt Lake City.  
 Price, Terry Hunter, Salt Lake City.  
 Yates, Lewis Rickey, Kearns.

## VIRGINIA

*Army*

Armentrout, Raymond Lee, Weston.  
 Galloway, Arthur Lee, Jr., Williamsburg.  
 Helbert, Roy Lee, Richlands.  
 Hensley, Shelby Gleason, Cripple Creek.  
 Larson, Gary Wayne, Arlington.  
 Logan, Charlie Matthew, Virginia Beach.  
 Pullam, Robert Lee, Petersburg.  
 Vencill, Eddie Wayne, Hanover.  
 Wilson, Jonathan Traxler, Richmond.

*Navy*

Buckley, Victor Patrick, Falls Church.

## WASHINGTON

*Army*

Bradshaw, Paul Leslie, Leavenworth.  
 Clearwaters, Christopher L., Seattle.  
 English, Steve Craig, Seattle.  
 Felton, Melvin James, Spokane.  
 Lancaster, David Clyde, Everett.  
 Loobey, Merle E., Olympia.  
 Simonson, Larry Arnold, Mercer Island.  
 Smith, Mitchell Bruce, Tacoma.  
 Taulala, Tagipo Vaoga, Seattle.

*Air Force*

Eisenbeisz, Robert Arthur, Seattle.

*Navy*

Moe, Lester James, Olympia.

## WEST VIRGINIA

*Army*

Hatfield, Druey Lee, Lorado.  
 McClanahan, Terry Lee, Chesapeake.  
 Moore, Stephen Alan, Nitro.  
 Morgan, Rodney Eugene, Simon.  
 Phelix, Stephen Ray, Winfield.  
 Wilson, Arthur, Jr., Milton.  
 Woolridge, Thornton Lewis, Skygusty.

## WISCONSIN

*Army*

Caiton, Dennis Arnold, Baraboo.  
 Kihl, Patrick James, Milwaukee.  
 Koehn, Brian Robert, Campbellsport.  
 Ljke, John Albert, Rapid Woods.  
 Manthel, James Walter, Kewaskum.  
 Mezera, Terry Francis, Eau Claire.  
 Monson, Phillip Dean, Gratiot.  
 Pederson, Roger Allen, Elk Mound.  
 Robinson, Lance Allen, Brookfield.  
 Rocha, Jose Marie, Milwaukee.  
 Schmoll, James Kenneth, Shiocton.  
 Sjchon, Clarence Myron, Stevens Point.  
 Teresinski, Joseph Alvin, Oneida.

*Air Force*

Krueger, Dean Wilbur, Devilsville.  
 Smith, James Leonard, Larsen.

## WYOMING

*Army*

Slagowski, Benjamin Eugene, Evanston.  
 Tabor, Richard Eugene, Cheyenne.

## GUAM

*Army*

Nededog, Emilio Ninansen, Agat.  
 Pangelinan, Pedro Cabera, Agana.

## PUERTO RICO

*Army*

Benitez, Rafael Rivera, Hato Rey.  
 Brgos-Torres, Benjamin, Cayey.  
 Espinosa, Juan, Yabucoa.  
 Rodriguez, Reinaldo Rein, Guanica.

## DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM FROM APRIL THROUGH JUNE 1971

## ALABAMA

*Army*

Cooper, Jeffrey Lance, Huntsville.  
 Crear, Willis Calvin, Birmingham.  
 Eggleston, Robert, Leighton.  
 Franklin, Clarence Richard, Hamilton.  
 Glass, Arthur, Alabaster.  
 Grimsley, Lee Eldridge, Abbeville.  
 Hall, Ronald Hugh, Cullman.  
 James, Willie, Jr., Mobile.  
 Johnson, Joseph Wallace, Tallassee.  
 Jones, Ralph Wayne, Billingsley.  
 Lecates, Robert Burton, Florence.  
 Mims, Kenneth Edward, Montgomery.  
 Powell, Abraham, Wetumpka.  
 Summerlin, J. C., Brewton.  
 Williams, Melvin James, Birmingham.

## ALASKA

*Army*

Lang, Mickey Daniel, Anchorage.

## ARIZONA

*Army*

Applegate, Paul Orben, Tucson.  
 Burnside, Derrill Lee, Kingman.  
 Cjrran, John Dehaas, Phoenix.  
 Fiesler, Robert Nathan, Bisbee.  
 Jauregui, David Cruz, Flagstaff.  
 Littleton, John Wayne, Flagstaff.  
 Ljbbhusen, Gerald Martin, Phoenix.

## ARKANSAS

*Army*

Hall, Joseph Lindsey, Little Rock.  
 Hively, Bennie Ray, Jonesboro.  
 Sabatini, Robert Joseph, Tontitown.  
 Smith, William Taft, North Little Rock.

## CALIFORNIA

*Army*

Balley, Terry Joe, Lancaster.  
 Barbee, Richard Lordy, Salinas.  
 Birchim, James Douglas, Independence.  
 Black, Paul Vernon, Central Valley.  
 Cain, Robert Keith II, Valinda.  
 Cardwell, James Melvin, Castro Valley.  
 Chubb, John Jacobsen, Gardena.  
 Conniff, Thomas Joseph, Los Angeles.  
 Crone, Donald Everett, Whittier.  
 Dehnke, Dale Willard, Canoga Park.  
 Desmond, Ray Glen, Pico Rivera.

Engen, Robert Joseph, Stockton.  
 Esparza, Joseph David, Santa Monica.  
 Espinoza, Alfonso Louis, Jr., Compton.  
 Foley, Lonnie Dee, Santa Paula.  
 Gayosso, Joe Frank, Montebello.  
 Grantham, Robert Eugene, Los Angeles.  
 Gruber, John Henry, Sacramento.  
 Hall, Walter Ray, Los Angeles.  
 Hata, Glenn Lee, Gardena.  
 Hayes, Joseph D., Weed.

Hein, Robert Charles, Sacramento.  
 Johnson, Gary Lee, Malibu.  
 Kelly, Eric Melvin, Fullerton.  
 Lee, Richard Norman, La Mirada.  
 Maness, Steven Wayne, Ivanhoe.  
 Medina, David Phillip, San Jose.  
 Melim, Jon Michael, Mountain View.  
 Miranda, Manuel, Tujunga.  
 Montes, Leonard Daniel, Woodlake.  
 Nettle, William Leroy, Mountain View.  
 Nichols, James Arthur, Los Angeles.  
 Posey, Ralph Edward, Fresno.  
 Reza, Leonard, Patterson.  
 Roberson, Arthur Paul, Banning.  
 Sanchez, Jose Angel, Bakersfield.  
 Sharp, Philip Dean, Fortuna.  
 Stephenson, Bruce Donald, Santa Clara.  
 Stewart, Paul Clark, Buena Park.  
 Suedmyer, Larry Dean III, Tulelake.  
 Sutherland, James Edward, Garberville.  
 Taylor, James Harry, Oroville.  
 Trujillo, Felix Marcial, Carson.  
 Uhl, Robert Dale, San Mateo.  
 Varner, Douglas Allen, Lancaster.  
 Wentworth, John Vester, Santa Clara.  
 Whitaker, Michael Joseph, Los Angeles.  
 Witmer, Noel Bruce, McFarland.  
 Wolfe, William Edward, Fountain Valley.  
 Zimmerle, Rene August, Orange.

*Air Force*

Bjerk, William Carl, Los Angeles.

## COLORADO

*Army*

Adams, William Edward, Ft. Collins.  
 Pacheco, George Arthur, Denver.  
 Scoggin, Allen Dean, Nucla.  
 Simmons, John Wayne, Thornton.  
 Swanson, Jon Edward, Denver.  
 Whalen, Michael James, Aurora.  
 Yjgel, Louis Arthur, Thornton.

*Air Force*

Morgan, Burke Henderson, Manitou Springs.

## CONNECTICUT

*Army*

Kiser, Robert Jesse, Stamford.  
 Lavallee, Karl Joseph, Groton.  
 Lewis, Gary Lynn, Hartford.  
 Neale, Christopher Jonatha, W. Haven.

*Air Force*

Moriarty, Peter Gibney, Newington.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

*Army*

Dodson, Paul Alonzo, Sr., Washington.  
 Taylor, Darryl Wade, Washington.

## FLORIDA

*Army*

Baggett, Wayne Carlos, Tampa.  
 Ballance, Edmond Tello, Orlando.  
 Brzezinski, Bernard Francis, Clearwater.  
 Collum, William Edward, Jacksonville.  
 Dillender, William Edward, Naples.  
 Djbbeld, Orle John, Jr., Cocoa Beach.  
 Ferguson, Lowell Vernon, Jr., Avon Park.  
 Pedings, Billy Dean, Rockledge.  
 Ratcliff, Thomas Henry, Jacksonville.  
 Thomas, Charles F. IV, Palm Bay.  
 Traver, John Grove III, Jacksonville.  
 Wieben, Otto Tom, Ft. Lauderdale.  
 Williams, Lamar Longo, Jacksonville.

*Air Force*

Kerr, John Creighton Gilie, Mary Esther.

## GEORGIA

*Army*

Barker, Jack Lamar, Waycross.  
 Bradshaw, Floyd Lee III, Boston.

Daniel, Cantrell Monro III, Atlanta.  
 Dozier, John Tillman II, Atlanta.  
 Elrod, William Carroll, Jr., Byromville.  
 King, Michael Eli, Calhoun.  
 McDowell, William Clayton, Brunswick.  
 Meadows, Roy Lester, Ashburn.  
 Payne, Howard David III, Doraville.  
 Terry, Patrick Wayne, Moultrie.  
 Wood, David Beavers, Douglasville.

*Marine Corps*

Windsor, David Warren, Jr., Guyton.

## HAWAII

*Army*

Ignacio, Roy, Wahiawa.  
 Snowden, Thomas Edwards, Honolulu.

## IDAHO

*Army*

Broenneke, Leonard Lee, Moscow.  
 Cordon, Ralph Brent, Idaho Falls.  
 Powers, John Lynn, Mackay.

## ILLINOIS

*Army*

Alexander, James Patrick, Green Rock.  
 Arneson, Marcus Eugene, Glenview.  
 Brummer, Michael Lee, Jewett.  
 Davis, Clyde, Chicago.  
 Dowjotas, Gerald Jay, Downers Grove.  
 Fischer, Norman Charles, Granite City.  
 Fivelson, Barry Frank, Evanston.  
 Gammon, Larry James, Benton.  
 Garber, Wayne Arthur, Granite.  
 Hjart, Martin Reinhold, Jr., Addison.  
 Jennings, William Clarence, Chicago.  
 Kowalk, Charles Norbert, Melrose Park.  
 Lawrence, Johnny Harold, Manteno.  
 Meyer, David Paul, Collinsville.  
 Montes, Miguel Alejandro, Chicago.  
 Orr, George James, Lincoln.  
 Rog, Edward Joseph, Jr., Chicago.  
 Shanks, James Everett, Springfield.  
 Spencer, Stephen Alan, Alton.  
 Trumblay, Leonard James, Chicago.  
 Walsh, Williams Thomas Jr., Chicago.

*Air Force*

Smith, Joseph Stanely, Assumption.  
 Witte, Roger Earl, Collinsville.

*Marine Corps*

Dickie, Dennis Michael, Downers Grove.

## INDIANA

*Army*

Brown, David Clarence, Cedar Lake.  
 Creamer, Charles Forak, III, South Bend.  
 Fjrr, William Renard, Ft. Wayne.  
 Gettelfinger, Thomas J., New Albany.  
 Gross, Columbus Virgie, Rensselaer.  
 Houston, Mark Joseph, Terre Haute.  
 Kiger, James Robert, Buffalo.  
 Lewellen, Walter Edward, New Albany.  
 McKinney, Robert Dale, Valparaiso.  
 Nolen, Paul Mickle, Kingman.  
 Powell, James Benjamin, Jr., New Castle.  
 Smith, Ronald Eugene, Covington.  
 Taft, Thomas Harold, Indianapolis.  
 Taylor, Mark Randall, Chesterton.  
 Teeter, Hilbert Walter, Hobart.

## IOWA

*Army*

Brooks, Wheeler David, Ollie.  
 Cook, Charles William, Tama.  
 Craver, Dennis Martin, Centerville.  
 Crooks, Douglas Eugene, Boone.  
 Delehant, Thomas Francis, Dunlap.  
 Hendricks, Steven Wayne, Hawarden.  
 Lockwood, Richard Jon, Cedar Rapids.  
 McConkey, Wayne Allen, Shenandoah.  
 Mitchell, Steven Michael, Des Moines.  
 Stansbarger, Richard Laure, Clinton.  
 Thomason, Kenneth Arthur, Algona.

## KANSAS

*Army*

Poke, Donald Maurice, Kansas City.

## KENTUCKY

*Army*

Armstrong, Joseph Larry, Vine Grove.  
 Blatz, Thomas Lee, Shepherdsville.

Butcher, Bruce Edward, Lexington.  
 Carter, Paul Dean, Louisville.  
 Glass, Phillip Scott, Mount Eden.  
 Goodrich, Jeffery Camon, Gratz.  
 Hale, John Douglas, Brandenburg.  
 Orr, Patrick O'reilly, Ft. Thomas.  
 Stout, James Robert, Valley Station.

## LOUISIANA

*Army*

Billeaud, Wayne James, Scott.  
 Marcantel, Elbert, Mamou.  
 Myles, James Walter, Bossier City.  
 Thomas, James Ronald, New Orleans.  
 Wiesendanger, Lawrence Lou, Metairie.

## MAINE

*Army*

McLaughlin, James Bruce, Bangor.

*Air Force*

Churchill, Carl Russell, Bethel.

## MARYLAND

*Army*

Barnard, Harold Edward, Silver Spring.  
 Cherry, Ervin Benjamin, Baltimore.  
 Imler, Harold Eugene, Jr., Baltimore.  
 Saxon, James Russell, Glen Burnie.  
 Weisman, Donald Eugene, Wheaton.

## MASSACHUSETTS

*Army*

Bengston, Frank Walter, Millbury.  
 Gray, Richard Joseph, Salem.  
 Likely, Richard Allen, Auburndale.  
 MacNeil, Edmund Lamber, III, Winthrop.  
 Thompson, William F., Jr., Chelsea.

## MICHIGAN

*Army*

Alvarez, Bernard Rodrigue, Jackson.  
 Binkley, Stuart Marshall, Flint.  
 Crites, Franklin Thomas, Flint.  
 Drinkard, Danny George, Ferndale.  
 Djrand, Dennis Charles, Allen Park.  
 Eilers, Anthony Michael, Detroit.  
 Grof, Robert Lester, Lansing.  
 Hjorth, William Harold, Lansing.  
 Kirchner, Gary Allen, Belleville.  
 Leonard, Marvin Maurice, Grand Rapids.  
 Loux, James Arthur, Owosso.  
 Maki, Frank Rudolph, Fibre.  
 Nicklyn, Robert James, Detroit.  
 Plumm, Richard Dale, Charlevoix.  
 Potts, George Henry, Detroit.  
 Robertson, Mark John, Detroit.  
 Shinn, Gary James, Holly.  
 Taylor, Donnie Carl, Grand Rapids.  
 Toler, Richard George, Bay City.  
 Vollmar, Christopher Lee, Akron.  
 Yingling, Joseph Walter, Jr., Pontiac.  
 Zlotorzynski, Gerald, Detroit.

*Marine Corps*

Bower, Howard James, Jr., River Rouge.

*Navy*

Kowitz, David Ralph, Dearborn.  
 A. Gaard, Harold Lowell, Fosston.  
 Burns, Steven Craig, New Hope.  
 Firkus, James Ronald, Eagle Bend.  
 Gilbertson, Alan Dale, St. Paul.  
 Larson, Ronald Joe, St. Paul.  
 Lloyd, Allen Richard, St. Charles.  
 Olson, Jerome Andrew, Excelsior.  
 Schoolmeesters, Joseph A., Litchfield.  
 Westerberg, Kenneth Glen, Barnum.  
 Bryant, Maurice Herbert, Coahoma.  
 Humphres, Jimmy Darrel, Tremont.  
 Kenedy, William Michael, Meridian.  
 Nelson, Howard Hamilton, Yazoo City.  
 Sargent, Stanton Gerald, Grenada.  
 Warbington, Howard Otto, Pascagoula.  
 Wilson, Billie Joe, Tutwiler.  
 Yielding, Larry Thomas, Fulton.

## MISSOURI

*Army*

Benton, Carroll Joe, Cape Girardeau.  
 Channel, Billy Gene, Kansas City.  
 Cleve, Reginald David, Farmington.  
 Harris, James Braddock, Festus.  
 Herring, Billy Dale, St. Louis.



Hollingsworth, Gary Lynn, Paris.  
 Jiles, James, Jr., St. Louis.  
 Masden, Stephen Knight, Kansas City.  
 Miller, Larry Lee, Edgerton.  
 Schene, Terrence Richard, St. Louis.  
 Sly, Johnnie Rae, Independence.  
 Stoner, William Dennis, Macks Creek.  
 Verstraete, Michael James, Kansas City.  
 Waller, Harold Dean, Nelson.  
 Wilson, Michael Roy, St. James.  
 Wray, Steven Charles, Ferguson.

## NEBRASKA

## Army

Bales, Ronald Eugene, Scottsbluff.  
 Church, Ralph Lee, Hickman.  
 Johnson, Gary Lee, Omaha.  
 Scott, Michael Monroe, Ashland.  
 Wemhoff, Michael Lynn, Norfolk.

## Air Force

Kllinger, Michael Lee, McCook.

## NEVADA

## Army

Warren, Richard Michael, Las Vegas.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

## Marine Corps

Seybold, Gerald Calvin, Concord.

## NEW JERSEY

## Army

Berg, George Phillip, Belford.  
 Dempsey, Walter Edward, Jr., Glendora.  
 Digan, John Francis, Roselle.  
 Gilchrist, Ricky Dean, Somerset.  
 Hadley Stephen James, Chatham.  
 Kjkowski, Thomas, Montclair.  
 West, Donald Frederick, Lakehurst.  
 Winters, Christopher Micha, Rutherford.

## NEW MEXICO

## Army

Benavidez, Benjamin John, Montezuma.  
 Cordova, Chris B., Mosquero.  
 Sanchez, Charles Anthony, Mora.

