

at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Administration officials say that should the delegation of Soviet scientists agree to attend the trial as "observers," they would see for themselves that the trial was conducted in a fair and unprejudicial manner.

Concern that black militants could not receive a fair trial in America was dispelled following a scrupulously conducted trial of Black Panther militants in New Haven, Conn.

#### BREWSTER COMMENT CITED

Earlier, Kingman Brewster, president of Yale University, expressed reservations over the possibility that black militants could receive a fair trial in America today. Officials here have no concern that Miss Davis would not be afforded the same judicial care given in the New Haven trial.

In addition to Dr. Kapitza, several others in the Soviet group are believed to have publicly aligned themselves with liberal causes in the Soviet Union. All belong to the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and are winners of high Soviet scientific awards. Physicist Igor Y. Tamm is a winner of a Nobel prize for his work. All are honorary members of American scientific academies—either the U.S. Academy of Sciences or the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1971]

#### MISS DEVLIN SCORES VARIETY OF TARGETS

(By David R. Boldt)

Bernadette Devlin, 23-year-old Irish revolutionary and member of the British Parliament, raked Queen Elizabeth II, President Nixon, the British and American armies, Soviet Russia and American capitalism last night at the University of Maryland.

Asked during questioning from the audience if she advocated the overthrow of the U.S. government, she said, "I congratulate the gentleman on his astuteness of mind . . . the answer is yes."

She added, however, that her principal concern was to bring about socialist revolution in northern Ireland.

Miss Devlin's principal message was the one she has reiterated during her current speaking tour of American campuses: the conflict in northern Ireland is a working-class struggle and not the religious warfare it is being portrayed in the world press.

She drew a link between the efforts of poor Catholics in Ireland, poor blacks in the United States and poor Vietnamese in Southeast Asia to break free from a capitalistic system that she says robs them of the value of what they create.

The audience crowded the ballroom of the student union, well beyond its posted limit of 600 and hundreds of students sat in lobbies and corridors to listen to a public address system. Many people in the audience gave Miss Devlin an ovation when she finished.

She drew applause after telling the audience that President Nixon would never go on trial as an accessory to "the murder of the Vietnamese people" because "he's not black and he's not a Socialist."

Queen Elizabeth II is "a squatter in Buckingham Palace," which should, instead of being a royal residence, be used to house "100 working-class families," she told a questioner.

The British Army in northern Ireland and the American Army in Vietnam are both seeking, she said, to protect the interests of capitalistic society.

Asked why socialist governments such as those she defends have to keep citizens in with barbed wire, while capitalistic countries have to curb immigration, she said, "I have great criticisms of the Russian system," and described it as not socialism, but "state capitalism."

America had halted Irish immigration, she claimed, when American capitalists discovered they could send their industries to Ireland and exploit the Irish there "without having to pay their fares over."

She received her largest crowd reactions in handling hostile questioners. When some in the audience tried to shout down one of her antagonists, she cautioned, "You ought to let the gentleman make a fool of himself."

#### WELFARE OR WASTE

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, neither State nor Federal welfare payments ought to come anywhere near being the equivalent of what a man can earn by an honest day's work. To the extent that people are sick, disabled, or mothers with little children are in need, financial assistance is needed but it must not be permitted to get out of hand to the point of encouraging people to stay on welfare and not go to work.

In this connection a recent letter written to the editor of the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader makes the point very well. The letter follows:

#### WELFARE VERSUS WORKING MAN

To the Editors: My sister-in-law receives \$252 per month from welfare plus \$140 per month from her husband giving her a total of \$392 per month for a family of five.

The total for a year is \$4,804 tax free plus medicaid and furniture allowance.

I work 40 hours a week and my year's salary is \$4,922. Out of this I pay \$254 for S.S., \$204 for taxes, \$75 for union dues, \$125 for Blue Cross, so it gives \$4,254 to support my family of five.

Welfare pays all medical expenses; Blue Cross half. Glasses and dental work are paid by medicaid, while Blue Cross pays for none. Now please tell us whose better off. The one whose on welfare or the working man.

If the Nixon administration's family assistance program can stop this sort of thing and meaningfully encourage people to go to work, it will be a significant accomplishment.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 22, 1971

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

*Preserve me, O God, for in Thee do I put my trust. Psalm 16: 1*

Our father's God, we come to Thee with the sacred remembrance that on this day was born the one we call the Father of Our Country. We think of the moral fiber of his mind, his courage when confronted with hardship, his willingness to adventure, his skill in leading men and his attitude in helping to found this our beloved Nation and we are grateful.

Above all we thank Thee for his humble faith which time and again sent him to his knees in prayer as he sought to find Thy way and to walk in it.

May the memory of this great life strengthen our souls and sustain our spirits as we labor to preserve liberty in our land and to proclaim freedom to all the world.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 670. An act to authorize further adjustments in the amount of silver certificates outstanding, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-417, appointed Mr. BIBLE as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the James Madison Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 91-510, appointed Mr. CASE and Mr. SCHWEIKER as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

#### GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 8, 1971, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON) to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia read the Farewell Address as follows:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that,

in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the Government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to

mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous

anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strengths; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportion-

ably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our for-

eign relations towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and actions of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not

only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of persons and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false

alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern: some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let

it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by

every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest; in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base of foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign

influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely

trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1773, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to main-

tain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,  
17th September, 1796.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. N. 92-50)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

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

Nearly a year ago, in my first special message on higher education, I asked the Congress to join me in expanding higher education opportunities across the nation. First, I proposed to reform and increase aid to students. Second, I

proposed a National Foundation for Higher Education designed to reform and strengthen post secondary education.

Neither house of Congress acted on these proposals. Now the time for action is growing short. Existing legislative authority for the basic Federal higher education programs expires at the end of the current fiscal year.

1971 can be a year of national debate on the goals and potentials of our system of higher education. It can be a time of opportunity to discover new concepts of mission and purpose, which are responsive to the diverse needs of the people of our country. I therefore again urge the Congress to join with me in expanding opportunities in two major ways:

*To help equalize individual opportunities for higher education, I am proposing the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1971.*

*To broaden opportunities through renewal, reform and innovation in higher education, I am proposing a separate act establishing the National Foundation for Higher Education.*

#### EQUALIZING INDIVIDUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

At the present time, a young person whose family earns more than \$15,000 a year is almost five times more likely to attend college than a young person whose family earns less than \$3,000.