## NEW YORK

## Army

Armstrong, Harold Kingsley, New York.  
 Corcoran, Edward Walter, Sunnyside.  
 Daniels, Rex Martin, Buffalo.  
 Deplaplaine, Donald Lynn, Bayville.  
 Dewey, Larry Richard, Weedsport.  
 Dillett, Leno Renaldo, New York.  
 Jackson, Leon Jerome, Yonkers.  
 Knutsen, Donald Paul, Buffalo.  
 McLeod, Arthur Edward, Bay Shore.  
 Norris, Alin Emile, Floral Park.  
 Osterhoudt, Clifford Roy, Homer.  
 Ramirez, Alberto Antonio, New York.  
 Sawtelle, Paul Coburn, Hicksville.  
 Schumacher, Jeffrey David, Fairport.

## NORTH CAROLINA

## Army

Anderson, Donnie Wray, Shelby.  
 Best, Arthur, Kenansville.  
 Bingham, Tony Ray, High Point.  
 Blackmond, Phillip Cornell, Louisburg.  
 Borowski, Wayne Roy, Fayetteville.  
 Crawley, Lawrence Erwin, Morganton.  
 Greene, Terry Willard, Nashville.  
 Harrison, Larry Gene, Williamston.  
 Hatley, Joel Clinton, Albemarle.  
 Howell, Ernest Richard, Goldsboro.  
 Jackson, Johnny, Smithfield.  
 Lee, Nathan Larry, Riegelwood.  
 McKenzie, Paul, Asheville.  
 McPeters, Michael Edgar, Nebo.  
 Navarrete, Job, Jr., Fayetteville.  
 Pilkington, Edward Percy, Clayton.  
 Roberts, Alton Reese, Gastonia.  
 Saxon, Johnny, Charlotte.  
 Sexton, Hugh Ames, Jr., Denton.  
 Ward, William James, Jr., Stantonsburg.

## Air Force

Lang, Benjamin Gaines, Greensboro.

## NORTH DAKOTA

## Army

Miller, Pius Leo, Fargo.

## OHIO

## Army

Adkins, Henry Dale, Lorain.  
 Andrews, Willis Norwood, Cincinnati.  
 Ball, Edward Mearl, Cuyahoga Falls.  
 Blanton, Bill Edward, Dayton.  
 Blosser, Robert Keith, Kent.  
 Boddie, James Edward, Cleveland.  
 Boehm, Allen Thomas, Cincinnati.  
 Brewster, Carl Warden, Forest.  
 Brown, Merle Dewayne, Columbus.  
 Campbell, David Dana, Macedonia.  
 Crawford, Charles Marion, Lucas.  
 Dewine, Robert Bruce, Lima.  
 Djtikiewicz, Robert John, Toledo.  
 Evans, Ronald Lee, Morrow.  
 Fearn, Guy Victor, Fredericktown.  
 Gentkowski, John Steven, Elyria.  
 George, William Michael, Cleveland.  
 Haney, Keith Eugene, Piqua.  
 Lee, Phillip Lewis, Columbus.  
 Lewis, Charles Albert, Jr., Akron.  
 Long, Robert Lester, Wilmington.  
 McCoy, Albert, Jr., Friendship.  
 Morgan, Richard, Akron.  
 Najmola, John Henry, Canton.  
 Newport, Scott Herbert, Parma.  
 Pietrzak, Joseph Ray, Roseville.  
 Rogers, Larry Lee, Canton.  
 Spangler, John Flanagan, Akron.  
 Speidel, Louis John, Milford.  
 Taylor, William Kerry, Dayton.  
 Thomas, Jerry Lynn, Lima.  
 Wilcox, Charles Thomas, Chagrin Falls.  
 Williams, Hiawatha Henry, Dayton.  
 Wood, Donald, Cleveland.  
 Youngerman, George W., Jr., Vandalia.  
 Youngerman, Joseph Michael, Dayton.

## Air Force

Conaway, Lawrence Yerges, Columbus.

## OKLAHOMA

## Army

Armstrong, James Leonard, Pauls Valley.  
 Barnes, Herbert Spencer, Bixby.  
 Begley, Jack Perry, Jr., Oklahoma City.  
 Chriss, Gary Doyle, Ringwood.  
 Gibbons, Claude Robert, Oklahoma City.  
 Hall, Roy Ray, Tulsa.  
 Lester, Earl Roy, Jr., Stroud.  
 Reed, William Elbert, Mayfield.  
 Woods, Floyd William, Yale.

## Air Force

Jones, Richard Warren, Ada.

## OREGON

## Army

Calloway, Ronald Duane, Union.  
 Ellis, Steven John, Portland.  
 Farmer, Thomas Hoyt, Eugene.  
 Flores, Fidencio, Jr., Silverton.  
 Grogan, Kevin Douglas, Stanfield.  
 Murphy, Wayne Stephen, Dallas.  
 Sorensen, Dale Edward, Beaver.  
 Stearns, Jerry Sheldon, Tigard.  
 Strawn, John Thomas, Salem.  
 Wilson, John Lanning, Jr., Coquille.  
 Woods, Gerald Ernest, Salem.

## PENNSYLVANIA

## Army

Fisher, Edwin Frederick, Franklin.  
 Foy, Jerry, Philadelphia.  
 Fuhrman, Robert Michael, Erie.  
 Heasley, Edward Francis, Butler.  
 Homschek, Robert William, Duryea.  
 Matykiewicz, David Benjamin, Washington.  
 McDonald Martin Terrance, Philadelphia.  
 Moreira, Ralph Angelo, Jr., Beaver Falls.  
 Royer, Robert Henry, Lewistown.  
 Sweeney, Joseph Edward, Philadelphia.

## RHODE ISLAND

## Army

Benedetti, Vincent Mario, Providence.  
 Dalton, Michael Moran, Pawtucket.

## AIR FORCE

Glover, John, Newport.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Bowen, Matthew Anderson, Greenville.  
 Dearing, Philip Ray, Florence.  
 Helms, Jerry Donald, Ft. Mill.  
 Pruitt, Osier Lawrence, Inman.  
 Robinson, Melvin, Greenville.  
 Saylor, William, Jr., North.  
 Taylor, George Thomas, Jr., Mt. Pleasant.  
 Thompson, Charles Lee, Nesmith.

## TENNESSEE

## Army

Bradford, Terrill Edward, Tullahoma.  
 Cabe, Paul Phillip, Guild.  
 Hesse, Edwin, Rives.  
 Mathis, Donald Robert, Harriman.  
 Wilson, John Wesley, Memphis.

## TEXAS

## Army

Baumgardner, Thomas Edison, Jr., Ft. Worth.  
 Baumgardner, Thomas Edi, Jr., Ft. Worth.  
 Beggs, Terry Kent, Amarillo.  
 Boyd, Randall James, Tyler.  
 Chenault, Thomas Dudley, Gonzales.  
 Cowley, Jeffrey Edward, Freer.  
 Garcia, Edelmiro Leonel, Sr., Mercedes.  
 Jackson, James Donald, Ft. Worth.  
 King, Jack Lloyd, Deer Park.  
 Marker, Michael Wayne, Wichita Falls.  
 Martinez, Sylvester C., Waxahachie.  
 Nelson, Roy Lane, San Antonio.  
 North, Bennie Lee, San Antonio.  
 Oatman, Leo Clark, Weatherford.  
 Quiroz, Alexander, Austin.  
 Ramsey, Don Michael, Houston.  
 Rinard, Kevin Alonzo, Waco.  
 Rothel, Larry Wayne, Granbury.  
 Silva, Joe Reyes, San Antonio.  
 Smith, General DeWayne, Austin.  
 Speer, Robert Fritz, Dallas.  
 Staley, John Arthur, Houston.  
 Thompson, Donald Bruce, Ft. Worth.  
 Valtr, James Robert, El Paso.  
 Watson, Ronald Leonard, El Paso.  
 Weston, James Edward, Ft. Worth.  
 Wilkinson, Clyde David, Mineral Wells.  
 Williamson, Johnny Gordon, Henderson.  
 Winter, Peter Louis, Woodville.  
 Woodrum, John James, Houston.  
 Young, James Michael, Dallas.  
 Zepeda, Armando Marin, San Antonio.

## Navy

Wall, James Arthur, Atlanta.

## UTAH

## Army

Low, James Bernard, Beaver.  
 Skewes, Robert Joseph, Bountiful.  
 Winkle, David Ryan, Bountiful.

## Air Force

Powell, Lynn Kesler, Provo.

## VERMONT

## Army

Humphrey, Harvey Edward, Barnet.

## VIRGINIA

## Army

Blair, Thomas George, Jr., Springfield.  
 Boffman, Alan Brent, Norfolk.  
 Cochran, Gary Duane, North Tazewell.  
 Curry, Alvin Christoph, Portsmouth.  
 Dance, Lawrence Russell, Chester.  
 Hamilton, Kyle Stevens, St. Paul.  
 James, Clayton Wade, Amelia.  
 McGinnes, Charles Dennis, Roanoke.  
 Reynolds, Gary Lee, Barboursville.  
 Williams, George Hardy, Jr., Richmond.

WASHINGTON

Army

Brandt, Keith Allan, Bellingham.  
Crandall, Gregory Stephen, Tacoma.  
Forcum, Kevin Paul, Everett.  
Hall, Kimber Lynn, Seattle.  
Holm, Alan Hans, Othello.  
Humbert, Jean Pierre, Tacoma.  
Nelson, David Lindford, Kirkland.  
Osborne, Rodney Dee, Kent.

WEST VIRGINIA

Army

Carden, Albert Parker, Morgantown.  
Duncan, James Edward, Point Pleasant.  
Harvey, Thomas Preston, Lashmeet.  
Ohler, Herbert, Lester.  
Persinger, Robert Morrison, Alderson.  
Robinson, Loyd Eugene, Horner.  
Shamblin, Kenneth Wayne, Sissonville.

WISCONSIN

Army

Fitzgerald, David Bartlett, Milwaukee.  
Fricke, Eugene Marshall, Sheboygan.  
Giese, Michael Everett, Milwaukee.  
Gregorash, Lon Paul, Port Washington.  
Hentz, Richard Jay, Oshkosh.  
Leis, John Eugene, La Crosse.  
Westphal, Gary Lee, Bonduel.

WYOMING

Army

Glasspoole, Randall John, Riverton.  
Morganflash, Robert Lee, Moorcroft.

AMERICAN SAMOA

Army

Teo, Fiatele Taulago, Pago Pago.

GUAM

Army

Borja, Juan Santos, Agana.

PUERTO RICO

Army

Qjllshernandez, Antonio, Rio Piedras.  
Sotofigueroa, Jose Antonio, Caguas.

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

Army

Jeffries, Gabriel Augus, Jr., St. Croix.

BUSING VERSUS EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have completed tabulation of the returns on my 1971 public opinion poll. This year, the poll was marked by a highly unusual incident. An unasked question received a unanimous response; although I did not mention the topic on the poll, I had a very high percentage of those responding give me their views on busing of students to achieve so-called racial balance in schools. The opinions were 100 percent against.

I want to go into this unasked question in some detail, but first, the results of the questions asked, and some brief comment upon them. The figures are in percentages of direct answers to the question:

1. France has passed legislation which holds that each individual who voluntarily joins a mob is civilly and criminally responsible for any acts committed by the mob. Should we have such a law?

Yes ----- 82  
No ----- 18

2a. Should penalties for the use of marijuana be repealed?

Yes ----- 13  
No ----- 87

b. Should penalties for the sale of marijuana be repealed?

Yes ----- 11  
No ----- 89

3. Should American draft dodgers or military deserters who fled abroad be allowed to return without prosecution?

Yes ----- 11  
No ----- 89

4. Should the Government impose wage and price controls to fight inflation?

Yes ----- 72  
No ----- 28

5. Do you approve of the President's initiatives toward Peking, to be made without deserting allies and endangering our own security?

Yes ----- 80  
No ----- 20

These responses tell their own stories—1 shows that law and order is still very much an issue—2 indicates great opposition to moving this country closer to a drug culture—3 means any general amnesty, now recommended by some, is very much opposed—4 at one time, after the President's August 15 speech, hit a 92-8 return of approval; the overall figure shown above clearly indicates wide support for the President on his economic program—5 shows, I believe, that the people want this action, but with care, and always being faithful to our allies and to our own security.

I wish to take the balance of this poll report to discuss a question that was not asked, but which was certainly unanimously answered by an amazingly large number of those responding to the poll: busing of students outside of their neighborhood school districts for so-called racial balance.

BUSING AGAINST EDUCATION

Today, the American people are rising up in anger over the busing of their schoolchildren. They are sincerely aroused over the trend toward neglecting the true purpose of education and resorting to the busing of pupils hither and yon—busing them not to local neighborhood schools but far beyond their neighborhood schools. This growing concern is becoming increasingly noticeable in central Indiana.

I have been aware of this concern and have received more than 10,000 letters and names on petitions protesting this highhanded busing of pupils. I have spoken about this matter at some length before the House of Representatives in a speech entitled, "Education or Social Experimentation?" on July 30, 1969, and later in a speech, "Classroom for Chessboard: Pupils for Pawns," on October 7, 1970.

GREAT MAJORITY OPPOSES BUSING

Who is for busing? Who is attempting to divert education in this manner? As I stated before the House on July 30, 1969:

So who is for the busing concept? Parents? Certainly not. My mail and, I dare say, the mail of every Member of the Congress, is overwhelmingly against it. School superintendents? Nation School magazine, May,

1968, reported a poll showing 74 percent of the Nation's school superintendents were opposed to busing as a desegregation measure. School boards? The same survey had 88 percent opposed. Teachers? Today's Education Association research division survey showing 78 percent of the teachers were opposed to busing students from one district to another.

The momentum against busing is growing rapidly. The Gallup poll released September 11 of this year, discloses that only 18 percent of the American people favor busing and only 45 percent of the blacks favor it.

President Nixon stated his stand in his March 4, 1970 message on school desegregation which I quoted on the floor of the House on October 7, 1970:

First, deliberate official racial segregation is unlawful and must be eliminated at once—This is indisputably the law of the land and is recognized as such by all.

Second, the neighborhood school system is the most appropriate base for a public school system.

Third, transportation of students beyond normal geographic school zones to achieve racial balance will not be required.

On August 3, 1971, President Nixon re-emphasized his antibusing stand:

I am against busing as that term is commonly used in school desegregation cases. I have consistently opposed the busing of our Nation's schoolchildren to achieve racial balance and I am opposed to the busing of children simply for the sake of busing.

An increasing number, even among more militant civil rights leaders, while properly demanding equal educational opportunities for all, are becoming increasingly disillusioned about forced busing as the answer.

REASONS AGAINST BUSING

It is morally wrong to deny a pupil the right to go to his neighborhood school because of race or color; it is equally morally wrong to bus him away from his neighborhood school against his and his parent's wishes.

Busing enthusiasts have falsely attempted to justify busing by stating that busing has been the accepted practice for many years in the transportation of pupils to schools. Busing has been used to transport children to their neighborhood schools especially in rural districts where distance or other conditions made walking especially hazardous or difficult. But such busing was not used to transport children away from their school district to another and farther point.

Busing adds greatly to the cost of maintaining our schools and adds to the increasingly large financial burden of our homeowner and taxpayer who is seeing a major part of his tax dollar being spent for education. Today, the school patron is seeing his tax money being spent on busing rather than on bettering the educational system.

The child's health and development is disregarded in the busing. His work, his play and his association with his home are minimized because of the time that he must spend just sitting on a bus early in the morning and late into the evening. Who can say that the time and con-



venience of the child is of no import, yet busing completely disregards such.

Busing contributes to the disruption and the destruction of wholesome school, home and community pride such as PTO work, athletics, extra-curricular activities in music, drama, departmental projects, Sunshine and Booster Clubs, and so forth. It undermines the moral and civic pride that is so important in the developing youth. It leaves him confused as to loyalties or responsibilities to something in which he should have a proud interest.

Rather, it insinuates a sense of inferiority that the student should be bused to those superior or those superior should be bused to him. Such philosophy is false, frustrating, and degrading. The philosophy that has made America great, is that no one is inferior except as he makes himself inferior.

The present trend for ignoring the true purpose of education in resorting to busing could result in grave damage to our educational system and all that it means—our youth of today and the citizens they become tomorrow.

I would like to cite two widely varied sources, both of which point out how pertinent the grave dangers this ill-conceived busing philosophy may bring:

Our longshoreman-philosopher Eric Hoffer once said:

Those who would sacrifice a generation to realize an ideal are the enemies of mankind—no matter how noble the objectives of a government, if it blurs decency and kindness, cheapens human life, and breeds ill will and suspicion, it is an evil government.

The Indian philosopher Radhakrishnan put it this way:

If we believe absurdities, we shall commit atrocities.

We are now saddled with an absurdity called busing, which shall most certainly lead us directly to the atrocity of nothing less than sacrifice of a generation—not only this one, but those yet to come.

#### WHY INCREASING FEAR OF BUSING

The decision by Federal Court Judge, S. Hugh Dillin, in the case of the United States against Indianapolis Board of School Commissioners decided on August 18, 1971, generally referred to as the Dillin decision, intentionally or unintentionally has alerted the public generally to the grave dangers faced by our youth and by education. Prior to the Dillin decision, it appeared that only the pupils residing in the Indianapolis School District were to be exposed to the philosophy of busing taking precedence over education. Consequently those living outside the Indianapolis School District were relatively disinterested because they assumed that "it can't happen to us." It is now becoming apparent that if the Dillin decision is to become the law of the land, any pupil may be involved.

Was the Dillin decision attempting to tell us something—was it alerting us to the approaching danger—was it reducing to the extreme and absurd the philosophy of busing?

#### TOTAL IMPACT OF DILLIN DECISION

The total impact of the Dillin decision is not as yet clear, but the questions

raised by the Court are sufficient to bring deep concern to those who believe in the true principles of education. For a moment let us study the possible extent and damage that the busing philosophy may bring to the education of our youth.

The Dillin decision, if it is being interpreted correctly, specifically suggests not only the busing of pupils from school to school within the Indianapolis School District, but also busing them to and from the Indianapolis School District and County. This decision also suggests the busing of pupils from the Indianapolis School District across the Perry Township School District to and from the Greenwood School District in Johnson County. Also suggested is the busing of pupils to and from the Indianapolis School District across the Decatur Township School District into the Mooresville School District into Morgan County. Also suggested was the busing of pupils to and from the Indianapolis School District across the Wayne Township School District to the Plainfield School District in Hendricks County. If the Dillin decision is correct, the same to and fro busing could be resorted to from the Indianapolis School District to the schools of Franklin, Danville, Zionsville, Shelbyville, Lebanon, Martinsville, Brownsburg, Carmel, Noblesville, and Greenfield. In fact, if the Dillin decision remains the law of the land there is no limit to where the social-planners might send pupils—Gary or Jeffersonville.

It is interesting that there have been no allegations or even suggestions made that any of the school districts involved in the Dillin decision such as the Plainfield School District, the Greenwood School District, the Mooresville School District or any of the 11 school districts in Marion County, except the Indianapolis School District, are guilty of segregation.

#### HOW IT ALL BEGAN

Who is for busing? There is generally that group in every age and society who are dedicated to run other people's business—those who believe that they can settle all human problems if they can become the dictator and play "God." There are those who believe that if they can control where people can live, where they can go to school, where they can work, then they can bring about a utopia. Also in that group are those who would rule over people for ambitions and ulterior motives. These self-appointed social planners were given their grand opening and carte blanche authority when Harold Howe II was appointed Federal Commissioner of Education in December 1965. Then busing began taking precedence over the true principles of education. A Wall Street Journal story of August 12, 1966, as to Howe's busing program was headlined as follows:

Federal Officials Now Favor End to Tradition of Neighborhood School—New Education Commissioner Calls for Busing.

Armed with this manifesto from the high office of the Commissioner of Education, the buses moved in. These busing enthusiasts were given Federal Civil Service appointments in Education and in the Department of Justice. Because

these people cannot be fired even President Nixon, who opposed busing as contemplated by the social planners, has been frustrated and has not yet been able to get busing, as planned by the Howe philosophy, under control. Congress has attempted to stop this wholesale busing by the withholding of funds, but opposition by second-string Federal Education bureaucrats armed with some questionable Federal District Court decisions have diluted congressional effort.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Many of us are hoping that the present legal uncertainties caused by certain Federal court decisions may be clarified soon by the Supreme Court and that sanity to our educational system can be restored; that quality education can be substituted for this riotous social experiments.

The mayor of Indianapolis, Dick Lugar, has made his opposition to busing of students quite clear, and has announced he is ready to fight this matter all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, if necessary.

We must not, however, rely entirely on the hope that the Supreme Court will make such a helpful, intelligent, and vital decision. A constitutional amendment may be required, an amendment which will clearly spell out the powers and limitations of schools and courts as to their authority for the busing of pupils to schools. This amendment must be in terms so clear that Washington bureaucrats and wavering courts cannot misconstrue it.

Such a constitutional amendment has been filed in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. The pertinent part of this amendment reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of final passage of this joint resolution:

#### ARTICLE—

SECTION 1. No public school student shall because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school.

For reasons which I do not care to discuss, both the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate have failed to have hearings or report these amendments for action by the House or Senate. In order to force a vote on this important constitutional amendment in the House, we are resorting to a petition which I have already signed.

The Congress is quite obviously getting tough about it all, and the administration is making it clear that it is not going to support this idea of calling for busing students all over a city or community whenever some fool playing sociological pickup sticks calls for it. For far too long and in far too many instances the Federal Government has allowed itself to be pulled or pushed into following artificial concepts and illusions—chasing after false gods, allow-

ing the social experimenters rather than the educator and parents to direct the education and training of their youth.

We can win in this important fight. For the good of all we can build soundly toward practical and quality education under the control and the concerned interest of true educators, parents, and the local neighborhood. But to "straighten out this mess" every citizen, every parent, every teacher, every friend of education must make himself heard, loudly, and clearly.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the floor on Monday, October 18, since I was returning from my district where I spent the weekend reporting to my constituents on the activities of Congress and fulfilling other engagements which had been scheduled for some time.

There were four rollcall votes taken on bills that were on the Suspension Calendar. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 302. H.R. 9212, black lung benefits. I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 303. House Joint Resolution 923, school lunch and breakfast programs for needy children. I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 304. H.R. 10458, cooperative animal disease control. I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall No. 305. H.R. 8140, Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1971. I would have voted "yea."

#### PRAYER AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, 67 Members of this House have joined in writing to our colleagues expressing our opposition to the Wylie amendment, House Joint Resolution 191 which has been discharged from consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary.

In 1964, the House Judiciary Committee held exhaustive hearings on a similar amendment, because of what seemed to be overwhelming support for its enactment. After hearing testimony from an extensive group of learned and renowned church officials, educators, and authorities in the field of constitutional law, the committee concluded that enactment of any so-called prayer amendment would represent a serious erosion of the principle of separation of church and State and would be a threat to religious freedom.

In 1966 the Senate reached identical conclusion when pressure was used to once again bring this issue under consideration.

The framers of the Constitution believed so strongly in the preservation of

our religious freedom that they provided for its special guarantee under the first amendment. In the past 175 years this guarantee has successfully withstood many challenges, but today its very existence is being threatened and it faces the danger of being struck down.

My colleagues and I have joined together in an effort to guarantee the continued free exercise of religion as it is now so amply protected under the Constitution and have invited all Members of the House to join us in our efforts.

At this time I take the opportunity to insert a copy of our letter as well as the statement we made at a recent press conference announcing the formation of our coalition to work to preserve religious freedom:

OCTOBER 4, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We, the undersigned, have formed a Congressional Committee to Preserve Religious Freedom. Our purpose is to urge you to oppose the Wylie amendment (H.J. Res. 191) which would alter the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights for the first time in our history.

For many reasons, a broad spectrum of religious groups, educators and constitutional authority groups oppose the Wylie amendment. In 1964, the Committee on the Judiciary, after three months of hearings on various proposals, decided against any amendment. We believe that the House should not now undertake to tamper with the First Amendment after a scanty one-hour floor debate, particularly where the meaning and possibly far-reaching consequences of the pending resolution are far from clear.

The Bill of Rights has served our country well. We believe, with James Madison, that "it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties."

The Wylie Amendment (H.J. Res. 191) may be considered as early as November 8. We strongly urge you to vote against H.J. Res. 191.

Abourezk of South Dakota.  
Abzug of New York.  
Adams of Washington.  
Ashley, Ohio.  
Aspinall, Colorado.  
Begich, Alaska.  
Bingham, New York.  
Blatnik, Minnesota.  
Bolling of Missouri.  
Brademas of Indiana.  
Burton of California.  
Celler, New York.  
Chisholm, New York.  
Clay, Missouri.  
Collins, Illinois.  
Conyers, Michigan.  
Corman, California.  
Dellenback of Oregon.  
Dellums of California.  
Dingell of Michigan.  
Dow of New York.  
Drinan of Massachusetts  
Eckhardt of Texas.  
Edwards, Don of California.  
Foley of Washington.  
Ford, William of Michigan.  
Fraser, Don of Minnesota.  
Gonzalez, H. B. of Texas.  
Hansen, J. B. of Washington.  
Hansen, O. of Idaho.  
Harrington of Massachusetts.  
Hawkins of California.  
Hollifield of California.  
Kastenmeier of Wisconsin.  
Koch of New York.  
Leggett of California.  
McCormack of Washington.  
McFall of California.  
McCulloch of Ohio.  
Metcalfe of Illinois.  
Meeds of Washington.

Mikva of Illinois.  
Miller, George of California.  
Mink of Hawaii.  
Mitchell of Maryland.  
Morse of Massachusetts.  
Mosher of Ohio.  
Moss of California.  
O'Hara, James of Michigan.  
Pepper of Florida.  
Podell of New York.  
Rangel of New York.  
Rees of California.  
Rosenthal of New York.  
Roybal of California.  
Ryan of New York.  
Scheuer of New York.  
Schwengel of Iowa.  
Seiberling of Ohio.  
Sisk of California.  
Stokes of Ohio.  
Thompson, Frank of New Jersey.  
Udall of Arizona.  
Van Derlin of California.  
Whalen of Ohio.  
Wiggins of California.  
Wilson, Charles of California.

#### ON OPPOSITION TO AMENDING THE BILL OF RIGHTS

(Monday, October 4, 10 a.m., room 210, Cannon House Office Building)

Dr. Carl Bates, President, Southern Baptist Convention.

Congressman Emanuel Celler, Democrat of New York.

Congressman James C. Corman, Democrat of California.

Congressman Robert F. Drinan, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Congressman Robert Eckhardt, Democrat of Texas.

Congressman Don Edwards, Democrat of California.

Congressman Don Fraser, Democrat of Minnesota.

Dr. David K. Hunter, Deputy General Secretary, National Council of Churches.

Bishop John Wesley Lord, the United Methodist Church.

The Rev. Warren Magnuson, Executive Secretary, Baptist General Conference and Chairman, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

Congressman Mike McCormack, Democrat of Washington.

Mrs. Marcus Rohlfis, President, American Baptist Convention.

Congressman Fred Schwengel, Republican of Iowa.

Dr. Robert VanDeusen, Director, Office of Public Affairs, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., representing: Dr. Robert Marshall, President, Lutheran Church of America.

Dr. J. A. O. Preus, President, Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod.

Dr. Kent S. Knutson, President, American Lutheran Church.

The Rev. G. K. Zimmerman, Executive Secretary, North American Baptist Convention.

#### CONGRESSMEN AND CLERGY UNITE IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDING THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Representatives of several religious denominations met today with concerned Members of the House of Representatives to express their opposition to the Wylie amendment, H.J. Res. 191, which proposes to amend the Bill of Rights for the first time in history to authorize "non-denominational prayer" to "persons lawfully assembled in any public building." Under the rules of the House, the proposed amendment, which requires a two-third vote of both Houses of Congress for passage, may reach the floor of the House as early as November 8, 1971.

The group issued the following statement: "We, clergymen of various denominations, and members of Congress, are deeply concerned with the very real threat to religious



freedom should the Wylie resolution, H.J. Res. 191, become a part of our Constitution. We feel most strongly about any constitutional amendment being brought to the floor without the possibility of amendment and with only one hour of debate, controlled by the sponsor, but more particularly we oppose any change in our Bill of Rights which throughout our long history has never been amended.

"We believe and aver that we do now have adequate protection of religion in the First Amendment; that the Supreme Court decisions of 1962 and 1963 served to strengthen that freedom, and that, contrary to its supporters' contentions, H.J. Res. 191 would restrict that freedom.

"Representative Wylie's resolution reads as follows: 'Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer.'

"We, as Americans, are already guaranteed the right to participate in prayer—non-denominational or denominational, and in buildings public or private, and whether or not lawfully assembled. All this is now guaranteed to us under the free exercise clause of the First Amendment and none of it has been diminished by any opinions of the Supreme Court. Thus, the proposed amendment might actually serve to lessen our religious liberty rather than broaden it.

"The so-called 'school prayer' decisions of the Supreme Court (*Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 1962; *Abington School District v. Schempp* and *Murray v. Curlett*, 374 U.S. 203, 1963) dealt with the power of governments to compose or require a particular prayer, not the inviolable right of the individual to pray as his conscience dictates. In contrast, the proposed amendment deals with the right of persons, a right not affected by the Supreme Court decisions. A child may still pray in school so long as he does not interfere with others.

"H.J. Res. 191 would authorize "nondenominational" prayer. Assuming such a prayer could be composed, and disregarding the question of who should compose it, the very word is antithetical to religion. Religion is by its nature intensely personal and denominational. A "nondenominational" consensus prayer could only serve to reduce religion to its least common denominator, to neutralize it, and finally to create what might be called a nonsectarian public school religion. We do not believe that even the proponents of the Wylie amendment wish such a result.

"Other questions are raised by the language of the proposed amendment, and would, we believe, eventually result in widespread, acrimonious controversy and litigation.

"In short, the importance of these questions and others, requires, we believe, far more careful consideration than they are apt to receive in a scant hour of floor debate.

"In 1964, in the wake of the Supreme Court's 'school prayer' decisions, the House Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings over three months on a wide variety of proposed amendments and was unable to devise language which it could recommend to the House that would not do violence to religious liberty now guaranteed by the First Amendment.

"In 1966, the Senate rejected an amendment intended to override the 'school prayer' decisions.

"Moreover, two Presidents have cautioned against hasty action to override the Supreme Court's 'school prayer' decisions. Speaking shortly after the first such decision, *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, President Kennedy said:

"You would have to make a determination of what the language was and what ef-

fect it would have on the First Amendment. The Supreme Court has made its judgment, and a good many people obviously will disagree with it. Others will agree with it. But I think it is important for us if we are going to maintain our constitutional principle that we support the Supreme Court decisions even when we may not agree with them.

"In addition, we have in this case, a very easy remedy and that is to pray ourselves. And I would think that it would be a welcome reminder to every American family that we can pray a good deal more at home, we can attend our churches with a good deal more fidelity, and we can make the true meaning of prayer much more important in the lives of all of our children. That power is very much open to us. And I would hope that as a result of this decision that all American parents will intensify their efforts at home, and the rest of us will support the Constitution and the responsibility of the Supreme Court in interpreting it, which is theirs, and given to them by the Constitution."

"On July 4, 1964, the New York Times quoted former President Eisenhower as follows:

"General Eisenhower said he was opposed to the constitutional amendment on prayer in the public schools. He said religion should be taught in the schools, not as creed, but to show how great religions had influenced the course of civilization.

"But when you talk about prayer,' he said, 'this is in the nature of a personal communication and its use in public schools violates the First Amendment to the Constitution.'"

"We hope that Members of the House will heed these calls for caution and will not act hastily to undo what has served us well for 180 years. In the words of James Madison: 'It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties.'

"We take alarm at this fresh experiment on our liberties and we hope that all citizens will join us in voicing our concern."

#### SPORTS FISHING IN THE GULF AND ELSEWHERE MUST BE PROTECTED

(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, attention is being directed to a serious problem for sports fishermen because of billfish catches by Japanese tuna longliners in the Gulf of Mexico. This problem in varying degrees is being experienced in other offshore American waters because of similar commercial activities by foreign vessels.

My district borders on the Gulf of Mexico where the problem is particularly serious. I am not convinced that the State Department is making a sufficiently determined effort to obtain protection for northwest Florida's important sports fishing industry from the operations of foreign trawlers in the Gulf of Mexico. Japanese and other fishing vessels have been working in the area along the "DeSoto Canyon" or the "100 fathom curve" where billfishing has become a nationally known attraction for sportsmen. The commercial vessels can seriously deplete gulf waters of marlin, sailfish, swordfish, and tuna within a short time if they are allowed to operate unrestricted.

I have lodged strong protests with the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Commerce about this sit-

uation. It is the official policy of the U.S. Government that water beyond 12 miles from shore is free for use of all countries. Thus, the voluntary cooperation of fishermen from other nations is necessary to protect sports fishing which lies further off shore. I have insisted that vigorous action be undertaken by our Government to bring about this cooperation before an important American sports industry is ruined.

It is ironic to note the difficulty which has been encountered by American commercial fishermen in Latin American waters where a number of nations claim territorial rights extending 200 miles out to sea. U.S. fishing boats in these waters have been seized and crews arrested without reprisal from the United States. If other nations protect their waters, we have a right to do the same, and I am insisting on stronger action by our Government agencies for the protection of gulf waters, as well as for U.S. fishing vessels in Latin American waters.

The Louisiana Conservationist magazine for May-June 1971 carried a comprehensive summary of the threat to sports fishing in the gulf from commercial operations. It is entitled "Will They Be Back This Year?" Its author, Paul Kalman, is to be commended for his true knowledge of the problem. He is a citizen of New Orleans and was one of the pioneers of billfish and other big game fishing in the gulf. He is past president of the Louisiana Outdoor Writers Association.

The problem is also spelled out in additional detail in an editorial which appeared in the Pensacola News on August 27 entitled "International Action on Fishing Is Needed," and in a commentary from the Pensacola Journal of August 25 by Betty Jackson entitled "Japanese Fishermen in Gulf May Spark Commercial War."

I am submitting these three excellent articles for printing in the RECORD:

[From the Louisiana Conservationist magazine, May-June 1971]

WILL THEY BE BACK THIS YEAR?

(By Paul Kalman)

In 1965, the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission and the New Orleans Big Game Fishing Club initiated a continuing program of biological studies involving the major species of large pelagic fishes taken in the Gulf of Mexico offshore from South Pass of the Mississippi River.

In addition to measuring and examining the stomach contents of fish brought in for weighing, biologists stationed at the tiny village of Port Eads keep accurate records on the marlin, tuna and other fish which anglers catch and subsequently release.

During a normal Summer, South Pass can be expected to produce anywhere from 60 to 125 blue marlin, 200 or more white marlin, about 50 sailfish, and at least 600 yellowfin tuna averaging 100 pounds and weighing upwards of 150.

Half of the 1969 season was lost as a result of Hurricane Camille. Because of adverse current conditions, the 1968 season was considered an "off year" but, even so, 76 blue marlin were officially recorded along with 195 white marlin, 37 sailfish, and approximately 250 tuna.

In contrast, only a dozen blue marlin were tabulated during the 1970 season which ended last October. Equally disappointing

was the remainder of the seasonal catch consisting of nine white marlin, 13 sailfish, and 30 yellow tuna. The latter averaged less than 50 pounds.

Although the evidence for doing so is purely circumstantial, it is generally conceded that this dramatic decline can be traced to the presence of commercial fishing vessels which moved into the northern Gulf last July and systematically raped Louisiana's fabulously fertile offshore waters for at least two months before they picked up their fearfully efficient "long lines" and sailed home to Japan.

The first of the grimy white ships was spotted by a group of sport fishermen who mistook the Zenko Maru No. 12 for a merchant vessel, one of the hundreds of such steamships passing through the area each year on their way to or from the Port of New Orleans.

Only when they steered the "Bonnie Blue" in for a closer look did William J. Willkomm, Sam Gonzales, and Captain Lon Boudreaux properly identify the unmistakable signs of the dreaded long liners: stretched between the superstructure and afterdeck was a series of wire cables strung with hundreds of fish bills and tails, grisly reminders of the many fine game fish whose butchered carcasses were stowed in refrigerated holds for shipment to Japan.

Up forward, crewmen stripped to the waist were working knee deep in small mountains of blue marlin, white marlin, yellowfin tuna, sailfish, broadbill swordfish, and half a dozen varieties of sharks including the rare and prized Mako. Blood pouring from the scuppers in steady streams attracted small sharks that tore up the surface fighting for scraps of refuse being washed overboard.

Circling the floating abattoir at a respectful distance, Willkomm and Gonzales took pictures before Captain Boudreaux headed back to port.

"We were too sick to continue fishing," Gonzales later related.

Several weeks of squally weather put a temporary end to sport fishing but had little effect on the long liners. No one saw Zenko Maru No. 12 during this time but there is ample reason to believe that she and several sister ships stayed on station and never stopped working their lines.

In mid-August during the annual Empire-South Pass Fishing Rodeo, several groups of sports fishermen reported encounters with the Japanese. One group headed by New Orleans architect August Perez III spotted a long liner half again as big as Zenko Maru No. 12. It too was strung with the same festoons of bills and tails and was surrounded by a sea of blood.

Fishing nearby, Dr. James W. Burks, Sam Perino and Captain Wes King stumbled across a similar 400-footer with a smaller tender moored alongside.