At the present time, Federal student assistance programs do not always reach those who need them most.

At the present time, there are just not enough funds to go around to all deserving students. Needy students often do not have access to grants. Higher-income students are frequently unable to borrow for their education, even when loans are guaranteed by the Federal Government.

I repeat the commitment which I made in my message of last year: that no qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money. The program which I am again submitting this year would benefit approximately one million more students than are currently receiving aid. It would assure that Federal funds go first, and in the largest amounts, to the neediest students, in order to place them on an equal footing with students from higher-income families. Abundant resources for loans would also be available to students from higher-income families. The budget I submitted in January provides funds for these reforms and stands behind the commitments of this administration. Failure to pass this program would not only deny these benefits to many students, but also would limit their opportunity to make major choices about their lives.

A major element of my higher education proposal to the last Congress is the creation of a National Student Loan Association. For too long, the volume of funds available to students for federally insured loans has been arbitrarily restricted by the lack of a secondary market in which lenders could sell paper in order to replenish their supply of loan capital.

Establishment of the National Student Loan Association would relieve this squeeze on liquidity by making available

an additional \$1 billion for student loan funds. The Association would be authorized to buy student loans made by qualified lenders—universities as well as commercial lending institutions. This secondary market would enable universities and commercial lenders to make loans to students in far greater quantity than they have in the past.

It is important to be clear on what this reform would mean. It would mean that higher education would be open to all the people of this country as never before. It would mean that students still in high school would know that their efforts to qualify for college need not be compromised by doubts about whether they can afford college. It would mean that their choice of a college would be based on their educational goals rather than upon their family's financial circumstances.

#### RENEWAL, REFORM AND INNOVATION

If we are to make higher education financially accessible to all who are qualified, then our colleges must be prepared both for the diversity of their goals and the seriousness of their intent. While colleges and universities have made exceptional efforts to serve unprecedented numbers of students over the last decade, they must find additional ways to respond to a new set of challenges:

—All too often we have fallen prey to the myth that there is only one way to learn—by sitting in class, reading books, and listening to teachers. Those who learn best in other ways are rejected by the system.

—While the diversity of individuals seeking higher education has expanded in nearly every social dimension—age, class, ethnic background—higher education institutions have become increasingly uniform and less diverse.

—Increasingly, many colleges, and particularly universities, have become large, complex institutions which have lost their way. The servants of many masters and the managers of many enterprises, they are less and less able to perform their essential tasks well.

—At the present time, thousands of individuals of all ages and circumstances are excluded from higher education for no other reason than that the system is designed primarily for 18–22-year-olds who can afford to go away to college.

—At the present time, institutional and social barriers discourage students from having sustained experiences before or during their college years which would help them get more out of college and plan for their future lives.

The relationship between the Federal Government and the universities has contributed little to meeting these needs because it has not been a genuine partnership. In many cases the Federal Government has hired universities to do work which has borne little natural relationship to the central functions of the institution. Too often, the Federal Government has been part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

Certain Federal agencies promote ex-

cellence, innovation, and reform in particular areas. The National Science Foundation has played a magnificent role in the public interest for science, and the National Institutes of Health have played a similar role for health.

The National Foundation for Higher Education would fulfill a new role in the Federal Government. It would have as its mandate a review of the overall needs of the American people for postsecondary education. It would have as its operating premises, the principles of selectivity and flexibility. Its constituency would include people as well as institutions—and not only the usual secondary student entering college, but also others—such as the person who wants to combine higher education with active work experience, or the one who has left school and wants to return.

The Foundation can do much to develop new approaches to higher education:

—New ways of “going to college.” I am impressed with the need for new and innovative means of providing higher education to individuals of all ages and circumstances (Britain and Japan, for example, have already taken significant steps in the use of television for this purpose).

—New patterns of attending college. A theme of several recent reports is that students are isolated too long in school, and that breaking the educational “lockstep” would enable them to be better and more serious students (as were the GI's after World War II). If so, student bodies would reflect a greater mix of ages and experience, and colleges would be places for integrating rather than separating the generations.

—New approaches to diversify institutional missions. Colleges and universities increasingly have aspired to become complex and “well rounded” institutions providing a wide spectrum of general and specialized education. The Foundation could help institutions to strengthen their individuality and to focus on particular missions by encouraging and supporting excellence in specific areas—be it a field of research, professional training, minority education, or whatever.

#### SPECIAL HELP FOR BLACK INSTITUTIONS

Colleges and universities founded for black Americans are an indispensable national resource. Despite great handicaps they educate substantial numbers of black Americans, thereby helping to bring about a more rapid transition to an integrated society.

Black institutions are faced with an historic inadequacy of resources. To help these institutions compete for students and faculty with other colleges and universities, the combined help of government at all levels, other institutions of higher learning, and the private sector must be summoned.

This administration has taken a series of actions to assist these institutions:

—The proposed reform of student aid programs, with its concentration of funds on the neediest students, would significantly aid students at black institutions.

—The National Foundation for Higher Education will direct special efforts toward meeting the needs of black colleges.

—Additional funds for black colleges have been requested for fiscal year 1972 in programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Agriculture.

#### CONCLUSION

These are but some of the new approaches to higher education which need to be pursued. A theme common to all of them is a new kind of engagement between all the citizens of our society and our system of higher education. All of us can make a contribution to bringing about such an engagement by taking part in a thoughtful national discussion about our priorities for higher education. Students and faculties can make a contribution by reexamining their goals and the means they choose to achieve them. The Federal Government can do its part by supporting access to higher education for all of our people and by providing the resources needed to help develop new forms of higher education which would be responsive to all of their needs.

—RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 22, 1971.

#### DIFFICULTY YOUNG PEOPLE ARE HAVING THROUGHOUT NATION IN FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President has again urged action on a problem that cries out for attention—the difficulty young people are having throughout the Nation in financing their higher education.

No qualified student should fail to go to college for lack of funds. If we accept that statement—and I think every Member of Congress does—then the Congress should not fail to act this year on proposals to expand funding opportunities for prospective college students.

The President's proposals in this area of difficulty make great good sense. Under his program, Federal funds would go first and in the largest amounts to the neediest students. But loan money would be readily available to students from higher income families.

The creation of a National Student Loan Association has been delayed far too long. All of us know that in many communities it is virtually impossible for a prospective college student to get a loan from a bank. This situation must be remedied, and the proposed National Student Loan Association appears to be the obvious answer.

We must open higher education to all of our qualified young people. America must truly be the land of opportunity.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4690, PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until mid-

night to file a report on the bill, H.R. 4690, to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes, along with any separate and/or additional views.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 91-145, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop the following Members of the House: Mrs. GRIFFITHS, chairman, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

#### RIGERMANS IN UNITED STATES

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, February 20, Leonid Rigerman and his mother, Mrs. Esther Rigerman, arrived in the United States. It was a thrilling experience for me to greet and welcome them at John F. Kennedy Airport. This was an historic moment, marking the culmination of efforts to secure the confirmation of their U.S. citizenship and their emigration from the Soviet Union.

On December 19, I reported to the House that the U.S. citizenship of Leonid Rigerman and his mother, Mrs. Esther Rigerman, had been confirmed by the U.S. Government. Prior to that time, Leonid Rigerman had made several attempts to enter the U.S. Embassy in Moscow in order to prove his American citizenship. Each time Soviet Government personnel forcibly prevented his entrance, and in November he was jailed for a week.

The confirmation of the citizenship of the Rigermans constituted a commendable action on the part of the State Department, with which I worked on this matter, and I should like to express my appreciation for the efforts of the State Department personnel involved. It also was a tribute to the persistence of Daniel Greer, deputy commissioner of the New York City Department of Ports and Terminals, who voluntarily represented the Rigermans before the State Department. Commissioner Greer's efforts deserve the highest accolade.

The Rigermans received exit visas from the Soviet Union on February 15, and U.S. passports were issued to them by the U.S. consul in Moscow on February 16.

Tomorrow Leonid Rigerman will be in Washington where he will speak at a press conference, which I will sponsor, along with my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), for members of the House and Senate who joined us last November in urging the State Department to act affirmatively to confirm the Rigermans' citizenship.

My pleasure regarding the arrival of the Rigermans must be tempered, however, by the plight facing the Jews of the Soviet Union who do not possess U.S. citizenship and are unable to emigrate.

Yesterday at the Lincoln Square Synagogue in New York City, Rabbi Steven Riskin, who was deeply involved in assisting the Rigermans, introduced Leonid Rigerman, who movingly described conditions facing Soviet Jews. Leonid Rigerman said:

A Jew cannot be a Jew in Russia. We are deprived of all forms of Jewish culture; you cannot study the language; Jewish religion is forbidden.

Members of the Jewish faith have been barred from emigrating from the Soviet Union, even though they face concerted efforts to stifle their Jewish identity so long as they remain there. Their plight was most vividly evidenced only weeks ago, when nine Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union who were allegedly involved in an attempt to hijack a Soviet plane received harsh sentences. World opinion was aroused at the time, and the Soviet authorities commuted the death sentences which had been imposed upon two.

In the Congress on December 31, we passed House Resolution 1336, conveying the "grave concern of the people of the United States" regarding these sentences, and urging "fair and equitable justice for—the Soviet Union's—Jewish citizens." Passage of this resolution followed soon after my introduction of House Resolution 1320, which urged the free exercise of religion and pursuit of culture by the Soviet Jews, and urged that the Soviet Union allow those citizens who wished to emigrate to do so.

Despite passage of House Resolution 1336, even the relaxed sentences imposed upon the Soviet nine are still harsh. Moreover, the plight of the Soviet Jews persists—they still suffer religious and cultural persecution. Their emigration is severely restricted.

Congress should demonstrate to the Soviet Union, which is sensitive to world opinion, its disapproval of the systematic efforts to stifle Soviet Jewry. To this end I have introduced in this Congress House Resolution 43 which provides:

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives condemns the persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union, urges that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by all Jews and all others within its borders, and urges that the Soviet Union allow those citizens who wish to emigrate to do so.

I am sure that we are all gratified that Esther Rigerman, and her son, Leonid, have now finally reached the United States. Hopefully, the day will soon come when the Jews of the Soviet Union may express their Jewish identity in security and freedom, as the Rigermans can now do. Hopefully, too, the Jews of the Soviet Union who wish to emigrate will soon be able to do so freely. Common decency and morality demand the speedy inception of these events, in order that the Jews of the Soviet Union may live as Jews, proudly and openly.

At this point, I should like to include

a story which appeared in the February 22, 1971, edition of the New York Daily News, entitled "World Opinion Getting to Soviets: Rigerman" and written by Peter Coutros, which quotes Leonid Rigerman. The article follows:

WORLD OPINION GETTING TO SOVIETS:  
RIGERMAN

(By Peter Coutros)

The political behavior of Russian politicians is being increasingly influenced by world opinion, according to Leonid Rigerman, who, with his Brooklyn-born mother arrived here late Saturday to end a long struggle to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

"In Stalin's time, it would have been inconceivable that anyone should try to do what we did," Rigerman, a 30-year-old physicist born in Russia, told a press conference at the Lincoln Square Synagogue.

CONTINUOUS WEAKENING

"But people started to think about the possibility of emigration during Khrushchev's administration. And since then, there has been a continuous weakening of the regime there. Public opinion is being considered, and where Stalin once purged millions, now there are only a few thousand in jails."

Speaking excellent English in subdued tones and choosing his words carefully, the slight, bearded Rigerman detailed the rigors he was subjected to by Soviet police when he applied at the United States Embassy in Moscow for applications to migrate. Only after eight months of intensive effort and several arrests was Rigerman granted passports for himself and his mother, Mrs. Esther Rigerman, who went to Russia in 1931 with her husband.

The Soviets regarded Leonid and his parents as Soviet citizens (his father died in 1967). The older Rigerman was born in Russia and his wife became a naturalized Soviet citizen in 1937, a citizenship characterized by U.S. authorities as "involuntary."

CONGRESSMEN HELPED

Through the intercession of Reps. James Scheuer (D-Bronx) and William F. Ryan, (D-Manhattan), the case was given a high priority by the State Department. The matter was called to their attention by Daniel Greer, the city's deputy commissioner of ports and terminals.