"They had just finished cleaning the catch when we got there," Dr. Burks explained, "because only a few marlin were on the conveyors and the men were hosing down the decks. However, they must have been quite busy before our arrival since crewmen were hanging scores of bills and tails on those big clotheslines."

Perino climbed into the tuna tower and made the excellent closeups which illustrate this article.

Except for those by the long liners, only a handful of marlin and tuna were caught or even seen during the Empire-South Pass Rodeo, underlining the fear that big game fishing at the mouth of the river was destined for oblivion if the Japanese continued their deadly work.

Hanging like a shroud over the big game fishing scene at the outset of the 1971 season is the ominous question:

"Will they be back this year?"

The paradox of South Pass is that one of  
CXVII—2320—Part 28

the world's most promising big game fishing hotspots is in imminent danger of being destroyed by the same diabolical device that led to its discovery.

Few people even thought about big game fishing in Louisiana's coastal waters prior to 1951 when the U.S. Interior Department sent its research vessel "Oregon" into the area to conduct a series of experimental cruises. Outfitted primarily for shrimp trawling, the "Oregon" also carried a modest supply of long line gear which project director Harvey R. Bullis, Jr. had obtained from sources in Japan. Government scientists hoped that Louisiana and Mississippi labels would someday appear on tuna bought by American housewives but this didn't materialize because the Japanese could catch, process, and ship tuna into this country much cheaper than it could be done on the Gulf Coast.

Nevertheless, "Oregon" and her long lines proved beyond doubt that tuna, marlin and the other prized big game species could be caught in quantity surprisingly close to the delta. On one 14-day voyage, "Oregon" returned to Pascagoula with 652 tuna in her hold. The fish weighted up to 215 pounds with the entire catch scaling 29½ tons. In addition to yellowfins, the long lines brought up 27 blackfin tuna, 10 sailfish, 78 white marlin, one blue marlin, two broadbill swordfish, and 178 sharks.

Encouraged by reports of the "Oregon's" activities, this writer called together some friends in 1956 and organized an expedition to South Pass where we produced the first marlin and tuna ever taken from Louisiana waters on rod and reel.

Although they could have been there earlier, foreign long liners were first seen off South Pass in 1967 when several Cuban vessels made a brief incursion. They were apparently discouraged after undergoing a few days of surveillance flights by patrol aircraft ordered out by Rear Admiral James D. Craik, commandant of the Eighth Coast Guard District.

Distance appears to mean nothing to the Japanese whose long line ships have extended their operations over all the productive tropical and sub-tropical waters of the world. They introduced the process to the Atlantic in 1955 and, by 1962, the Japanese Fishery Agency issued a report listing that year's long line catch from the Atlantic alone as consisting of 52,000 giant bluefin tuna (average weight 450 pounds), 19,000 swordfish, 111,000 white marlin, 117,000 blue marlin and 67,000 sailfish taken in 18,200 man days of fishing. A 1966 report issued by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution indicated that Japanese vessels working the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico were catching upwards of 200 blue marlin, 250 white marlin, and 350 bluefin tuna in a single day.

Frank Mather, director of Woods Hole, was moved to comment: "These figures have not touched on the landings of albacore, yellowfin, and bigeye tunas which are the mainstay of the Japanese long line fishery since these are, at present, of little importance as game fish in these areas. It may be expected, however, that as the stocks of these three species are reduced, there will be greater pressure on the others (marlins and bluefins), and there are strong indications this is already taking place."

How quickly the long lines can deplete an area of game fish has been demonstrated time and again by the Japanese and other foreign nations. For years, the waters surrounding New Zealand were reputed to be the world's best for marlin fishing, with more than 1,300 billfish being caught on rod and reel in 1949.

In 1965, after the Japanese had decimated the area and moved to greener pastures, less than 100 marlin were taken by sport fishermen.

In Venezuela, a single Japanese long liner

caught 1,500 billfish in one 24-hour period, with 90 percent being white marlin.

Early last year, the long liners struck in Puerto Rico, producing a 50 percent drop in the expected catch of the San Juan Blue Marlin Tournament.

The Zenko Maru fleet operating off South Pass last year consisted of a giant mother ship serving as headquarters for six smaller vessels. Each vessel, including the mother ship, was staffed and outfitted to fish several lines which were usually put out in the early evening and picked up the following day.

Long lines vary in length with the average being 30 miles.

To facilitate handling, the "main line" is divided into 350-foot sections called "baskets." Vertical buoy lines attached to glass or plastic floats suspend the main line underwater at depths of 10 to 20 fathoms. The hooks are hung from three-fathom "branch lines" consisting of lengths of tarred dacron line attached to heavy cable leaders.

The hooks used by long-liners are specially designed to be swallowed into the throat or stomach, making them almost impossible to dislodge. They are baited with almost anything that is readily available including mullet, cigar fish, ballyhoo, and herring.

The branch lines (with hooks) are spaced about every 15 fathoms with a float or buoy at intervals of 150 fathoms along the main line. In addition, the Japanese attach small battery-powered radio transmitters with fiberglass antennas to assist in locating the ends of the lines.

Aboard ship, the operation is a marvel of efficiency and mechanization. One of the few chores done by hand is the baiting of hooks. The heavy lines are paid out and retrieved on motorized reels feeding into other devices which automatically coil the lines into plastic tubs.

As fish are brought to the surface, crewmen lean over the side and impale them on giant gaff hooks. The bigger marlin and tuna are hoisted aboard with power blocks and beaten senseless before the butchers go to work with their knives, saws and cleavers.

As noted earlier, the prime objective is tuna but the Japanese are frugal people and throw back nothing. Even sharks are considered a valuable by-product. Marlin are shipped intact to Japan for manufacture into fish sausage (a Japanese delicacy that fetches a fancy price) or consumed raw with horseradish and soy sauce in a dish called "Sashimi".

Not all long liners operating in the Gulf of Mexico are Japanese or Cuban. In 1969 and 1970, the commercial boat "Gulf Stream" came all the way to South Pass from her home port in Maine and harvested 155,000 pounds of broadbill swordfish. Later the same year, the "Harry Glen" out of Montauk, New York was spotted fishing in the same area.

The reaction of sportsmen to the presence of long liners isn't always passive. A few years ago, outraged charter boatmen in Baja California brandished their shark rifles when they discovered a long liner with 225 striped marlin aboard. The intruder wisely decided to strike his colors and head for the horizon before the shooting started. Another Japanese vessel with 300 Pacific sailfish aboard was apprehended, brought to port, and fined for fishing in Mexico's territorial waters. In Panama, the government used to send fighter planes aloft to shoot long liners away from the prolific black marlin fishing grounds near Pines Bay. Today, these waters are largely ignored by the Japanese.

Louisiana sportsmen stop short of open confrontation but many think nothing of "liberating" the attractive glass floats and bringing them home as decorative "trophies of war" for their patios and dens. Fearful that the long liners might retaliate by bobby-trapping the floats, some anglers have taken



to shooting the balls in a unique game called "ocean skeet".

The Sport Fishing Institute, a non-profit conservation organization sponsored by major fishing tackle manufacturers, discourages such actions, saying that violence can lead only to greater hardship. The institute adds that the Japanese will cooperate if they are approached in the proper way.

R. H. Stroud, executive director of the Institute, has established an informal, non-government agreement with Japanese commercial fishing representatives who have pledged to keep their boats sufficiently well away from important sport fishing centers and avoid fishing deliberately for billfish in competition with sportsmen. On the other hand, says Mr. Stroud, sportsmen must begin showing good faith by stopping the substantial harassment of Japanese boats and destroying the floats, lines and other gear. The Sport Fishing Institute asks sportsmen to submit notarized statements citing complete details of any Japanese long line operations they might come upon, and to support such documents with photographs. He warns, however, that the quickest way to end such negotiations is for American sportsmen to "liberate" the long liners' tackle.

From the viewpoint of legality, the Japanese (or any other nation) are free to fish anywhere they please so long as they come no closer than 12 miles from our shores. It is important to note that this 12-mile limit applies only to fishing. The so-called "territorial limit" is only three miles.

All efforts to lessen either fishing or territorial limits have been rebuked by the State Department which explains that the U.S. would jeopardize its own freedom of passage in more than 100 areas of the world where narrow straits and passes are often traversed by U.S. naval vessels.

In contrast, seven South American and Latin American nations and Korea claim jurisdiction over "maritime zones" extending 200 miles from their shores. All say this is done to protect their fisheries.

Confusing the issue even further are the long-range biological effects of over-fishing the oceans. Everybody agrees that long lining exacts its deadly toll in a very brief time but nobody is equipped to say how many months or years are needed for the offended resource to recover.

As Frank Mather sees it: "Even if it (long line fishing) does not deplete the local supply of fish excessively, it may so disturb the fish that they move away or alter their behavior in such a way as to reduce their availability to sports methods."

[From the Pensacola News, Aug. 27, 1971]

#### INTERNATIONAL ACTION ON FISHING IS NEEDED

World fisheries—and this includes the Gulf of Mexico—are in danger of a man-created depletion just as serious to the ecology and economy of nations as once was the over-cutting of every stick of standing, usable timber by a generation of lumber barons.

The problem of over-fishing is not a new one, nor does it follow a similar pattern from area to area. Yet the results are the same—a depletion of oceanographic resources that may take as long to restore as have the trees to once denuded forests.

What puts particular emphasis on the problem now is the invasion by a Japanese fleet into the 100-fathom curve of the Gulf—the habitat of game fish and a prime mecca for sports fishermen from all over the United States.

The Japanese are breaking no law. They fish well beyond the Florida 10-mile limit. But they are depleting the fish population by using longline fishing methods whereby fish are lured by bait attached to strings of vertical buoy lines that average 30 miles in length.

The lines contain mazes of hooks designed

to be swallowed so as to make capture of the fish most certain. Strobe lights and radio transmitter are attached to the lines to aid in the fishing technique.

The catches are heavy.

It has been suggested that the Japanese technique will make fishing barren for many years to come unless it is halted. This it is felt, will not only keep tourists from being attracted to the Miracle Strip but will seriously affect the incomes of scores of charter fishermen who make a living carrying tourists.

Local fishermen are so stirred, one speaker told the Pensacola-Escambia Development Commission, that there is danger of open hostilities between American fishermen and the Japanese.

Nothing could be more undesirable than this. Nothing can be achieved by it except display of stupid, acrimonious temper tantrums and violation of international law.

The problem cannot be solved by a single state, nor a single nation. It must be considered by all nations in concert and an end put to the heterogeneous maze of national laws fixing territorial limits on continental shelves.

Most nations recognize 12-mile limits and regard the rest of the seas as international waters free to all. Yet, there are some—notably Latin American countries, Korea and two African states—which describe their maritime zones as 200 miles off shore. This, of course, is a ridiculous distortion.

What is needed is positive action by the international conference convening in 1973 at Geneva. Actually the conference should be moved up because the need is great and the situation explosive.

And while there is action fixing maritime limits there also should be adopted an international code of behavior for fishermen in the interests of conservation of this important food resource. No methods that can sweep an area clean of fish should be countenanced. Seed must be left.

But now a word of warning!

No series of agreements is going to be worth the paper and ink expended on it unless there is an effective system of enforcement.

The United Nations can't do this—it has failed in too many crises involving prestigious nations.

It would then appear that penalties should be applied in a court of international law in much the same manner in which legal violations are handled in other areas.

But enforcement must be required and backed by the strength of the principal world nations.

[From the Pensacola Journal, Aug. 25, 1971]

#### JAPANESE FISHERMEN IN GULF MAY SPARK COMMERCIAL WAR

(By Betty Jackson)

Japanese fishing boats are back in Gulf waters and local sport fishermen fear an undeclared war may break out between the two factions.

Pat Dodson, Pensacola advertising executive, warned the Pensacola-Escambia Development Commission Tuesday that unless the Japanese "longliners" cease operations in the Gulf's 100-fathom curve, gamefish—a major tourist calling card—will be seriously depleted along the Miracle Tourist strip.

In response, the council passed by unanimous vote a resolution proposed by Secretary Marvin Kaiman that appropriate governmental agencies be alerted to the situation existing in area offshore waters.

Member Crawford Rainwater further proposed that such dangers as the loss of tourist business be brought to the attention of proper authorities in the Florida Department of Conservation and the U.S. Department of Interior.

Chairman Carl Jones suggested that copies

of this report be sent to Panama City, Destin and Fort Walton Beach officials. The information also will be forwarded to Sens. Edward Gurney and Lawton Chiles and Rep. Bob Sikes.

Although the Japanese are fishing beyond U.S. territorial limits, Dodson observed that outraged charter boatmen may take action if fishermen are not pressured into departing.

"There is no question," Dodson said, "that the diplomatic recourse is best. Sport fishermen have become incensed when they have observed hundreds of fish bills and tails flying from cables aboard the Japanese vessels."

Four fishing vessels under Japanese charter were spotted two weeks ago in the South Pass off the New Orleans shore, according to information received by Dodson. Another ship was sighted as close as 50 miles to Pensacola in what is called the "DeSoto Canyon" or the 100 fathom curve.

During a normal Summer, South Pass could be expected to yield to fishermen anywhere from 60 to 125 blue marlin, 200 or more white marlin, about 50 sailfish and at least 600 yellowfin tuna averaging 100 pounds.

Last year, Louisiana sport fishermen claimed that Japanese vessels systematically raped fertile offshore waters for two months. Prized tuna, marlin, swordfish and sailfish, were being caught at an estimated rate of 200 to 300 a day.

Ecologists fear that so deadly a toll within a short period may require long periods for the offended resources to recover.

Sport fishermen are vocal in their disapproval of Japanese longline fishing methods whereby fish are lured by bait attached to strings of vertical buoy lines that average 30 miles in length.

Buoy lines are attached to glass or plastic floats that suspend a "main line" underwater at depths from ten to 20 fathoms. Hooks are hung from three-fathom "branch lines" that consist of tarred dacron tied to heavy cable leaders.

Hooks are designed to be swallowed into the throat or stomach of the fish where they are impossible to dislodge. Bait depends on whatever may be available—Mullet, cigar fish, ballyhoo and herring.

The Japanese attach strobe lights or radio transmitters with fiberglass antennas to assist in locating the ends of their long lines.

Dodson said the ships are equipped to process the fish before returning to Japan.

Fishing authorities observe that not all "longliners" that have cruised Gulf waters are Japanese. In previous years, Cuban and American commercial boats operated in similar fashion.

R. H. Stroud, executive director of the Sport Fishing Institute, a nonprofit conservation organization, has established what he terms an informal, nongovernment agreement with Japanese commercial fishing representatives to keep boats away from important sport fishing centers.

Stroud has asked that Japanese operations be documented when sportsmen feel their waters have been invaded. At the same time, he has urged American anglers to refrain from harassment or destruction of Japanese gear.

From a legal standpoint, vessels from any nation may fish as close as 12 miles from American shores. The territorial limit for most states is only three miles, although in Florida it is three leagues or about 10 miles.

In contrast, some Latin American nations, Korea and two African states claim jurisdiction over "maritime zones" that extend 200 miles offshore.

An international conference will consider the issue in 1973 in Geneva. The United States in the past has been reluctant to support any extended territorial claims that diplomats feel would jeopardize open seas.

### THE SILENT NEW GENERATION

(Mr. CLANCY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, many Americans believe that today's typical youth are long-haired, unwashed, rebellious, ungrateful, pot-smoking, and militant, because of all the clamor which that type has raised and the publicity they have attained.

I would like to introduce you to Harding Jones who compromises with the typical image by wearing his hair somewhat long, but who otherwise typifies the ideal of the new generation which shall assume the reins of our American society and Government in a few short years.

Harding is a graduate of Lemon-Monroe High School in Middletown, Ohio, and a senior at Princeton University. Last summer, he worked as an intern at the White House and wrote about his experiences in a three-part series published in the Cincinnati Enquirer.

I commend to you his accounts of how young Americans can reach the ear of the President in this terribly big, complex Government:

#### A SUMMER SPENT WORKING AT THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Harding Jones)

Taking a bus ride for half an hour every morning at 8 a.m. was one of the less interesting ways that I spent my time in Washington, D.C. this summer. Perhaps it created a better contrast though, when after the three-block walk from the bus stop, I could see the Executive Office Building and the White House, all enclosed by a black wrought-iron fence.

I usually went in the Pennsylvania Avenue entrance just across from Blair House where presidential guests stay. Going through the gate, one must walk down several steps, across a checkerboard plaza and then up quite a few steps. I always glanced to my left to look at the inspiring sight of the White House and the perfectly kept grounds. The sun was already hot.

Inside the EOB a guard at a desk in the reception area checked my pass and I walked the wide, curving stairs to the third floor where my office was located. For the uninitiated, the climb up those two flights of stairs can be very tiring. Working in those majestic surroundings always reminded me that I was working for the President of the United States. The long, high, wide halls, enormous doors, the high-ceilinged offices with huge windows, not only gave me a sense of purpose but also a little ego boost when I compared my lowly status to that of most of the people with whom I was working.

I usually arrived before the secretaries who worked on counselor Robert Finch's staff (this was my appointed station for the summer) and usually spent 45 minutes reading newspapers, the White House summary or some material left over from the day before. The first of five mail deliveries arrived at about 9:15 a.m., so I spent some time reading letters. I telephoned to set up meetings, gather information usually by calling the White House Press Release room for copies of the President's speeches on specific topics, or by calling the library for certain books.

At about mid-morning I tried to devote some time to the memoranda concerning youth that I was writing for Mr. Finch. I gave advice, tried to analyze situations, and in general tried to determine better ways

for the White House Staff to understand young people and young people to communicate with the White House Staff. Two points come to mind. Many people feel that they must speak directly to the President or they will be able to accomplish nothing. Many letters make this request. This is an unfortunate misconception, because White House junior staff members handle the bulk of appointments, research, and back-up work and are in a better position to get behind an idea and channel it through the proper offices.

I learned very quickly that the President is so busy that he relies on a staff just for appointments, and that staff determines the balance in numbers and interest of the people who see the President. Most of the people on the White House staff rarely sit in a meeting with the President, simply because he—and they—usually cannot afford the time. I was amazed however, that the President was as aware of popular and unpopular views as he was—and this can be attributed to the use of memoranda. One is always told "Send me a memo on that"—for this is the way the Nixon administration gets things done. Once it is on paper, an idea or a comment can be passed along to many other staff members for additional suggestions and recommendation. This also enables the President to have scheduling flexibility.