Rigerman was flanked by Ryan and Scheuer yesterday as he described his first day in America. "I can't get rid of the feeling that it is only a picture of New York that I'm looking at and that it will all disappear," he said, apprehensively.

Pressed for comment on the militant Jewish Defense League, which has been charged with harassment of Soviet officials here in protest against the treatment of Jews in Russia, Rigerman conceded "the JDL gets a lot of publicity in the Soviet press, all of it bad, so some Jews there think the JDL must be doing something good. But I am not an advocate of JDL methods. When Jews resort to violence, it must be their last resort."

CANNOT BE A JEW

Why did the Rigermans emigrate?

"A Jew cannot be a Jew in Russia," he explained, "We are deprived of all forms of Jewish culture, you cannot study the language, Jewish religious literature is forbidden."

Why do the Russians make emigration so difficult?

"Historically," said Rigerman, "there has been a strong connection between Jews and the Soviet. Jews represent an intellectual part of that society."

At this point, Rigerman paused. Then, he concluded: "Because they want the slaves to work."

Rigerman rejected a suggestion that the Soviet repression of Jews may be linked to

pro-Arab sentiments, but conceded that there are many Soviet Jews who see a strong connection. "But Jews rarely can agree on any single issue," he smiled.

"I was raised in the American spirit by my parents, so my migration here is an irreversible thing," he said, refusing to speculate on what his fate might have been had the State Department not exercised pressure to effect his release.

Referring again to the resistance of Jews to Communist edicts, Rigerman called it "the only people's movement that is alive there."

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM  
NEEDS FUNDS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the persisting underfunding of Federal programs directed at meeting the basic needs of our people, it should be no surprise that the Federal bilingual education program's allocation of funds is so paltry. But to perpetuate this situation is to sanction more than just "business as usual"; it is to continue the injustice of the past.

For this fiscal year, which ends on June 30, \$80 million has been authorized for the bilingual education program—title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Even if this entire amount were in fact available, it would still not meet the need for educational assistance which exists among the more than 3 million non-English speaking school age children in this country. After all, \$80 million divided by 3 million breaks down to a meager \$27 per child.

In New York State alone, there are approximately 300,000 Spanish-surnamed children in prekindergarten through 12th grade. New York City accounts for almost all of these. They constitute more than 22 percent of the children in school in New York City. And their percentage has been steadily increasing.

The insupportable fact of the matter is that \$80 million is not available for these children. The Congress has once again engaged in the familiar process of authorizing one amount of money for a program, and then appropriating a much smaller amount. In the case of the bilingual education program, it is \$25 million which has been appropriated for this fiscal year. In terms of the children who need this program, this comes to the miserly sum of \$8 per child.

The gap between authorization and appropriation—or between rhetoric and reality—is a full \$55 million. Actually, the Congress has only responded to the administration's own perception of priorities. The administration has consistently sought inadequate funding for this program, and this pattern continues for the next year. The authorization for fiscal year 1972, which begins on July 1, 1971, is \$100 million. The administration has requested only one-quarter of that amount—\$25 million.

In light of this continued misperception by the administration of the bilingual education program's importance, it is clear that Congress must take the lead and appropriate the funds which, no

matter the administration's posture, are in fact urgently needed. To this end, I have introduced H.R. 1589, which provides for a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1971 of \$55 million for bilingual education. This bill thereby brings the funding of the program up to its fully authorized level.

Of course, even \$55 million more is not going to meet adequately the needs of our non-English-speaking population. Much more must be done, including passing increased authorizations for the bilingual education program, followed by full funding. But the \$55 million is extremely important, because the bilingual education program, created by the Bilingual Education Act, of which I was an original cosponsor, is so important.

This is a program which does not aim at destroying the child's mother tongue. To the contrary—properly conducted, it should encourage the child to respect and enjoy his proud cultural heritage, including his family's and community's language, which is so integral a component of that heritage. As Prof. Francesco Cordasco, of Montclair State College, at Upper Montclair, N.J., wrote in the May 1970, issue of the Teachers College Record of Columbia University:

What the legislation has really proposed (no matter how awkwardly, and with full cognizance of all the programming intricacies which will have to be worked out) is that the social institution which is the school and which serves the children of an open society must build on the cultural strengths which the child brings to the classroom; to cultivate in this child ancestral pride; to reinforce (not destroy) the language he natively speaks; to cultivate his inherent strengths; and to give this child the sense of personal identification so essential to his social maturation.

The importance of the bilingual education program was also recently examined in a two-volume study, entitled "Bilingual Schooling in the United States," by Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. In this study, published in January 1970, the authors wrote, at pages 48-49 of volume 1:

Bilingual education can provide one important means of building out of varied ethnic elements a harmonious and creative community. It is not enough for educators to understand the principles on which a solid bilingual program must be built; they must also create understanding throughout the community concerning the important connection between one's mother tongue, one's self-image, and one's heritage (both individual and group-cultural). One can hardly despise or depreciate any people's language without depreciating the people themselves. . . .

Wherever the vicious circle begins, it is the community as a whole or the nation as a whole that suffers the consequences. Both those responsible for the administration of the schools and those who exert leadership in the community must search their consciences before deciding what kind of education to provide. The non-English-speaking child who at the beginning of school is unable to acquire literacy in English in competition with his English-speaking classmates and who is not permitted to acquire it in his own language makes a poor beginning that he may never be able to overcome. Frustrated and discouraged, he seeks the first opportunity to drop out of school; and if he finds a job at all it will be the lowest

paying job. He will be laid off first, will remain unemployed longest, and is least able to adapt to changing occupational requirements. . . .

To summarize, a rationale for bilingual schooling in the United States rests on the following propositions:

1. American schooling has not met the needs of children coming from homes where non-English languages are spoken; a radical improvement is therefore urgently needed.
2. Such improvement must first of all maintain and strengthen the sense of identity of children entering the school from such homes.
3. The self-image and sense of dignity of families that speak other languages must also be preserved and strengthened.
4. The child's mother tongue is not only an essential part of his identity; it is also his best instrument for learning, especially in the early stages.
5. Preliminary evidence indicates that initial learning through a child's non-English home language does not hinder learning in English or other school subjects;
6. Differences among first, second, and foreign languages need to be understood if learning through them is to be sequenced effectively.
7. The best order of the learning of basic skills in a language—whether first or second—needs to be understood and respected if best results are to be obtained; this order is normally, especially for children: listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing.
8. Young children have an impressive learning capacity; especially in the case of language learning, the young child learns more easily and better than adolescents or adults the sound system, the basic structure, and vocabulary of a language.
9. Closely related to bilingualism is biculturalism, which should be an integral part of bilingual instruction.
10. Bilingual education holds the promise of helping to harmonize various ethnic elements in a community into a mutually respectful and creative pluralistic society.

Ours is a nation two of whose premises are first, the stress on education as a means for every child to learn and to advance himself, and second, the stress on maintaining each cultural group's heritages and traditions. The bilingual education program—of particular importance in New York City to our Spanish-speaking citizens—combines both these premises. It seeks to facilitate the educational opportunities of our children for whom English is a second language, while maintaining their pride in the language of their birthright.

Consequently, this program must receive adequate funding. That is why passage of my bill, H.R. 1589, providing an additional \$55 million for fiscal year 1971 for the bilingual education program, is so essential.

#### LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE ALL DRUGS BE REGISTERED

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Americans who take drugs assume that these have been tested by the Food and Drug Administration for safety and effectiveness. And this is particularly true. FDA does in fact test

new drugs when a manufacturer applies for a new drug application.

But in a quirk of law quite like the "lock the barn door after the horse is gone" scenario we find that manufacturers are not required to notify FDA before placing a new drug on the market. In other words, manufacturers can, if they wish, put any type of drug on the market without notice to the Federal agency responsible for insuring the safety and effectiveness of drugs.

I would make the point that drugs in the sense which I am referring to includes a wide variety of products ranging from aspirins to cold remedies to prescription items.

The loophole in the law has allowed new products which should be tested and regulated via prescription to be marketed for months without FDA's knowledge.

I, along with my colleagues, KYROS, CARTER, and HASTINGS am today introducing legislation to correct this situation by requiring all drugs be registered. This will give us a catalog of all the drugs on the shelves which we now assume to be safe and effective. The end result of this law will be that FDA at least knows what is being sold throughout the Nation and can, if it then wishes, inquire further of the manufacturer as to whether or not the product should be the subject to testing. I would add that this legislation would carry out the recommendation of the Task Force on Drug Research and Regulatory Affairs.

In order to point out some of the recent examples, I have inquired of FDA and would like to enclose in the RECORD at this time, some specific cases which add emphasis to the need for new legislation.

1. Aminopyrine and dipyrone preparations which after many years of marketing were brought under the new drug procedures; we lacked a reliable method of determining what drugs were being marketed and were subject to the new policy.

2. Coronary vasodilators, some of which were recently brought into the new drug area, and all of which were required to conform to prescribed labeling; again we could not be sure that all distributors of these drugs learned about the change in policy published in the *Federal Register* because our search undoubtedly did not reveal all suppliers of such drugs.

3. Cobalt-containing drugs; we called over 20 firms listed as suppliers to request that marketing be stopped. Since the registration requirements of Section 510 of the Federal Act does not require drug manufacturers and distributors to list all of the drugs they market, it could not be determined for certain that all suppliers of cobalt-containing drugs had been contacted. In addition, we do not know whether the *Federal Register* publication regarding our policy on these drugs has reached all suppliers because we do not have complete information on who supplies these drugs.

4. FDA implementation of the National Academy of Science-National Research Council (NAS/NRC) review findings on the effectiveness of pre-1962 drugs would be much more effective if we knew the identity of every such product on the market. As it now stands, the firm and product specifically identified in the *Federal Register* Announcement must either take corrective action voluntarily or contest the matter in court, whereas it may be years before FDA can determine the identity of all of the "me too" drug products on the market. This inability

to act across the board leads to justifiable criticism of the Agency and, in fact, at times allows others to profit from our action or inaction against the products of specific firms.

#### IMPROVEMENT IN THE TEACHING OF THE RETARDED

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the field of education is often a frustrating one, especially if your students are retarded. The attention span of retarded children tends to be very short, thus making it difficult to teach them.

I am extremely pleased to hear that a small Rhode Island company has produced a new desk system which offers hope for the improved teaching of the retarded. The Higgins Teledesk, produced by Instructive Devices, Inc., of Pawtucket, R.I., is presently being used in the Nathaniel Green School, also located in Pawtucket.

To date, the desk has been extremely successful. Miss Sara J. Hagan, a special education teacher at the school, said:

One of the major advantages, especially for brain damaged children, is that it holds their attention. . . I've had not one child who hasn't liked the machine.

I hope that all of my colleagues will take a moment to read the following article from the February 17 edition of the Providence Evening Bulletin. The Higgins Teledesk deserves a chance to be used throughout the country.

#### RHODE ISLAND DESK WILL AID RETARDED (By S. Robert Chiappinelli)

A small Rhode Island company is producing a new desk system that appears to offer hope for improved teaching of the retarded and possibly of other children as well.

"One of the major advantages, especially for brain damaged children, is that it holds their attention," said Miss Sara J. Hagan, a special education teacher at the Nathaniel Greene School in Pawtucket where the desk is getting its first public school testing in the state.

Called the Higgins Teledesk and produced by Instructive Devices, Inc., of Pawtucket, the desk is the product of almost a decade of research and development by Dr. Conwell Higgins, chief psychologist of the Albany, N.Y., Board of Education, and the firm.

"They love this," Miss Hagan said of the approximately 15 youngsters who have used the machine which flashes pictures on a small screen in its center. "They're really geared to the machine. I've had not one child who hasn't liked the machine."

"A lot of kids we just can't communicate with," explained Edward W. Riccio, founder of the firm. "The only way that we can communicate with them is with pictures."

Miss Hagan explained that the attention span of a retarded child is generally quite short, which makes it difficult to teach them. However, with the desk and its pictures the youngsters appear totally involved, locked into the subject.

The device consists of a screen, earphones, tape set, program cartridge and numerous small plastic objects with pictures of pears, children and silverware used to match pictures that appear on the screen.

These children can start the desk by pushing in the cartridge containing one of the 32 mathematical concept programs that come with the desk. The programs and the desk cost a total of \$2,400.

"It makes the child independent," Miss Hagan said. "They can do this on their own." The inserted cartridge starts the images flashing on the screen.