My memos were usually directed to Mr. Finch. Some of them were then taken to the President or passed to other staff members. During the beginning of the summer I was working on a presidential statement concerning the passage of the 26th amendment. At that time, it had not passed and consideration was being given to the President's trying to give it some encouragement. (He has supported lowering the voting age for more than 20 years). Before my suggestions were ever sent to the President, Mr. Finch was adapting them to a message congratulating the Ohio Legislature for being the last state needed to pass the amendment. The next day I was able to detect a few of my phrases in the President's statement. Several days later I received a memo asking for suggestions on what kind of ceremony should be held at the White House for the President's endorsement of the amendment (this is not required by law, but a custom started by Lyndon Johnson). There was no deadline mentioned but during the weekend I read in the paper, two hours before it was to happen, that the ceremony would be held on the Fourth of July in the East Room with a young singing group participating. That taught me how fast things can happen. I filed my outline.

At around noon I followed up on telephone calls and made plans to join several interns for lunch in the EOB cafeteria. There we usually discussed our jobs or the latest events. Politics always on the agenda.

On various occasions I would walk across the driveway between the White House West wing offices and the EOB. This was to meet with Mr. Finch or his assistant, or to check with one of several secretaries on the staff over there. A number of times Mr. Finch and I would discuss the problems associated with youth, the President's thinking on them, and possible solutions, new ideas, etc. Mr. Finch would describe situations during which the President commented on youth, people, or other issues—whatever was on his mind. This confirmed my feeling that the President was well aware of the moods of young constituencies, and that he is anxious to serve them. Mr. Finch said that he always stressed that young people cannot be put into one group—"He just doesn't feel they all think the same and want the same things."

The atmosphere in the West Wing was very impressive. The ceilings on the ground

floor and the second floor were low, but photographs of the President on recent trips, Tricia's wedding, or original paintings together with thick carpeting and light gold-colored walls made it seem to me just what the White House offices should be like. They are formal, and yet they are busy and business like. One is likely to run into Mr. Finch, Donald Rumsfeld, Henry Kissinger or Robert Haldeman while walking through those halls. You're also likely to meet a number of Secret Servicemen and White House police—especially when the President is around.

One of Mr. Finch's secretaries was startled one day to walk off the elevator with Mr. Finch's lunch tray. The President was coming down the hall. He said hello to her and she was so excited that later she was thankful she remembered to address him as Mr. President—(the proper way.)

The latter part of many afternoons I often spent at seminars with White House executives, with other interns working in executive departments such as HEW (I set up the meetings in order to create a larger base of communications), or on Capitol Hill where Princeton students met with senators and congressmen. I will discuss much of this in a following article.

By about 6 p.m. secretaries began to leave, the phones quieted down and I was able to turn to letter-writing, memo-writing and thinking. I would often watch the activity at Blair House as visiting ambassadors left for dinner. The entire street was often blocked off and a fleet of limousines and police cars pulled up to the canopied entrance. This was a period of reflection when I wondered if anything I was doing really mattered—whether my suggestions were even worthy of being passed on to a presidential adviser. I think this helped to balance the thrill and excitement and the inevitable amount of pride which accompanied working at the White House. By about 8 p.m. my two roommates usually had arrived from Capitol Hill and we walked together to the bus stop, sharing experiences of the day and comparing comments on the latest bills in Congress, current events or other political happenings. Almost always, as I walked down the steps to the small plaza and Pennsylvania Avenue, I glanced over my right shoulder to see the White House, its front columns brilliantly lit by the new outdoor lighting, often ready for an important visitor—even if it was just the President coming home from the Executive Office Building a few feet away.

#### AIDES MAKE PRESIDENT'S JOB EASIER

(By Harding Jones)

Washington, D.C., is an impressive sight for the occasional or vacationing visitor. I have never failed to take a deep breath upon seeing the lighted capitol dome against a black sky as I have often arrived from Princeton on the evening Metroliner.

It is said that New Yorkers never see the Statue of Liberty or the Empire State Building; I wondered if I would take the sights of Washington for granted after several weeks. I never did.

I found the city itself had an effect on my work experience at the White House. For me, Washington is a continual inspiration and reminds me of our country and its history.

My own feelings, working at the White House were those of a young man who finds himself close to the making of history—close to the lasting greatness which surrounds the Presidency. On several occasions, I was able to visit the Cabinet Room. Looking at the empty room, I wondered the question: What would it be like to be President?

My feeling was that while the power and nature of the job makes it a lonely one, and the problems with which the man must deal are overwhelming, the Washington atmosphere must contribute a great amount of inner strength to a President's spirit.



Being able to gaze at the Washington Monument or the Jefferson Memorial during a moment of thought would most certainly give one a sense of purpose.

A President relies tremendously on his staff. There was no doubt after meeting many of the junior and senior staff members, that they are capable of making the President's work not easy, but at least possible.

Harry Dent, one of the President's political advisers who attempts to gauge the reaction of the country to various White House initiatives, is from South Carolina. He is outgoing and entirely able to grasp staffers often speaking for and concerned the feelings of the average American. He is considered one of the more conservative about the individual American who might be a member of the silent majority.

Both privately and speaking to a group of young interns, Mr. Dent is able to excite his listener, conveying an exuberant confidence in President Nixon. He often tried to explain what it was like for the President to make many of the pleasant and unpleasant decisions, supplying anecdotes from Cabinet meetings or personal conversations with the President. He was able to provide a special insight into the country's leader.

Herbert Klein, one of the President's closest friends, is the White House Communications Director. He too is outgoing, but in a quiet friendly way which must calm an antagonist and make conversation easy. On the several occasions that I have talked with him or heard him speak, he took one very strong position. He did not see his role as one which would cover up the news of the White House.

Mr. Klein is a former newspaper man and insists on honesty and accuracy. I have recently written about the bias which I detect in the national news media. As I consider the circumstances and problems which surround Mr. Klein's job, my admiration continues to grow for a man who can remain so optimistic and good natured. He has indicated that he is heartened by the response of local press to his efforts toward improving White House communications.

Connie Stuart is a vivacious young woman who serves as the First Lady's press secretary. This involves an incredible amount of work as I found after hearing her describe an average day of meeting with women reporters, getting out press releases on social events and making use of all the diplomatic capability she had.

Connie explained that her job is made easier because Mrs. Nixon insists on making many of the arrangements herself and is willing to work very hard at being the First Lady while shunning publicity. For instance, Mrs. Nixon has done much more decorating of the White House than Jacqueline Kennedy, and has obtained (through donations) many pieces of furniture, paintings, and other objects—all without a great deal of press coverage.

Mrs. Stuart was able to convey to us the close family relationship in the Nixon household.

Mrs. Stuart told, in a rather charming way, the story of Mrs. Nixon's idea of lighting the White House at night. She worked for months experimenting with lighting experts, looking at the effects of spotlights and such and planned it to be completed in time for their return from a visit to San Clemente.

As the helicopter approached the White House, Mrs. Nixon interrupted the President in order to get his reaction to the new lighting. Mrs. Stuart said that he had the pilot circle the White House three times so that he could get a good look at the new night-time appearance of the mansion.

One of the last people I had a chance to meet at the White House was Vice President Agnew. He, of all the officials we met, undoubtedly made the best impression on the

White House interns. He was generally firm in his beliefs and listened closely to comments and questions from the young people seated at his conference table.

He did not try to hedge on any of his answers and was very direct. Most important, he devoted an hour and a half—almost unheard of for any White House executive—to talk with us, even though most interns expected a short, 20 minute meeting.

The Vice President covered many topics during his discussion. Some of these views are important to my reactions to the entire summer which I will include in the final article describing the role I feel young people must play, and the events we are likely to face.

#### INSIDE VIEW OF WHITE HOUSE YOUTH POLICY (By Harding Jones)

In this final article, I hope to speak to members of my generation as honestly as possible. I will describe the projects on which I worked this summer and convey what I see as the White House attitude toward young people. The last objective is not easy. I have chosen to attempt a description of the President's attitude (as I saw it), and the feelings of the staff. Perhaps collectively, their views constitute the White House youth "policy."

The initiatives of the present Administration include a major policy statement early in the President's term, Operation Dialogue, a United Nations Commission, Volunteer Service Corps and the National Center for Voluntary Action, the expansion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, White House Conference on Children and Youth (the report is still being given careful consideration by the President), a 30% increase in jobs available to youths, and the backing of the 18-year-old voting amendment.

These might be listed as accomplishments, helping to reveal the "attitude" or the staff. Critics will argue that this is not enough or that it does not show the President's real feelings. Let us begin with the President.

Most Americans would assert that the President must be the President of all the people. He believes this. Therefore, to demand overwhelming attention by the President toward youth is to assume first, that "youth" is a group of people who desire the same things and have the same interests.

This is simply not the case. The President rejects this idea, feeling that young people, just as adults, have varied interests and needs and thus require diversified, varied attention. Second, a great deal of Presidential attention to "youth" would simply not be fair just as it would be wrong for the President to pay attention exclusively to farm workers or retail store owners.

Vice President Agnew said that he, and I believe he included the President, felt it was an insult to lump youth, or disadvantaged, or blacks into one political group, design a big program for them all, and expect them to be happy. I think this impressed a group of young people with whom he was speaking—they didn't want the same things, or think alike and they didn't want to be thought of as "just like everyone else."

As for the White House staff, it is my opinion that at times they may have gone too far in trying to appeal to young people. There is unquestionably a desire to listen to all "outsiders". I was impressed that Ray Price, the President's top speech writer, was willing to spend an hour listening to the views of a friend of mine, and this was not an isolated incident. Many staff members attended seminar sessions which I helped arrange for departmental interns from HEW or the Labor Department. But I was disturbed and sometimes embarrassed that the young people—usually college undergraduates—were rarely willing to go even half way in discussing problems and issues. I believe the staff members should be interested and willing to hear young people. But they are not obligated to

listen only to students nor must they reject their beliefs in and support of the President in order to begin a conversation.

Often, today, we hear the motives of people attacked. To question motives, I believe is justifiable, but to launch a full scale attack on a person, supposedly because of his motives, is wrong. These attacks have been used frequently against many men and this fundamental method has been used to undermine our institutions. President Nixon's motive in any initiative toward a group of young people is passed off as political. The only Mr. Nixon the person and his ability to communicate with certain groups, but also the Presidency and our entire "system."

But a mature viewer would recognize that even if Mr. Nixon's motives were exclusively political and selfish, there would be benefits for the group he recognized. This is the beauty of having the right to vote. Whether out of the sincere desire or simple political selfishness, an elected official cannot afford to ignore any group of people.

I believe the President is sincerely interested in young people and their future, that he thoroughly enjoys talking with them (this I have seen), and that as far as the vote goes, he has supported lowering the age to 18 for more than 20 years—and continues to even though it is said to be potentially dangerous for him politically.

It has been my experience that young people in general are usually not especially well informed about current events, and that to the extent that they are, their information is distorted. Young people are too quick to accept information which they are given by political candidates to whom they are attracted. I wonder if the followers of John Lindsey, George McGovern, Edmund Muskie, or Ted Kennedy have ever checked their candidates' facts, studied their arguments and compared them to those of opposing political figures?

Have they ever thought that they are being used by these politicians? I would suggest that young people are frequently used in a perhaps insidious way, and that it is often due to a lack of information, or information distorted by the national news monopoly or popular youth candidates. Who has more to gain? Ted Kennedy—who spoke to Capital Hill interns this summer and seemed to say that they had been and continued to be right about everything—or Richard Nixon—who says that he will listen to all young people but will not give them special treatment. I think young people—especially students—are beginning to see subconsciously that they need experience in order to make decisions for themselves and that at this point in their lives, they are not quite ready to make too many major decisions . . . at least not without advice. . .

I submitted my views on youth registration to the White House staff. My feeling was that the President should continue to urge all young people to register, just as he has urged all Americans to do so in the past. At the time, I was not aware of some of the registration drives going on, or I would have sharply criticized them. I consider it an insult to my intelligence to hear radio stations advertising registration parties complete with rock bands. This is precisely what machines-boss politicians used to do to line up their hip-pocket voters. I resent the insult.

Young people who so often attack the "old politicians" should be disgusted by the "rock and register" campaigns. Voting is a privilege and a serious matter, and young people should be willing to demonstrate their acceptance of this responsibility with a mature attitude. Perhaps, however, young people were not registering in very large numbers—which is not much of a compliment in itself.

I respect the President for treating me as he would other voters. I suggested that he do some things which would appeal to young constituencies in order to make it clear he

was anxious for young people to exercise the privilege they have now been granted. I urged that he personally endorse a consideration of lowering the age of majority. In other words, give the right to sit on a jury, to sign a contract or deed, to buy on credit, to make a will, to youths 18 and older—the same as the voting rights.

These are, of course, local matters and must be decided on that level, so the President himself cannot grant such rights. I know, however, that he believes that most, if not all of these rights and responsibilities should be extended to youths who can vote. State Senator Donald E. (Buzz) Lukens has suggested that newly enfranchised voters organize to lower the age of majority, thus participating in the governmental process and learning how it operates.

During my three years at Princeton, I have been aware of an attitude of superiority among many students—not just at my own college. It is disturbing and I have often tried to make fellow students consider other young peoples' points of view. Thus, when, as I studied the statistics we had at the White House, I found that more than two-thirds of young people are not college students, I decided to focus some attention on this group. At the same time I became aware of the many advantages of vocational-technical education programs. I feel that an expansion of these programs can do more to help people and our society than many of the solutions now being considered.

Too many young people who want to improve themselves are forced either by public opinion or the failure of higher education authorities to diversify their programs, to go to a liberal arts college for instruction.

There must be many more who know they do not want to study the humanities—the liberal arts—but are not sure where to go. Technology will be more and more important to our country and an expansion of and greater emphasis on vocational-technical education is vitally needed. This, I believe will be President Nixon's emphasis in the future.

On Labor Day, he spoke of the dignity of work, and the need for more education and the development of skills in order to increase our productivity—something which has been lagging behind other countries.

Although I did not spend a great deal of time studying the prospects of voluntary action among young people, I was very much aware of the new National Center for Voluntary Action (NCVA) which is one of Mr. Finch's interests and a special interest of the President. This is a recognition by the President of the tendency for all Americans and a growing number of young people, to volunteer their services to help others.

The NCVA has been formed to co-ordinate local groups and help them in their efforts to help others. I think the President is greatly heartened by what he feels is the desire of young people to do something and he has been very anxious to see the NCVA grow.

These are some of the projects with which I was involved in one way or another. I have tried to convey some of the personal feelings I noted while working at the White House. There is no question in my mind that the President and Vice President and the White House staff are willing to listen to and consider ideas from young people. With that knowledge, I would hope that members of my generation would attempt to take a sophisticated, mature view of circumstances study many sides of a question, and then calmly and reasonably voice their opinions. Only this way will they gain the respect they want and should have.

Nothing, however, can substitute for experience—and this lack of experience should always be taken into consideration by those of us who do not yet have it.

## TWO THOUGHTS ON HEALTH

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived for Members of Congress to delve into the multitude of proposals that have been offered as possible solutions to American health needs.

There will be many good ideas that merit thoughtful consideration, and there will be many other ideas that should be rejected out of hand.

To that end, I offer two news items. They should be read and digested, as part of the "homework" necessary to keep one's self informed during the coming national health care debate.

The articles follow:

[From American Medical News, Apr. 12, 1971]

### HOAXES AND HOAXERS

Chicago Daily News—Leonard Woodcock, head of the United Auto Workers, opposed the Nixon plan for expanded federal health care when he testified before a Senate subcommittee. Because the plan would work through private insurance and require a patient to pick up part of the tab, he said, it would be "a cruel hoax" on the public.

Like Sen. Edward Kennedy and a number of like-minded Congressmen, Woodcock is gung ho for socializing the whole medical establishment.

Woodcock comes by his beliefs naturally as one of a long line of labor leaders who have preached that their constituents can reasonably expect maximum benefits with a minimum of exertion. The whole ruinous history of featherbedding, for example, springs from such "reasoning"—that the needs of labor can be met by drawing upon some bottomless well of capital that obviates any need for corresponding productivity. This is the cruelest hoax in the whole gamut of economic theory.

Woodcock also has his thinking wrong as to health programs. It isn't the Nixon plan of partnership that would be a cruel hoax, but the Kennedy plan. Nothing could be crueler than persuading the people that they are going to get something for nothing when it just ain't so. Yet this is precisely the line peddled by those who want Uncle Sam to be doctor, nurse, and orderly.

Britain found it hard to backtrack considerably from its original idea of "free" medical care for everybody. The experience here with Medicare and Medicaid has provided a hint as to the costs and problems of a government takeover of health care all down the line.

At the very least, the Nixon plan has the virtue of telling the people that health care can't be "free," at the same time it proposes sound ways of lessening the personal financial burden. This honest approach to a serious problem deserves better than to be labeled a "hoax" by the master hoaxers themselves.

[From the Kansas City Star, June 1, 1971]

### AD CAMPAIGN FOR A.M.A.

(By Phillip S. Brimble)

The American Medical Association is trying to change the climate.

Not the weather but the "receptive" climate. That's what a press release issued from the A.M.A. says.

To convince the American public that its membership is not full of money-grubbing, self-centered quacks, but instead is made up of men (and women) of high character and personal concern for not just the ill but society as a whole, the A.M.A. is launching

what might be viewed as an advertising campaign.

This is something of a turnabout. For virtually decades physicians from all ranks, from small-town doctor to top-of-the-heap A.M.A. big wheels, shunned publicity as if it were plague. To many of them, talking to a reporter about a medical story was tantamount to advertising for themselves.

Foolish was the physician who got his name in the newspaper. No sooner would the paper hit the sidewalk than he would get a critical phone call from a fellow doctor. I'm not sure how logical the reasons were, but, in general, many physicians until recently endorsed that closed-mouth attitude.

The situation has changed. Now, I believe, a majority of physicians would be more than co-operative if their help was needed on a news story.

Perhaps the grassroots change in attitude about press dealings set the stage for the A.M.A.'s new project, a \$750,000 campaign each year for 1971 and 1972, to place six eight full-page inserts in such big-league magazines as *Life*, *Reader's Digest* and *Ebony*.

In addition, there probably will be similar inserts in 10 major daily newspapers, and some television spots in a few cities.

The campaign will have two purposes. First, it will provide information on improving health, such as the release on "How to Kill Yourself," an insert explaining the dangers of being overweight. Another message will be on ecology and the environmental factors of disease.

An A.M.A. news release announcing the campaign says: "We hope to make a positive, constructive contribution both to people's own personal health and to the growing public dialogue on national health care problems."

The A.M.A.'s motives are not unselfish. The organization knows its back is to the wall. Everybody is taking potshots at physicians and organized medicine. And that nasty topic "socialized medicine" in the form of several proposals to Congress for a national health insurance plan—essentially a lever for changing the way medicine is practiced in some proposals—is on the minds of many a politician.