If that particular program concentrates on the concept of two, for instance, the sequence begins by representing pairs of objects and builds to the numeral itself.

The youngsters do not have to be able to read and the teacher can adjust the desk beforehand to give them as much time as needed to answer before the machine moves on to the next picture.

The youngsters' answers are recorded on a tape cassette in case the teacher is not present. The students sometimes are asked to match the artifacts to pictures on the screen or to circle groups on the screen. The markings are easily erased.

"This is basically what education is trying to get back to—the person," Miss Hagan said. "This provides for the child to be at his own pace. They have as many chances as they want. If they don't get it the first time they can go back."

Some children take 10 or 15 minutes, others 30 or 35 but their interest does not waver. The concentration of two children with severe brain damage has been "unbelievable" the special education teacher said. She believes the desk has potential for teaching language arts and children with hearing problems. "You can do this with anything," she said of the concept.

George Quinlan, New England sales representative of the company and a former member of the audio-visual department in the Pawtucket system, interested Miss Hagan a friend, and the special education department in the machine.

"We have several different categories of special education," said Frank Kleniewski, principal. "I felt if it didn't suit one group it would suit another."

The machine is just one of several educational devices being produced at the company, which was founded by Mr. Riccio, who left a profitable position at the age of 50 to start his own company and patent a testing device.

The device, called Testmate, is a frame into which a sheet containing multiple choice questions is inserted. The students press a pencil point on their choice.

If it is correct the pencil punctures the paper. If not it leaves a dot. The student continues pressing until he gets the correct answer. The dots indicate how many incorrect guesses he made.

That device is being used in a driver education program the company has developed in connection with Ford Motor Company's traffic safety and highway improvement department.

The program was used in about 50 Massachusetts schools last year and is scheduled for about 100 schools there this year. The company also is doing audiovisual work for the state Division of Unemployment Compensation and has a series of programs on current problems such as drugs, smoking and alcohol.

Donald H. Gray, director of the company which began in Mr. Riccio's house in Barrington, said it showed a profit for the first time last year and is ready now for full scale production of its teaching desk.

Mr. Riccio sees international possibilities for the desk, which centers on pictures. "The language of pictures is universal," he said. "We just have to put in the different language."

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. BARNBY KEENEY OF BROWN UNIVERSITY

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, there are not many men who would say: "I'm an arrogant, effete, Eastern intellectual—and a WASP to boot. I'm also a snob. I think it's a fine thing." But then, there is only one Barnaby Keeney.

He is, as Haynes Johnson of Washington Post tabbed him, "a resident wise man." He is a former president of Brown University and President Johnson appointed him the first Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Presently, Dr. Keeney is the chief executive officer of a consortium of five major universities here in Washington.

Dr. Keeney's distinguished service to the humanities is unparalleled. I urge my colleagues to take the time to read the following article which appeared in the Washington Post. Their time will be well spent.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 14, 1971]

#### A RESIDENT WISE MAN

(By Haynes Johnson)

Barnaby Keeney is an irreverent iconoclast who, at tea one afternoon, slouches over his desk, peers over his glasses, offers an apple to his guests, and says, disarmingly, "I'm an arrogant, effete, Eastern intellectual—and a WASP to boot. I'm also a snob. I think it's a fine thing."

Although he would cringe at the term, Keeney is also one of the resident wise men of Washington. If there are any dissenters to that claim, Keeney even has a new citation to prove it (but, of course, he would never show it or refer to it).

When the scholars of Phi Beta Kappa looked around for an American deserving of their first award for distinguished service to the humanities, they went no farther than Keeney. He was, they said, a man "whose qualifications were so far above dispute as to make him the sole and unanimous choice." They went on to say, superfluously and effusively, that he was a man of "incisiveness" with "the breadth of understanding that characterizes the true humanist," a person of "earthy common sense and unerring capacity to get to the issues and close with it . . ." Keeney, they concluded, certainly would establish a "worthy line of descent for his successors."

Such accolades would either sink—or swell—most men, Keeney takes it all in stride. He has that rare capacity to refuse to be impressed with honors.

Some years ago, when Lyndon Johnson appointed him the first chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, an effort aimed at attracting to the humanities some of the attention and money that was being poured into science, Keeney reacted with characteristic wry self-deprecation.

"I'm not a bit brighter today than when I was flunking third grade," he said. To further disabuse anyone of the idea that Keeney, a former president of Brown University and distinguished Renaissance scholar, was some ivory-tower savant, he added: "If I met with intellectuals on weekends, I would perhaps have more ideas on Monday. But when you are with intellectuals all week, you should go fishing on weekends."

Time has not tempered Keeney's tongue, nor altered his habit of poking fun at himself and his surroundings. He is now the new chief executive officer of a consortium of five of Washington, D.C.'s major universities. When asked what he was doing, he shrugged his shoulders and said, "This is where the elephants go to die, and a lot of them are dying here."

Keeney was no less sharp in his remarks

about the two presidents who have given the leadership to the move to support greater funds for the humanities. It was Johnson who had endorsed the first bill, and things were proceeding well until "he got himself in his God-damned war," Keeney says. Then, on Richard Nixon: "Nixon, of course, has no reputation at all as an artist or humanist—but, for one reason or another, he's supported this very generously."

Keeney still expresses the same kind of concern about the support of the humanities that led him to accept Johnson's appointment five years ago. "I'm more concerned about the humanities," he said, "because that's what's lacking in our society—the disinclination to ask why, or to ask where are we going. That's where we've always had trouble. We've always had a lack of understanding of the past."

Actually, Keeney can take considerable satisfaction in the change in attitudes toward supporting the humanities. When the program was first introduced in 1966, many congressmen opposed even the barest federal endowment of the arts.

One fear dominated the debate: the old bugaboo of government control of the arts. As an indication of how views have changed, in the last Congress many of the same congressmen who initially had opposed the idea voted to support President Nixon's recommendation and double the authorized funding of the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities. H. R. Gross of Iowa, as staunch a supporter of free enterprise and foe of big-government spending as can be found in the Congress, remarked then that there hadn't been so many converts in a long time.

A major reason for the change lay in the demonstrated effectiveness of the program. Under Keeney's leadership, the foundation led to a flowering of support for the arts in America, with the federal grants generating three times as much private financing.