I doubt if those who hold low opinions of organization medicine will be swayed much by the newspaper inserts and telephone spots. But the campaign may help remind the rest of society, perhaps the majority, that individual physicians are merely men, and usually good men at that.

## DESTROY THE FBI AND WHO WINS?

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no limit in the persistence of those attempting to discredit the FBI in the minds of the American people. Fresh signs are in evidence that the FBI may do well to gird itself for another well-publicized assault on its distinguished reputation—this time from critics sequestered in the protection of hallowed university halls.

Late in October, the Committee for Public Justice has scheduled a conference at Princeton University "to examine"—as the committee's recent letters carefully emphasize—"in a nonpartisan and objective way the role, structure, and power of the FBI in the American society." That certainly sounds fair. But it is distinctly out of tune with the comments made when the formation of



the committee was announced last November.

At a press conference held following Director Hoover's characterization of him as the worst Attorney General the FBI chief had ever worked for, Ramsey Clark said:

The committee was formed because a number of prominent private citizens were concerned that the Nation had entered a "period of political repression."

He went on to accuse the FBI of "ideological" prejudice and intolerance of internal criticism. To the astonishment of many, Clark described the FBI's pursuit of the Soviet Union's puppet Communist Party in the United States as "wasteful" and its concern over the danger of the Black Panther Party, whose members have been charged in the past few years with the slayings of dozens of police officers, as "absurd."

The committee's chairman then followed with a series of punches at the administration for creating a "political climate" that had prejudiced constitutional rights.

Now it certainly is a long time from last November to this October, Mr. Speaker, and it is wrong to judge anyone or anything before it has a chance to perform. But the shrill accusations made by Clark and the chairman in announcing the committee's formation make suspect the "nonpartisan and objective" spirit in which it is supposed to conduct its deliberations. This notion gained strength when, in late April of this year, spokesmen for the committee issued a statement claiming that much of the "intense and unprecedented criticism" of the FBI in "recent months" had come from "impeccable quarters."

While these spokesmen declined to identify the "impeccable" critics, it does not take much imagination to associate them with a congressional cast of characters, starring several presidential aspirants serving as standard bearers, which joined anti-FBI forces in public pronouncements issued primarily last March and April. They launched, with all the sounds and fury of deadly combat, a seemingly withering attack against the Bureau. But when all the noise had subsided and the smoke had cleared, there stood the FBI unsullied and undaunted, going about its business with the same quiet efficiency which has distinguished its performance among Government and law enforcement agencies for nearly five decades. It will be surprising if some of these same "battle veterans" and their supporting personnel do not surface at the committee's conference at Princeton this fall.

There is no mystery why the protracted campaign against the FBI earlier this year was unsuccessful. The Bureau's enemies simply tried to fight a battle without any real ammunition. Salvo after salvo fired at the FBI was blank. They made a devastating sound but had no substance with which to inflict damage.

For example, there was the presidential candidate who urged in March that congressional hearings be held to evaluate the "administration of the FBI." Among the purported lengthy record of

reasons for his request, this critic highlighted his receipt of an anonymous letter from 10 FBI agents which complained of conditions and practices in the Bureau. The letter was found to contain so many grossly inaccurate statements about FBI procedure as to cast doubt that anyone even remotely acquainted with FBI operations, much less an employee, prepared it.

The plight also is recalled of the Congressman who rushed headlong into the anti-FBI skirmish the next month. Alas, 2 weeks following his electrifying statement that he had "proof positive" that the FBI had tapped his telephone, the Congressman admitted to his colleagues among much verbal camouflage that his proof consisted of some "interference" on his private telephone. A telephone company spokesman emphatically stated later that the Congressman's telephone was checked by their representatives who found no evidence it had been tapped.

Then came another presidential hopeful, already well into his stump, charging that the FBI had under surveillance a public gathering at which he spoke under legitimate auspices. The fact that a militant extremist, one of seven convicted for inciting violence at the 1968 Democratic Convention, was a speaker at this meeting apparently was of little or no concern to this Senator. Among the militant's incendiary ramblings was a call for his listeners to tear down the capitalist structure and march on New Haven, Conn., to stop the trial of a Black Panther Party leader charged with complicity in the murder of a fellow party member. Of course, the militant, not the Senator, was the object of FBI interest. When this fact eventually emerged, even some of the Senator's more dedicated supporters were forced to admit that this was a proper—if not required—discharge of FBI investigative responsibilities.

In the midst of all the early-spring furor over the FBI, one of its remote small, branch offices was broken into and burglarized. The thieves were after, and they found, a very special loot—confidential FBI communications which could seriously impair its performance and endanger the lives of legitimate sources. Nonetheless, copies of these confidential communications were sent by the thieves, in an obvious attempt to commit the most harm and create the most embarrassment for the Bureau, to newspapers and politicians, among others.

Not so oddly enough, Mr. Speaker, the recipients of copies of stolen FBI documents were opponents of the policies of the current administration. It should be a matter of considerable public concern—if it is not already—just how much the reckless and dangerous actions of the extremists who stole the FBI documents were encouraged by the anti-FBI drama that burst last spring with the glare and dazzle of a political bombshell.

With the committee's announcement that its study would include examination of the stolen FBI documents, hopes for an objective and scholarly examination of the Bureau plummeted. Thoughts of "prominent private citizens"—of which the committee is supposed to be composed—trafficking in stolen Govern-

ment documents, are not attractive or reassuring. This, together with the circumstances of the committee's founding, the anti-FBI debacle that followed, and the evident political bias of those associated with the committee, raises grave questions as to its motivation. If the committee has political objectives, then it has no credentials to examine the FBI, much less conduct its study under university auspices.

Politics is a necessary but sometimes bizarre endeavor, Mr. Speaker. Those who practice this irresistible but treacherous art would do well to leave the FBI where it belongs—out of it.

#### UNCOMMON CONTRIBUTORS

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the State, a South Carolina newspaper, which discusses the "uncommon contributors" to John W. Gardner's "people's lobby." The editorial makes the point that the situation is enough to shake one's faith in Mr. Gardner's operation.

The full text follows:

#### UNCOMMON CONTRIBUTORS

It was a year ago, if memory serves, that John W. Gardner launched Common Cause, the so-called "people's lobby" that was going to save America from the "special interests" by galvanizing the common man. "There is so much that needs to be done," pined Mr. Gardner to an accompanying gush of publicity, and he promised to do it.

A year has passed, and Common Cause has just filed a report on itself with the clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, as required by the 1946 Regulation of Lobbying Act. Surprise, surprise. Mr. Gardner's crowd may be saving us from those hated "special interests," but if so it is doing it with money from Rockefellers and Fords, among others.

"Common Cause, the national lobby attempting to change political structures and priorities, has a list of major contributors that reads like a Who's Who in the Establishment," reports Congressional Quarterly. Donors, it continues, include fat cats ranging from Time Inc. to Arlen Properties, commercial developers and partners with Greek wheeler-dealer Aristotle Onassis.

Now, there is nothing illegal about it. If John D. Rockefeller III wants to plunk down \$25,000 to join Common Cause (and Ford Motor Co. \$10,000), that's his (its) business. All the same, a lot of little Joes and Janes have plunked down \$15 in dues on the assurance from Mr. Gardner that "we cannot and should not depend on big contributors."

It's enough to shake one's faith in Mr. Gardner's operation and all those engines of publicity that gave it such a send-off. If the Common Cause is so pure, how come it was necessary to gull the members with all that "special interest" cant?

#### MANSFIELD AMENDMENT TO MILITARY PROCUREMENT BILL

(Mr. WHALEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished news commentator, Joe McCaffrey, addressed himself last evening to the possible vote in the House this

afternoon on accepting the Mansfield amendment to the Military Procurement bill. I take this opportunity to bring his thoughtful assessment of the importance of this vote to my colleagues' attention.

#### ASSESSMENT BY JOE McCAFFREY

Tomorrow the House of Representatives can decide if it wants to stand up and be counted on the Mansfield amendment. If it does, then it can decide if it wants to continue to endorse the war in Viet Nam. All over the fifty states more and more Americans have turned their back on the war, but not the House. The House hangs in there.

The amendment by Senator Mike Mansfield, the Democratic leader of the Senate, calls for withdrawal of all American military forces from Indo China within six months, contingent on the release of American prisoners of war. It was tacked to the military procurement bill in the Senate.

The House of Representatives has never rejected the folly of the Viet Nam war. It has stayed with it through the deaths of more than 55,000 young Americans. Even now as the war tails off the House continues to be mesmerized by the greatest tragedy ever to befall America.

One reason given for opposition to the Mansfield amendment is that President Nixon is ending the war so there is no need for Congressional action. For the past week I've been told by at least six different Republican House and Senate members that the President's big surprise will be getting all combat troops out of Viet Nam before New Year's.

Well, if this is true, why block the Mansfield amendment? If this is true, the President would actually be topping the Mansfield amendment.

If the President is about to get out of Viet Nam, as Republicans keep whispering to me, then there is no reason why the House should not overcome its timidity and vote at long last for an end to the war. If the whispers are true, that the war is winding down completely, then this might be the last chance the House will ever have to absolve itself, in a very small—very small—way from America's greatest, and saddest, folly.

Otherwise the House may continue fighting it even after the President has brought all our troops back home.

#### COLUMBUS DAY

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, in Syracuse, N.Y., I was privileged to participate in the ceremonies marking the first official Federal celebration of Columbus Day in the United States.

By honoring the memory of Christopher Columbus, Mr. Speaker, we also paid tribute to the dedication, the contributions, and the sacrifices which millions of Americans of Italian descent have made to transform this Nation of ours into the land of promise.

As one of the cosponsors of the legislation establishing the holiday, the day had a personal significance for me. This was compounded by the fact that I was able to join in paying special tribute to an old and dear friend, Mr. Anthony Visciglio, who was honored on the occasion with the Order Sons of Italy Humanitarianism

Award for 1971. No one is more deserving of this accolade.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point the remarks of Mr. John Nave, former grand and supreme delegate, Order Sons of Italy in America, Grand Lodge of the State of New York, who served as toastmaster for the evening and who presented the award to Tony Visciglio:

#### ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

Remarks by Toastmaster John F. Nave, former Grand and Supreme Delegate, Order Sons of Italy in America, Grand Lodge of the State of New York, on the occasion of celebrating Columbus Day at Three Rivers Inn, Syracuse, New York, by the combined three Syracuse Lodges of the Order Sons of Italy in America on Sunday, 10 October 1971.

Reverend Father, distinguished guests at the head table, friends and members of the Organization, ladies and gentlemen: It is with great reverence and deep appreciation that I address you this evening. The year 1971 has deep significance for those who have struggled down through the years to make Columbus Day a Legal Federal Holiday.

This month, for the first time in American History, Columbus Day is being observed as a national holiday. It has taken years to bring this about. The Order Sons of Italy in America played a prominent role in making this a reality.

On 28 June 1968 President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law a bill designating Columbus Day a Legal Federal Holiday on each and every 2nd Monday of October starting in this year of 1971.

I was privileged in 1964 to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and again in 1967 before the House Judiciary Committee in Washington, D.C. in behalf of making Columbus Day a legal federal holiday. In so doing I learned one interesting fact: it was mainly the Americans of Italian Origin who helped bring this thing about.

However, one factor becomes noticeable. Columbus discovered America in 1492. Yet, it took 476 years after that discovery for the Congress of the United States to take affirmative action. Stated differently, 192 years after the USA became an independent nation, that nation saw fit to honor Columbus with a legal federal holiday dedicated to him. And by so doing joined practically all of the other nations in Central and South America to make Columbus Day the most celebrated holiday in the Western Hemisphere, next to Christmas.

In addition, there appears to be a new renaissance in America regarding the proper celebration of Columbus Day. Such organizations as the Order Sons of Italy in America, Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Sons and Daughters of Columbus, Knights of Columbus, and a host of many other organizations—to many to list in such a few moments of time—have by their organizational by-laws or practice made Columbus Day the official holiday of their respective organizations.

In the State of New York in 1965 the Order Sons of Italy in America, Grand Lodge of the State of New York, had a law passed to place a bust of Columbus in the lobby of the State Capitol in Albany. I was privileged to play a major role in this.

In conclusion, I'd like to remind you all that our greatest hour in reference to honoring Columbus has finally come this evening, as we at last sit down to celebrate this day for the first time in American history as a national federal holiday. The ultimate triumph is ours and for all of America to share in.

And so we have scheduled one of the finest speaking arrangements with the Honorable Edward Re, Judge of the United States Dis-

toms Court, as Principal Guest Speaker. Also, a humanitarian award program to the well known and beloved Syracuse restaurateur Anthony Visciglio for his unfailing devotion to service for the care of homeless and underprivileged children by the Order Sons of Italy in America, Syracuse Lodges, and Congressman James Hanley (NY). This to be followed by a tremendous Hollywood celebrity show in celebration of this wonderful occasion—Columbus Day 1971—the beginning of a great new era in American History. Thank you.

#### ANTHONY VISCIGLIO—1971 HUMANITARIUM AWARD RECIPIENT

Humanitarian Award by Order Sons of Italy in America, combined Syracuse, New York Lodges to Anthony Visciglio well known Syracuse restaurateur for his great work in the care of homeless and underprivileged children, and other charities on Columbus Day celebration occasion, Three Rivers Inn, Syracuse, New York on Sunday 10 October 1971. Biography and citation award made by Toastmaster John F. Nave on behalf of the Order Sons of Italy in America, combined Syracuse Lodges.

Born 1911, Italy. Entered United States 1920. Son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank (Carmella) Visciglio. Resident of Syracuse, New York since that time. After an early career in hotel service as a bus boy, room service waiter, captain of waiters and chain hotel service trouble shooter, he entered into the restaurant field as an independent operator.

Since 1937 he has become one of upstate New York's best known restaurateurs operating originally a neighborhood family restaurant, which has since become a popular Central New York eating establishment, drawing from the entire metropolitan area.

In addition to operating a successful restaurant, Visciglio has been a constant and devoted leader in trade association activities on the local, state and national levels for nearly two decades.

He is prominent in Syracuse area affairs, both professional and civic. He has been a key leader in charitable efforts and for 12 years let the Central New York Tavernkeeper's Association, of which he was president, into community recognition through participation in many worthy civic and charitable enterprises. In Syracuse and Onondaga County, Visciglio has been a leader in Community Chest, Red Cross, March of Dimes, and aid to Retarded Children's Association programs. Also, vice chairman of 1967 Florence, Italy flood relief drive and Chairman of 1965 and Honorary Chairman of 1966-1970 drive for funds for homeless and underprivileged children of Boys Town of Italy. In addition, advisor and vice chairman of Sicilian Earthquake Drive for 1968.

He is a member of the local Army-Navy Disciplinary Board, Onondaga County Social Hygiene Committee, Syracuse Chamber of Commerce, and his local South Side Businessman's Club. For over 20 years he has been active in his own trade association field, such as being Chairman of the Board of the Central New York Tavern Keepers Association, Director of the National Licensed Beverage Association, State Restaurant Liquor Dealers Association of New York, and an officer in various trade associations.

He served honorably in the United States Army in World War II and a member of the American Legion and Italian American War Veterans of the United States. Is currently active in church affairs and is a member also of following organizations: Order Sons of Italy in America, Knights of Columbus, Order of Alhambra, Columbus Foundation (Syracuse, N.Y. of which also a director), and Benevolent Fraternal Order of Elks.

He is married (former Bess Ventre 1934) and has two children, Linda and Anthony, Jr. Three sisters—Jennie Samora, Fannie



Nave, and Mary Albanese, all of Syracuse, New York.

In 1970 this well known Syracuse restaurant operator and civic leader was honored personally by the Reverend Monsignor J. Patrick Carroll-Abbing—founder and director of Boys' Town of Italy—with decoration "Gold Cross of Merit".

By his actions he has demonstrated amply that people in business who value their time greatly can utilize some of that time for the good of all people in a community, including the International Community.

The Sons of Italy in America has been in existence in the Syracuse area for the past 55 years—since 1916. In all that time previous to tonight the humanitarian award has been given three times. Tonight it does so for the fourth time—to Anthony Visciglio.

I can best describe it by asking Anthony to step forward and receive his citation award.

As he did so, Toastmaster John F. Nave on behalf of the Order Sons of Italy in America, Syracuse Lodges, concluded with these remarks:

Congratulations Anthony Visciglio. You are worthy of this great humanitarian award.

#### DISCUSSION ON GREECE

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as one who makes no claim to expertise in foreign affairs in general, and certainly none in the Greek affair in particular, I feel a freedom that comes from objectivity to discuss the situation in Greece. Sometimes a fresh point of view makes obvious what experts overlook. In terms of my own experience, I have been more closely acquainted with the Korean picture in the Pacific than with Greek affairs in the Mediterranean. However, having visited Greece recently and having become much more interested in Greek affairs, I have followed some of the events which have lately occurred, and I would like to make some observations on what I believe are obvious parallels between Korea and Greece.

Both Greece and Korea are peninsula nation states, with rugged terrains and a very limited amount of land which lends itself to productive use. Both peoples have a strong cultural heritage. In the past, both countries have been very influential in the development of cultures, languages, and philosophies in neighbors now much stronger than they. Both have had periods of great importance in their areas of the world and, following that, long histories of suppression. In addition, each country has on its border enemies of long standing and each has been subjected to invasion and foreign domination over long periods of time.

After World War II, both countries found themselves in a situation of peculiar importance to the balance of power between the free world and the Communist world. President Truman chose the Korean peninsula in which to have the showdown with communism in Asia and the Greek peninsula for the showdown with communism in Europe. Following his decision, both countries developed a strong reliance on the United States, and, within each country, a high profile of American influence and pres-

ence exists. Both Korea and Greece struggle to re-establish something of an effective nationalism with governments strongly influenced by the military. Long periods of suppression had not allowed an indigenous political leadership to develop, accounting for a reliance on administrations made up almost solely by military men. These men had the advantage of American direction and education and, in carrying out the joint responsibilities of logistics, planning, personnel, and so on, developed the very skills that are essential to bringing together and making effective administrative and executive leadership in a modern state.

Greece and Korea had a fierce dedication to their own integrity as a people with a proud heritage, but each suffered the blights of foreign domination over a long number of years. To understand the Greek situation today, we must understand what is wrought by this kind of history.

I think that anyone who studies the history of a dominated people will find some common and almost inevitable reactions to such blights. Let us take as examples the Philippines or those South American countries where the Spanish domination occurred over a period of some 300 years. When this domination is by a country which is very strong and even cruel in its oppression and where that dominant country is solely interested in extraction and exploitation, then you can be sure that certain events will follow. First, the oppressor will either eliminate or strongly discourage a leadership capability within the country. The extent of this suppression is evidenced in a full spectrum of domination, from that of the Portuguese and Dutch, who discouraged the development of local leadership, to that of the English and Americans, who encouraged political development, even in its colonials, in the old sense of the word. When there is a lack of leadership training, the country which eventually comes into its own lacks a leadership capability. We find dedicated persons, but to find dedicated persons who are also capable is a challenge, particularly now when every country, whether it be developed or underdeveloped, requires broad administrative skills.

A second consequence of oppression are the attitudes born from a history of domination, attitudes of defensiveness and antagonism toward government per se. These attitudes emerge over long periods of time in which governments do nothing constructive for their people. Contacts with governmental authorities are generally bad. This causes a conditioned withdrawal to the rural areas of people trying to minimize the possibilities of contact with outside authority.

This withdrawal is still evident in Greece, where, during the Turkish occupation, many persons in the rural communities took to the hills and were willing to accept a very minimum existence in the rocky upper soils, where grapes and goats predominate, in return for a hiding place. The central government found it difficult to extract taxes, commandeer work forces, and conscript involuntary military personnel. One finds

about one-third of the Greek population still in these high rocky villages, with a fierce independence and a strong feeling of their own heritage.

I emphasize this section of the Greek population to point out what I feel is often overlooked, that a country is far more than its capital. The news media tend to concentrate on what emanates from the capital simply because it is far easier to assign and house correspondents there, in reach of the amenities of modern life and its best communications systems. With the media concentrated in a capital, we on the outside read capital news. We must guard against assuming that this news is an accurate reflection of what goes on in any sizable country. In Greece, for instance, little less than a third of the population is in Athens; a little more than a third is in all of the other cities of any more than, say, ten thousand persons on up. And another third would be in the small villages of the islands and hills. In order to know Greece, one would have to know with some accuracy the reactions, opinions, and attitudes of the people in places other than Athens.

However clear this understanding would be of the Greek population, it does not negate the fact that, as a result of foreign oppression, Greece is a divided people. The inhabitants of the highlands, for example, do not equate being Greek with being loyal supporters, necessarily, of any particular regime. And the inhabitants of Athens have a historical life different from those of both the smaller cities and the hill dwellers.

This factionalism was accentuated when Greece, after attaining its independence at the end of World War II, unfortunately, but predictably, came into being as a democracy with splintered parties, none of which have enough combined loyalty to really run the country. We had a period of coalition governments, made up of splinter party alignments, all of which were very vulnerable and none of which lasted a very long time. This splintering encouraged a kind of barter system in which elected representatives changed parties with shifts of alignments and made themselves available to the highest bidder for personal advantage. One can imagine the reaction in the home constituency, which elected a man in one party and saw him, during his term, join three or four others in order to get himself a cozier situation in Athens, often at the expense of his supporters.

A multiplicity of parties is not, of course, singular to Greece. One could point out that even an old and stable—supposedly stable—democracy such as France has a multiplicity of parties. Of course, one can also see in its history a revolving door of dominance and change of leadership until De Gaulle. I think that one has to recognize here that there can be a superimposition of a person who has the backing of the people and to whom all parties, splintered though they be, must be responsive in order to retain their own power base. That was the situation in France with De Gaulle. Where this does not happen, the tendency is to have splinter parties cause a

continual instability and absence of real leadership.

In the absence of a personality like De Gaulle or a strong party tradition, there may be the intrusion of another kind of stability brought in by the military. We have seen this time and time again, especially in underdeveloped countries. We see situations in which a military personality generates a movement leading to his singular power, or situations in which a movement is begun by a group, but whose leader, having started the movement, then decides to take it over for his own purposes. This is the classic dictatorship with military support.

We also have those situations in which there is a movement guided by certain power groups, in which the military is represented. This is what has occurred in Korea. I think we have a situation in Korea similar to the one in Greece. A tremendous factionalism existed in Korea which was in itself a splintering of power, and its vestiges still remain. The importance and changing operative stance of this factionalism or splintering has to be very carefully studied and understood in order to know what is happening in Korea and, of course, Greece. When one looks back at the overthrow of the Syngman Rhee government in Korea one sees some similarity to the Papandreou situation, in which there was a softening of the leadership and such a questionable handling of authority that, at any given time, certain persons near the seat of power could swing the policy one way or the other. When the central core loses its solidity, a country like Korea or Greece has the potential to explode into a sort of sub-chief fighting.

In Korea, as I pointed out, neither explosion nor military dictatorship happened. Instead, there was a semblance of a movement to a democratic position, even though many of the movement's personalities were of the earlier military stamp. Their presence is, as I noted previously, predictable, since the kinds of skills and capabilities that were required in the country were precisely what these military men had learned as part of the training they received from the United States.

The political situation in Korea parallels the situation in Greece. However, there still remains to be seen in Greece a willingness on the part of the military to move into a posture of political chance-taking by testing their performance before the people in an election. I would suggest that, unless there is evidence of a true movement toward democratization, stabilization, and unity in Greece, opposition will build up against the present Greek leadership as a result of the frustration of and disappointment in the original movement. When a movement is thwarted and when the development into a more stable and responsive democracy is not visible, the people's reaction is likely to be the same as that to the presence of repressive domination by a foreign power. A psychological effect can be observed in such situations, wherein the individual's instinct for survival takes precedence over any commitment to a broad political phi-

losophy. There is a reluctance to put one's position at stake unless there is a broad sense of group solidarity. If, in such situations, one hasn't the safety-valve effect of small crises which blow off steam, there is an accumulation of the kind of dynamite which, when it does go off, goes off in a rather startling and awesome way. I think you can predict that this introversion develops when people have been subjected to extreme repression. They will react in the same way, whether the source of that repression is their own government or that of a foreign government. This is something that must be understood and watched in Greece.

Having approached the Greek question generally and historically, I will now turn my attention to the hearings before our own committees interested in the problems of Greece, in particular, those before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee. I have been struck by the fact that most of the witnesses are persons with lengthy service in the on-going interest groups which contribute to this factionalized Greece that I talk about. The central issue in Greece, at the time of the Papandreou upset, was, in my view, a choice between a soft government, which was gradually eroding the stability of the country and diminishing its economic potentials, and a strong government which would recapture a sense of direction, control, and economic drive. As I say, this choice was not between liberal and conservative, but rather between soft and strong. If one misses this point, one misses the whole portent of the story.

Greece must foster a movement which will retain some of the strength and yet, at the same time, build a broader base of popular support, respond to the people through the electoral process, and shift the power from the military to an elected group. The question that should be asked by those outside of Greece is, "Is there any evidence of this movement?" "Can we predict that the developments we hope for from this movement will be achieved or is this one of those problem situations in which personalities will dictate the movement's direction?"

I hesitate over the value of testimony from persons like Mrs. Helen Vlahos, a strong conservative, who opposed Papandreou during his time and who now opposes the present leadership. Apparently, neither of these administrations reflects her own viewpoints. I think it is understandable that she would be in opposition, as long as she does not get her way. We should understand this, and we should realize that the testimony of such people, who operate from a narrow base of opinion, cannot give us insights and suggestions as to how we might interpret what is happening in Greece or what is likely to happen to America's goals or philosophical commitments there.

The final point I wish to make is that we need to take a stance that does not intrude the United States too heavily in whatever processes are evolving in Greece. Rather, we must study that evolution and see how it affects our goals. I think we should be honest and communicate to Greece, as well as to the rest of the world, that we understand

realistically what our goals are and that we are trying to intelligently serve those goals, acknowledging, at the same time, that every country has a right to work out its own political future.

Our objectives in Greece are comparable to our objectives in Korea. Both of these peninsula countries are peculiarly situated to create a posture of balance in the area of the world in which they are positioned. In order to be an effective power in a piece of the globe that is far removed from our land, we have to have the leverage of geographical position such as is offered in Greece or Korea. We can use our presence, such as it is, and our influence, such as it may effectively be, to maintain a condition of power balance that is in the best interest of the fulcrum country. And that is my view of the U.S. involvement in both Korea and Greece.

Finally, it would seem to me that what is really required of the committee, in terms of the pressures to which it is subjected, is that it involve itself in a study in depth of the Greek situation. Without this understanding, the committee is simply prey to the push and pulls from diverse groups in support of or in opposition to what is now the Government of Greece. When the central question is unclear, then debate on the subject is hardly informative. The central question is: Where is Greece going and how does this direction affect legitimate U.S. interests? The extent of our involvement in its future depends upon the answers we find in our study of the question. The committee, up to this point, has more or less overlooked this approach to the Greek situation, involving itself, instead, in either punishing or rewarding, depending on whether they approve or disapprove of who is in charge. This is not the best kind of position for our Government to be in, either from the legislative or the executive standpoint.

The intelligent believable policy is to accept great power responsibility for world peace, a policy which assumes some concern for regional order and balance and the promotion of general progress for economic betterment and political stability. This can be an international policy not a Greek policy. As such it is defensible without explaining unnecessary involvement in local affairs.

#### CIVIL DEFENSE TAKES INITIATIVE IN EMERGENCY PLANNING

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the efforts of Mr. Laurence E. Miller, Director of Civil Defense for St. Clair County, Ill. For many years, Larry Miller has contributed his hard work and expertise to solving the problems of emergency planning in my Congressional District. Therefore, I would like to insert the following article from the Defense Department magazine Response into the RECORD so that my colleagues may appreciate Mr. Miller's humanitarian contributions to public safety in St. Clair County.



## RAPID RURAL ROUTERS

ST. CLAIR COUNTY, ILL.—In this county of nearly 690 square miles, just east of St. Louis, the problem of how to locate and get to a particular home rapidly in an emergency has plagued public safety personnel for years. Now, through the initiative of St. Clair County Civil Defense, the problem has been solved.

Prompt response to rural fires was a major part of the problem, according to Laurence E. Miller, Director of St. Clair County Civil Defense. Not only was a threatened home sometimes difficult to locate, but at times there were also problems among two or more of the 48 fire districts in the county as to which department should respond to the call. Mr. Miller said the problem became evident to his office because it maintains 24-hour dispatch coverage of all fire and police frequencies in the county at its Emergency Operating Center.

## NEEDED: A BETTER MAP

Poor county mapping—at least for fire dispatching purposes—was found to be the crux of the problem. In fact the first major chore was delineating the actual boundaries of all the fire districts in the county. "We found that some of the fire departments had been organized for a great many years and the present personnel were not really familiar with some of the boundary locations," Mr. Miller said, "so we had to go back into the records and determine this, a time-consuming operation." By digging through tax district records and other sources of information, Mr. Miller, with major assistance from Ed Matysik, Belleville, Illinois, Civil Defense Director as well as Communications Officer for St. Clair County Civil Defense, determined and mapped the actual boundaries of all 48 fire districts in the county.

Then they developed a more precise "emergency address" system by mapping a type of grid system made possible by the fact that all of the townships in the county are divided into mile-square areas, usually 36 square miles to each township.

Mr. Miller said that, using the new color-coded base map, his EOC was frequently in a position to redirect the proper fire or police units to the scene of an emergency.

## THE PROJECT EXPANDS

But the project didn't stop there. The local District 8 office of the Illinois Highway Department printed more than 200 copies of the map for use by all fire, police, ambulance, and rescue units in the county.

And then St. Clair County Civil Defense, assisted by the various fire departments, conducted an educational program throughout the county so that each rural resident would know and report his new "emergency address" in an emergency. For example, rather than reporting it as "Jim Jones on Yeager Road" (wherever that might be), the address is reported as "Jim Jones, Prairie du Long Township, Section 2, Yeager Road, second house on the left." Individual fire departments have refined the system even more by assigning a specific "emergency address" number to each farm in the fire district.

The result is a big help to public safety personnel in the county and to the people they serve.

## THE PROPOSED ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 1970

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman PATMAN and I have introduced the administration's legislative proposal (H.R. 11309) to implement

phase II of "PEP"—the President's economic program.

Phase I, the temporary 90-day freeze of prices and wages expiring November 13, has received overwhelming support from the public despite the numerous inequities that are inevitable under any across-the-board freeze program. Phase I was imposed under authority of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 which expires April 30, 1972.

Phase II likewise will rely on the authority contained in the Stabilization Act. For that reason the administration is asking for a 1-year extension of the act to April 30, 1973, addition of a declaration of findings, and a broadening of authority to include control of interest and dividends consonant with economic growth. As an ongoing stabilization program the administration is also asking for subpoena powers, reestablishment of an Emergency Court of Appeals to expedite review of the legal problems, clarification of the authority to act on a selective basis in individual industries, provide exemption from conflict-of-interest provisions for members of the price commission and the pay board, authorize additional sanctions, provide pay provisions for top personnel, and authorize the necessary funding.

Last Thursday the President announced the broad outlines of the phase II program. The interim goal is to reduce the inflation rate to 2 to 3 percent by the end of 1972, about half the pre-freeze rate, which would be a great step toward price stability but not so rigid as to preclude adjustments needed for equity and efficiency. The new program will place heavy reliance upon voluntary compliance but will also involve reporting requirements, selective compliance reviews, and the use of sanctions where necessary.

The House Banking and Currency Committee probably will begin hearings on this legislative proposal early next week. The desirability of the additions to the act are so self-evident that they should be noncontroversial. The committee in my opinion will report the bill promptly.

There is no reason at all why the legislative process cannot be completed and the bill signed into law before the start of the phase II program on November 14. Those administering the program should have all the legislative authority needed to correct the inequities of the freeze period and make the phase II program an equitable one that will merit the continued widespread support of the public.

Attached to my remarks is a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

## SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Set forth below is a section-by-section analysis of the proposed amendments to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended.

Sec. 1. Findings of Congress. The present Act (hereafter, "title") contains no statement of findings and has been under court attack on the ground that it is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority to the Executive branch. The first two sentences set forth congressional findings as bases for the legislation. The last sentence is

intended to state why discretion to act is given to the President.

Sec. 2. Presidential Authority. The amendment to section 202 adds authority to stabilize interest and dividends. A new provision would require the President to set forth a statement of reasons to accompany stabilization orders and regulations. The President is authorized to stabilize prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels not less than those prevailing on May 25, 1970, as in the present legislation. With respect to interest rates and corporate dividends and similar transfers, the President is given authority to stabilize at levels consonant with orderly economic growth.

An existing law for controlling interest, the Credit Control Act, is not satisfactory as a statutory basis for regulating interest rates. The Act (Public Law 91-151; 12 U.S.C. 1901 *et seq.*) provides that interest rates may be regulated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as part of a credit control program which may be instituted only under certain circumstances. These circumstances require a Presidential determination that credit controls are necessary to prevent inflation generated by the extension of credit in an excessive volume. Such a determination would not appear justified under present conditions. Therefore, new authority to regulate interest rates is necessary to give the President a more flexible tool than the Credit Control Act.

Section 202(b) would be deleted from the statute. This subsection requires the President to make a determination before he may exercise wage-price stabilization authority with respect to a particular industry or segment of the economy. That determination must be that prices or wages in a particular industry or segment of the economy have increased at a rate grossly disproportionate to the rate at which prices or wages have increased in the economy generally. With the deletion of this provision, section 202 would contain clear authority in the President to make reasonable classifications and differentiations and to provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the judgment of the President are necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes of the title. Further, as under existing law, the President would have the power both to order rollbacks within the limits fixed by the statute and to allow increases in the ceilings which are fixed pursuant to this title.

Sec. 3. Delegation. The proposed language would give the President clear authority to delegate functions to boards and commissions. Where part time members serve on such boards and commissions, legal powers must be placed in the chairmen. Part time members will be expressly exempted from the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 with respect to their membership on such boards or commissions to avoid misunderstanding about their status. The proposed language also would give the President clear authority to order the use of available agency funds to carry out the functions of this title.

Sec. 4. Sanctions—Criminal Fine and Civil Penalty. Subsection (a) provides for a criminal fine of \$5,000 for each violation of an order or regulation. Subsection (b) provides for a civil penalty of \$2,500 for each violation of an order or regulation. Both of these sanctions would be enforced by the Attorney General through court action.

Sec. 5. Injunctions and other relief. The present language of the statute is open to the interpretation that an agency exercising authority under this title can bring an injunction action in its own behalf. The proposed language states explicitly that it is the Attorney General who is empowered to bring the action.

The present statute contains no explicit authority for the restitution of money received in violation of its provisions. While it

is probable that the courts have inherent equitable power to order restitution of money so received, such authority is made clear in this section by an explicit grant of power to order such restitution as part of injunctive relief.

Sec. 6. Confidentiality of information; subpoena power.

(a) This subsection provides that trade secrets and other confidential information which is reported to or otherwise obtained by an agency exercising authority under this title are entitled to the protection afforded by 18 U.S.C. 1905.

(b) The present statute gives the agency no subpoena powers. The proposed language is very broad and would give subpoena power to the head of the agency "for any purposes related to this title." Further, the Attorney General could enforce such a subpoena in any district court of the United States, thus making the reach of the subpoena nationwide.

Sec. 7. Administrative Review. This section provides that the agencies exercising authority under this title will be exempt from the Administrative Procedure Act, except for the public information section.

Sec. 8. Judicial Review. This section provides that exclusive original jurisdiction over wage-price cases shall be in federal district courts (a). Persons are entitled to bring declaratory judgment actions regardless of the amount in controversy (b). A Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals is created to consist of three or more federal district court or circuit court judges designated by the Chief Justice. The Emergency Court may sit in panels of three and may travel throughout the United States as necessary (c). The Emergency Court shall have the normal appellate jurisdiction of a U.S. Court of Appeals over wage-price cases (d). Substantial constitutional issues must be certified to the Emergency Court (e). Agency regulations may not be overturned unless they are in excess of authority or are arbitrary and capricious, and agency orders may not be overturned unless based on facts not supported by substantial evidence on the record (f). Injunctions against any provision of the Economic Stabilization Act or regulation or order thereunder may be granted only by the Emergency Court or the Supreme Court (g). The effectiveness of judgments of the Emergency Court is to be delayed by 30 days (h) to allow for review in the Supreme Court by petition for writ of certiorari (i). The provisions of this judicial review section apply to actions pending on the date of enactment (j).

Sec. 9. Personnel. This section authorizes new hires for the President to carry out the purposes of this title including Executive Level positions and supergrade positions. Additionally, the President is given authority to detail personnel from any executive agency to carry out the purposes of this title and to appoint advisory committees. Provision is made for reinstatement of employees of the United States to the position occupied at the time of appointment or a comparable position when such employees are appointed to positions for carrying out the functions of this title and are subsequently removed from those positions.

Sec. 10. Experts and consultants. This section authorizes the employment of experts and consultants without regard to certain laws concerning the reemployment of retired employees.