But if this gives Keeney justifiable satisfaction, there is much in American life today that causes him deep concern. Musing aloud about the shape of the future, he spoke of spiraling population, increasing pollution, lowering standards and greater tensions affecting nearly every one's life.

"I got thinking so hard this morning about these things," Keeney said, with another puckish smile, "that I almost drove in front of a big car—and then, while walking, I almost walked right into a school bus. I think that would have been inconsiderate to all those school kids."

Then, more seriously, he said:

"I think we're a self-liquidating proposition unless we make some really hard choices. And we—I mean, America—can't make them alone. It's a worldwide problem."

"We've got to stop fouling up the environment and we've got to stop fouling up the people with low-grade education, and we've got to stop letting large numbers of people breed themselves into inadequate and hopeless lives."

Already, he went on, the damage to the environment was irreparable in some areas. "You may not be able to unpollute what is polluted entirely, but in 50 to 100 years you can reduce the pollution to a tolerable level."

"You know, there's serious consideration being given by some scientists to increasing the length of human life. I think that's the most stupid thing you can do. If people live longer. They're going to stay fertile longer. I'm one person who doesn't want to see life prolonged."

Did that mean Barnaby Keeney, the humanist, had become a pessimist?

Keeney peered over his glasses again and paused a moment.

"No," he said, with a short laugh. "I'm just discouraged."

**SELECTION OF MISS KATHLEEN CZAR, OF WARWICK, R.I., AS 1971 RHODE ISLAND VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER**

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "Freedom—Our Heritage."

The winning contestant from Rhode Island this year is Miss Kathleen Czar from Warwick. Miss Czar is presently a student at Pilgrim High School and is the editor of the school paper. In addition, she is vice president of the German club and secretary of the ecology club.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include a copy of Miss Czar's winning speech. It is an extremely well written speech and I congratulate her for her fine work.

**FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE**

Freedom is an important word to Americans, a term that has always played a key role in the history of the United States. For the freedom to practice their religion, the first colonists faced almost insurmountable hardships in coming to settle in the New World. To "secure the blessings of liberty", a new nation was carved out of wilderness by brave men with a dream, a vision of a country where all men could be free. To make this dream reality, to make all men free, the United States fought a civil war, discovering that a nation so conceived could endure. And to protect this liberty, Americans fought and died in two world wars, risking their lives to preserve the freedom that had come to mean so much to them.

Today we have a responsibility. A challenge has been set before us by the Americans who strove throughout history to protect liberty. They have challenged us to carry on the democratic tradition. Our responsibility is great. We must face the challenge, and work to keep freedom from becoming nothing more than a hollow, meaningless word, tossed about casually.

In order to accomplish this difficult task, we must first dispel the illusion that freedom is guaranteed to every man merely by the fact of his birth. Freedom is not a static quantity to be passed from one generation to the next like a tarnished antique watch. We, as citizens of the United States, are not automatically the heirs of liberty. We are given the heritage of freedom, but it is the task of each generation to win once again the right to exercise its independence; it is the duty of every American to earn his liberty.

In the seventies, we can at least begin to merit our heritage by the wise, judicious use of our power. On a large scale, the United States can use her strength and wealth to aid weaker nations, countries with the same desire for life, liberty and happiness that sparked the American battle for independence. Closer to home, the citizen himself can make responsible use of the power of democracy. By keeping abreast of the major issues and problems that confront America today and by working within the system to implement the necessary changes, he can in his own way protect his freedom.

Part of the responsibility inherent in democracy is the respect for the rights of others. Many of the problems facing the

country today stem from the misconception that freedom can be taken for granted, that it can be accepted as no more than one's due. Democracy itself is threatened when rights taken for granted are abused, when liberty is mistaken for license, and freedom is confused with "anything goes".

It is not liberty that has been handed down to us, but rather the challenge to preserve and further the cause of freedom. We must take it upon ourselves to earn our liberty, to merit our priceless heritage, and, perhaps equally as important, to dispel the illusion that freedom is ours by birth.

**THE CONGRESS CAN STOP THE VIETNAM WAR**

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Southeast Asia is like an old song that we cannot get out of our mind. The verses change, but it is the same tune that haunts us. At the beginning we did not know how to react to this persistent humming. After a while it began to aggravate us and we protested, but not too loudly. Then the noise got louder and we erupted into loud shouting and banging our head to try to get rid of this ubiquitous sound. With this response, the degree of the humming leveled off. For awhile we truly thought it would leave us.

Then, with little warning, the loudness returned. We probably thought all along that it would, but we refused to admit it. This time we lack the energy to fight it. Maybe if we just ignore it, we say, it will go away. No such luck. We may try to dress it up and cover it over with make up, but it is still there. And unfortunately, it will remain until we find the correct antidote.

The President could apply this antidote, but unfortunately he feels his pride is involved. He says he too wants to end the war, but only if we come marching out with flags waving, bands playing, and wreaths being placed upon our heads. He refuses to admit that we have made a grievous mistake in Southeast Asia, a mistake that has been perpetuated for 10 long years.

Therefore, the only way to bring this war to an end once and for all is through an act of Congress. In a letter to James Madison in 1789, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

We have already given in example one effectual check to the Dog of War by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay.

It is time for the Congress to reclaim this "effectual check"; the "dog of war" has had it too long.

In a speech before the American Legion here in Washington on February 16, President Nixon stated:

The United States has not started a war anywhere.

He may claim that we did not initiate the Vietnam war, but he must accept the blame for expanding it.

There is no doubt that the Nixon administration violated the intent of the Congress as stated in the Church-Cooper amendment with their planned invasion

of Laos. The Congress had prohibited the use of American ground troops in that country. In doing this, we forgot we were dealing with a President who disguises our soldiers in civilian clothing and places an embargo on news so that the American people were the last to learn of our invasion of Laos. We cannot help but recall that the Russian people were the last to learn about the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Even some of the military are finding all of this hard to swallow. A ranking military information officer told the Saigon correspondent of the Baltimore Sun:

When an Administration replaces prompt and full disclosure—as much as is allowed by military security—with a policy of duplicity, well, you have to recall a few civic lessons and, if you're a good soldier, swallow hard.

This should not and cannot be tolerated.