Sec. 11. Funding.

(a) This subsection adds language authorizing the appropriation of moneys to the President for the purpose of carrying out this title.

(b) This subsection authorizes the President to accept contributions for purposes of this title.

Sec. 12. Expiration. This section extends

by one year the expiration date of the current statute.

Sec. 13. Ratification. This section contains approval of all action taken under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended.

Sec. 14. Severability. This section provides that if a part of this title is held invalid, other portions shall remain valid.

#### CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, unfortunate efforts have been made by some Members of Congress to threaten the withdrawal of U.S. financial support from the United Nations should the administration position of a "two-China" policy be rejected in that international body.

Today, to counter this illogical and destructive attack on the United Nations, 125 Representatives advised our Ambassador to the U.N., the Honorable George Bush, that they would not support or condone such retaliation.

As one who initiated this letter, I would like to make it clear that it is not our intention to defend or attack a "two-China" policy but to continue congressional support of the U.N. despite defeats which the administration might suffer on specific issues.

Those who signed the letter include the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and the majority whip, as well as others from both parties. A similar letter is underway in the Senate.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1971.

HON. GEORGE BUSH,  
Ambassador, U.S. Mission to the U.N.,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: We believe that a strong United Nations is an essential element in the creation of a just and peaceful world. We believe that you share our views.

We were deeply distressed to read statements ascribed to other Members of Congress threatening a dramatic reduction in U.S. financial support for the U.N. if the Republic of China were to be expelled from that body.

However we as individuals may feel on the particular issue, nothing could be more damaging to our genuine national interest than for us to undermine the foundations of the United Nations. For years the United States has fought the efforts of other U.N. members to exercise a financial veto over its activities by withholding funds. It takes little foresight to perceive that should this practice become widespread, the U.N. will cease to function at all in any meaningful way. The recent criticism by Narcotics Bureau Director Ingersoll of countries which are refusing to contribute to a U.N. anti-drug program poses an ironic counterpoint to the suggestion of withholding funds, and serves to underline the danger to our interests of such a course.

We firmly believe that our efforts, like yours, must be dedicated to strengthening the U.N., not simply for its own sake, but also because the attainment of a world in which international cooperation prevails ought to be at the heart of our foreign policy. We urge you to make clear that our government remains committed to that goal.

Brad Morse (Mass.), William F. Ryan (N.Y.), Ogden Reid (N.Y.), Benjamin Rosenthal (N.Y.), Herman Badillo (N.Y.), Lionel Van Deerlin (Calif.), Don Edwards

(Calif.), Sidney Yates (Ill.), John Seiberling (Ohio), Nick Begich (Alaska).

Farren Mitchell (Md.), Ronald Dellums (Calif.), James Corman (Calif.), Glenn Anderson (Calif.), Bob Eckhardt (Tex.), Robert Driscoll (Mass.), Don Fraser (Minn.), William Ford (Mich.), Ella Grasso (Conn.), James Scheuer (N.Y.).

John Dent (Pa.), James O'Hara (Mich.), Bob Leggett (Calif.), Lee Hamilton (Ind.), Edward Roush (Ind.), Charles Vanik (Ohio), William Hungate (Mo.), John Conyers (Mich.), Emanuel Celler (N.Y.), Abner Mikva (Ill.).

Lucien Nedzi (Mich.), Robert Nix (Pa.), Joseph Karth (Minn.), Ken Hechler (W. Va.), Paul Sarbanes (Md.), William Green (Pa.), Louis Stokes (Ohio), Harold Johnson (Calif.), Shirley Chisholm (N.Y.), Henry Helstoski (N.J.).

Robert Roe (N.J.), Mike Harrington (Mass.), John Dellenbach (Oreg.), Patsy T. Mink (Hawaii), Bob Kastenmeier (Wis.), Spark Matsunaga (Hawaii), Bella Abzug (N.Y.), Frank Evans (Colo.), Brock Adams (Wash.), Claude Pepper (Fla.).

James Howard (N.J.), Edward Roybal (Calif.), James Abourezk (S. Dak.), Teno Roncallo (Wyo.), John Culver (Iowa), Bertram Podell (N.Y.), Dante Fascell (Fla.), Thomas Rees (Calif.), Augustus Hawkins (Calif.), Henry Reuss (Wis.), Phillip Burton (Calif.).

John Brademas (Ind.), Dominick Daniels (N.J.), Frank Thompson, Jr. (N.J.), William D. Hathaway (Maine), John Moss (Calif.), Charles Rangel (N.Y.), Morris Udall (Ariz.), Lloyd Meeds (Wash.), Hugh Carey (N.Y.), John Dingell (Mich.).

Joshua Ellberg (Pa.), Fernand St Germain (R.I.), Andrew Jacobs (Ind.), Robert Tiernan (R.I.), William Moorhead (Pa.), Cornelius Gallagher (N.J.), Peter Kyros (Maine), Jonathan Bingham (N.Y.), Sam Gibbons (Fla.), Bob Bergland (Minn.).

Thomas O'Neill (Mass.), Clarence Long (Md.), Arthur Link (N. Dak.), John McFall (Calif.), Bill Frenzel (Minn.), Peter Frelinghuysen (N.J.), Frank Horton (N.Y.), Paul McCloskey, Jr. (Calif.), Wm. S. Broomfield (Mich.), Paul Findley (Ill.).

Gilbert Gude (Md.), Howard W. Robison (N.Y.), Charles Whalen, Jr. (Ohio), Silvio O. Conte (Mass.), Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (Mich.), Margaret M. Heckler (Mass.), Charles A. Mosher (Ohio), Richard Bolling (Mo.), Carl Albert (Okla.), Floyd V. Hicks (Wash.).

Henry B. Gonzalez (Tex.), Edward Garmatz (Md.), Chet Holifield (Calif.), Hale Boggs (La.), Ken Gray (Ill.), William R. Anderson (Tenn.), Mike McCormack (Wash.), Thomas E. Morgan (Pa.), Julia B. Hansen (Wash.), Edward Boland (Mass.).

Joseph M. McDade (Pa.), Ray Madden (Ind.), Edward Patten (N.J.), Joseph Minish (N.J.), John Blatnik (Minn.), Thomas Foley (Wash.), William Clay (Mo.), Jim Symington (Mo.), John Dow (N.Y.), Jerome Waldie (Calif.), Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (N.J.), Fred Schwengel (Iowa), George Miller (Calif.), Edward Koch (N.Y.).

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

Though the United States constitutes



less than 7 percent of the earth's land mass and our population comprises less than 7 percent of the world's total, the industrial output of this country is as much as the remainder of the world's nations combined.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, today.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:)  
Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.  
Mr. DANIELSON, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. CORMAN, today, for 15 minutes.  
Mr. MATSUNAGA, on October 20, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. CAREY of New York, on October 20, for 60 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEYSER in three instances.  
Mr. GUDE.  
Mr. GUBSER.  
Mr. DERWINSKI.  
Mr. SCHWENGL.  
Mr. TERRY in two instances.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. PELLY in two instances.  
Mr. McCLOREY in two instances.  
Mr. MATHIAS of California.  
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.  
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.  
Mr. McCLOSKEY.  
Mr. MICHEL.  
Mr. RUTH in five instances.  
Mr. VEYSEY.  
Mr. WINN.  
Mr. QUIE in two instances.  
Mr. KEMP.  
Mr. PETTIS.  
Mr. HOSMER.  
Mr. FINDLEY.  
Mr. MORSE.  
Mr. SCHMITZ.  
Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia.  
Mr. PRICE of Texas in four instances.  
Mr. RIEGLE.  
Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.  
Mr. SPENCE.  
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.  
Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.  
Mr. VANDER JAGT.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM), and to include extraneous matter:)  
Mr. BURTON in two instances.  
Mr. BEGICH in five instances.  
Mr. FISHER in six instances.  
Mr. BOLLING.  
Mr. CARNEY in two instances.  
Mr. ROY in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
Mr. RARICK in six instances.  
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.  
Mr. COLMER.  
Mr. ADDABBO.  
Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in two instances.  
Mr. BADILLO.  
Mr. BOLAND.  
Mr. RYAN in two instances.  
Mrs. GRASSO in five instances.  
Mr. OBEY in six instances.  
Mr. RODINO in three instances.  
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in three instances.  
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.  
Mr. HARRINGTON.  
Mr. JACOBS in two instances.  
Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.  
Mr. MAZZOLI.  
Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.  
Mr. RANGEL.  
Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.  
Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.  
Mrs. SULLIVAN in three instances.  
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.  
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.  
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.  
Mr. BLATNIK.  
Mr. HICKS of Washington in two instances.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 24. An act to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable;  
S. 123. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the operation of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, for fishery conservation;  
S. 1151. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise a repayment contract with the San Angelo Water Supply Corp., San Angelo project, Texas, and for other purposes; and  
S. 1939. An act for the relief of the Southwest Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District, Colorado.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 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:

1219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report of receipts and disbursements pertaining to the disposal of surplus military supplies, equipment and materiel, and for expenses involving the producing of lumber and timber products, covering fiscal year 1971, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1220. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department of the Army on contracts for military construction awarded without

formal advertisement, covering the period ended June 30, 1971, pursuant to section 604 of Public Law 91-511; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1221. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5504 of title 10, United States Code, relating to assignment of lineal position to certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1222. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1223. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report for fiscal year 1970 on Federal financial assistance for maintenance and operation of schools and for construction of school facilities in federally affected areas, and for disaster relief to schools in major disaster areas, pursuant to section 301(c) of Public Law 81-874 and section 12(c) of Public Law 81-815; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1224. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 in order to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corp. for the purpose of purchasing railroad equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1225. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Attorney General to provide care for narcotic addicts who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2266. A bill to assist school districts to meet special problems incident to desegregation, and to the elimination, reduction, or prevention of racial isolation, in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 8630. (Rept. No. 92-577). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 8629. (Rept. No. 92-578). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 6. (Rept. No. 92-579). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 11309. A bill to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. SALTERFIELD, and Mr. VAN DERLIN):

H.R. 11310. A bill to restore and maintain a healthy transportation system, to provide financial assistance, to improve competitive

equity among surface transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself and Mr. MYERS):

H.R. 11311. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, to establish an emergency Federal economic assistance program, to authorize the President to declare areas of the Nation which meet certain economic and employment criteria to be economic disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, and Mrs. GRIFITHS):

H.R. 11312. A bill to postpone the effectiveness of any U.S. district court order requiring the busing of school children for the purpose of achieving racial balance until such time as all appeals in connection with such order have been exhausted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL (for himself, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 11313. A bill to establish a District of Columbia Development Bank to mobilize the capital and the expertise of the private community to provide for an organized approach to the problems of economic development in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11314. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 11315. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 11316. A bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the various ethnic groups in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 11317. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11318. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11319. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11320. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11321. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the President to expend certain foreign currencies for the purposes of providing U.S. financial assistance in the reopening of the Suez Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 11322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive pro-

gram of health care for the 1970's by strengthening the organization and delivery of health care nationwide and by making comprehensive health care insurance available to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11323. A bill to amend the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 and certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to retirement of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11324. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide that all passenger train discontinuances must be in accordance with the provisions of section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11325. 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.

H.R. 11326. A bill to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11327. A bill to limit and control expenditures made by or on behalf of candidates for election to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 11328. A bill to provide that State laws or regulations with respect to certain environmental matters shall not be preempted or nullified by Federal law until such time as regulations in lieu of such State laws or regulations are put into effect by or pursuant to Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 11329. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to permit the maintenance of prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels contracted for prior to August 15, 1971; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LLOYD (for himself and Mr. MCKAY):

H.R. 11330. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the University of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 11331. A bill to compensate victims of crimes of violence in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself and Mr. GIAIMO):

H.R. 11332. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to certain local public bodies or agencies to finance the development costs of certain connecting sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11333. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to replace or repair sewage systems or facilities damaged in the course of the work of the Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mrs. HICKS, of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 11334. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that dividends may be used to purchase additional paid-up national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11335. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of national service life insurance policies to insurance on a modified life plan with reduction to age 70; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. BRINKLEY):

H.R. 11336. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 11337. A bill to amend the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 772); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 11338. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide college scholarships to students selected on the basis of their scholarship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself and Mr. MILLS of Maryland):

H.R. 11339. A bill to amend the act of September 21, 1965 (79 Stat. 824) which provided for the authorization of Assateague Island National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 11340. A bill to protect collectors of antique glassware against the manufacture in the United States or the importation of imitations of such glassware; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CABELL (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, and Mr. NELSEN):

H.R. 11341. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 11342. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize insured emergency loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11343. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that employers shall not be required to bargain with labor organizations whose representative status has not been established by a secret-ballot election; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11344. A bill to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 11345. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to permit the maintenance of prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels contracted for prior to August 15, 1971; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 927. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to neighborhood schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.J. Res. 928. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.J. Res. 929. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.J. Res. 930. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARENDIS:

H. Res. 648. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the dedication ceremony of the portrait of Hon. F. Edward



Hébert, chairman, Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 649. Resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Public Works; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 650. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and

study of all aspects of crime affecting the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 651. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the care of the aged in the United States and the effects of Federal laws and programs on the availability and quality of care; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 652. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to disclosure of the results of the national nutrition

survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause of rule XXII,

Mr. ABOUREZK introduced a bill (H.R. 11346) for the relief of Ernesto Espino, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### ENERGY AND ECONOMY PROBLEMS ARE COMPLICATED BY COAL STRIKE CRISIS, SENATOR RANDOLPH ASSERTS IN URGENT MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT NIXON

#### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my observation that the September 30, 1971, end of the prior-negotiated contract between the Bituminous Coal Operators Association and the United Mine Workers of America came at a most unfortunate time. In view of the fact that management and labor had not negotiated and signed a new contract, either prior to the wage-price freeze imposed by order of the President of the United States at mid-August or prior to the September 30 contract termination, it meant that the UMWA went out on strike October 1 under its traditional no contract-no work policy. Negotiations thereafter under strike conditions were also under the unusual circumstances of being conducted during a time of Government exercise of controls over the Nation's economy. Even worse, the negotiating parties know little, if anything, concerning the terms the Government will set for the so-called phase II of the controlled economy following the end of the wage-price freeze in mid-November.

The economy is being damaged severely—especially the economy of the principal coal-producing States. Unemployment goes up—reaching far beyond the UMWA striking miners and appearing in the form of furloughs for railroad workers and layoffs or absolute loss of jobs for many other persons employed in other industries or commercial ventures in the coal producing areas.

And the Nation cannot really afford the almost total shutoff of coal production and the impact of this condition on both domestic and export markets. If it goes on much longer the cost in wintertime power failures and other results will be catastrophic.

For the reasons I have cited, I sent to the President of the United States on Thursday, October 14, 1971, a telegraphic message in which I urged special attention to the problems of the coal strike and the difficulties of negotiating a new contract under existing economic "freeze" conditions and an upcoming phase II of the controlled economy which continues to be quite nebulous.

I emphasize, Mr. President, the last paragraph of my message to the White

House in which I declared that contract negotiations under existing controlled economy conditions seem to me to require more than mere liaison between the Government managing the controlled economy and the negotiating parties so that their negotiations can be meaningful and within guidelines.

Frankly, I believe it is time for the executive branch to move into action to help end the coal stalemate. The negotiating parties—under the extremely unusual conditions which prevail—need guidance and guidelines. More—much more—will be needed subsequently in the way of Government actions if guidance and guidelines are not forthcoming from the executive branch at once.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of my message to the President and the acknowledgment received from the White House in a letter from an assistant to the President, William E. Timmons. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Crisis With Coal," published in the Friday, October 15, 1971, Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register. The editorial discusses a statement made by Herbert F. Richey of Cleveland, Ohio, president of the Valley Camp Coal Co. and chairman of the National Coal Association—a statement made prior to the coal strike concerning certain basic conditions which have been prevailing in the coal industry.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TELEGRAM

OCTOBER 14, 1971.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The continuing work and production stoppages which plague the country's coal industry accentuate the nation's fuel shortages and threaten to deepen the energy crisis in an acute degree.

In the states and areas of states where coal mining dominates the economy—especially in West Virginia and neighboring Appalachian states—the economic and unemployment situation grows ever more severe.

The over-all effect of the still prevailing no-contract-no-work situation is growing more devastating daily as men and women in other industrial and commercial enterprises besides coal are being furloughed from their jobs. And our country's balance of payments status is being further damaged by the interruption of coal exports.

In light of these conditions and with the difficulty of keeping collective bargaining effective in the case of the Bituminous Coal Operators and the United Mine Workers of America, in this time of controlled national economy, I urge special attention to these problems by you and the appropriate executive branch officials of the Administration which you head.

Contract negotiations under existing controlled economy conditions seem to me to require more than mere liaison between the Government managing the controlled economy and the negotiating parties so that their negotiations can be meaningful and within guidelines.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,  
U.S. Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., October 15, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: I would like to acknowledge receipt of your October 14 telegram to the President regarding the impact of the current work and production stoppage in the coal industry and its threat to the nation's fuel and energy supplies. You may be assured your views regarding this situation will be brought to the President's attention at the earliest opportunity and also shared with those who are keeping the situation under close observation.

With cordial regards,  
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,  
Assistant to the President.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, Oct. 15, 1971]

#### THE CRISIS WITH COAL

"Safety, labor, financial and production problems beset the coal energy industry at its moment of greatest opportunity," Mr. Herb Richey, president of the Valley Camp Coal Company told the National Energy Forum in Washington, D.C. last month.

Both labor and management seem to agree on the industry problems, but are miles apart on the solutions. Mr. Richey's views expressing the concern of coal owners and management are timely and interesting especially when viewed in the light of what promises to be a lengthy strike called since his appearance in Washington.

Mr. Richey's remarks were amplified by a local spokesman for Valley Camp who said that the company employs over 1,200 people with an annual payroll in excess of \$10 million and "unless the many problems facing the industry are solved and unless certain factors change, the Wheeling area could suffer a loss of this economic asset."

In his address, Mr. Richey welcomed the recognition by the group of coal's leading role in the national energy picture, as it represents 88 per cent of the bulk of the national energy reserves, and said, "Too often the need for coal is stressed, rather than incentive and capability to produce it."

Using statistics of a West Virginia mine owned by Valley Camp, Mr. Richey told the forum that during the first half of this year productivity fell 23 per cent and the mine lost money. "Production has been in a steady slide from 1.5 million tons in 1967 to 1.1 million tons in 1970, to less than a projected million tons this year. Operating costs, meanwhile, have gone the other way—from about \$4.20 a ton in 1967 to \$6.61 in 1970, and to \$8.71 in the first six months of this year. No company can absorb such operating cost increases and resulting financial losses, and