Let us look at the explanation of the Defense Department for our expanded role in Southeast Asia. Actually, "expanded" may be the wrong word. Back in June of 1964, U.S. jet planes attacked Pathet Lao positions in north-central Laos. This was the first direct involvement of the U.S. military in Laos. In February of 1968, U.S. planes bombed communist forces in Laos in close support of Laotian troops, thus becoming the first time American planes had given direct support to Laotian ground forces. In the latter part of 1969, U.S. B-52's were flying as many as 200 sorties a day from bases in Thailand and South Vietnam, bombing the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos. It is my understanding that between 1966 and 1969, Laos suffered the highest per capita casualty rate in the world and endured the heaviest per square mile bombing in history.

But let us get back to the record. First it was going to be the bombing of the north that was going to be "decisive." Then it was the search-and-destroy missions, then American airpower, then American air support. After that it was the destruction of the enemy's forces in the Tet offensive that was supposed to have broken the back of the opposition. And only last spring it was the invasion of Cambodia that was going to destroy the enemy's sanctuaries and let us go home. Now we are being told once more that our latest adventure into Laos will surely put an end to our long agony. But the week-end news is replete with stories that the North Vietnamese are now digging in hard to protect the Ho Chi Minh Trail, and that the South Vietnamese Army had not, as we had previously been led to believe, taken over much of the trail. And so the possibility of American ground troops entering Laos to protect the South Vietnamese looms larger.

In the name of getting out, we are getting in deeper. Our policy is based on the million-man South Vietnamese Army. In the end, I am afraid that we will find this policy is built on sand. They are not what the administration builds them up to be, or our support would no longer be necessary. How can

we really continue to withdraw our forces when the Saigon regime could collapse after we are gone? This is the basis of the Nixon administration's thinking. Thus, our tactics are not protecting our withdrawal, they are preventing it.

And since the military tactics and the President's dependency on the military are unlikely to change, it is our policy and our tactics which must change. First of all, we must rid ourselves of the belief that we are the policemen of the world. I do not like communism anymore than Mr. Nixon does, but we cannot be the saviors of the world. We forget that Americans are only 6 percent of the world's population, and that there cannot be an American solution to every problem.

Second, we must recognize, as Alexis de Tocqueville said:

No protracted war can fail to endanger the freedom of a democratic country.

President Nixon stated last spring as a defense of our involvement in Cambodia, that "doing too little for an ally can induce a sense of despair." What he and many others do not realize is that a people lacking jobs, lacking adequate housing and health care, a people who are threatened on all sides by a polluted environment, are much more vulnerable to hostile powers than a people whose domestic life is built around respect for human values. We should have learned long ago that we cannot build confidence or credibility by stubbornly persisting in a futile venture. There can be no credibility unless the original cause is sound.

And, third, it is up to the people of this Nation not to retreat into despondency and frustration. The invasion of Laos was greeted with apathy in this country. Do we truly believe that it is somehow clean and fair to kill from the air, but it is an atrocity when it is done at Mylai?

This war will end only by an act of Congress. Unfortunately, Congress often does not act on its own, but instead reacts to citizen pressure. Last spring there was a tremendous response by the people of this country to the invasion of Cambodia. Largely as a result of this public outcry, the Church-Cooper amendment was passed by Congress. The President responded by saying he would not use ground troops, but he has used air and seapower, advisers, and medical aides. We could now enact legislation to prevent the use of these additional men in Laos and Cambodia, but the President would, I fear, only change their titles or even pick a different country to invade.

There is only one choice we have, and that is to cut off all military funds for Southeast Asia and set a date by which all American military personnel must be removed. To require the removal of only ground troops is to invite continued involvement for another decade.

Congress must act and we must act now. But we need the help of the people of this country. We need your letters and your calls and your visits. We need your pressure. We are in a far more favorable position this year to pass legislation than we were in last year. Listen to this statement made last month

by Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who has long been an outspoken exponent of giving free reign to the President as Commander in Chief. Senator STENNIS states that he now "totally rejects the concept advocated from time to time that the President has certain inherent powers as Commander in Chief which enable him to extensively commit major forces to combat without congressional consent."

Congress must act now to prevent future Vietnams. Senator JACOB JAVITS of New York has introduced a bill which would give the President the authority to initiate hostilities to meet emergencies, such as an attack on the United States or an attack on American troops abroad, to protect the lives and property of Americans abroad and to comply with a treaty obligation. However, the President could not continue the hostilities for more than 30 days unless he obtains congressional authorization. This bill seems to have broad support and I am today introducing it here in the House.

We must end this war and begin the task of rebuilding this country. We need the help of the people of this Nation. Not the shouting of obscene slogans, or the waving of Vietcong flags, or the bombing of buildings. You cannot merely complain or demonstrate or use violence to impose your will. This does as much to destroy this country as does the continuation of the war, and I abhor it just as much. What we need is your energy and your support. Do not mellow in despondency, for a senseless war tolerated in frustration or misunderstanding is no less senseless.

We may not be able to pressure the President to end this war, but we can get the Congress to stop it. Let us hear the voices of the people of America once again.

President Kennedy once said:

The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable.

It is this latter role that we seek.

#### SELECTION OF MISS MEREDITH ROLLINS, OF BILLINGS, MONT., AS 1971 MONTANA VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Montana members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its auxiliary have selected Miss Meredith Rollins of Billings, Mont., as their 1971 Voice of Democracy Contest winner.

Miss Rollins, a Billings West High School student, makes an eloquent presentation of a strong, free America able to withstand close examination and continually dedicated to the "responsibility to bring men, worldwide, closer to realizing the ideal of freedom." I am pleased to draw this good work to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

#### FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE (By Meredith Rollins)

My generation is inheriting America—the whole America. We are inheriting a history filled with Thomas Jeffersons, Abraham Lincolns, and Martin Luther Kings; a history nurtured by the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence; and dedicated to ideals of peace and freedom. Yet we are also inheriting a nation where the sick, the poor, and the hungry are often ignored; a nation where there are rumors of civil war and of revolution; a nation where Americans are labeled not as brothers, but as factions: black Americans, white Americans, ultra-conservative Americans, radical Americans, militant Americans, ugly Americans.

America personified is perhaps the greatest living paradox: it is the greatest nation ever on the face of the earth, yet it faces the most complex problems ever known to man. When I was very small, America seemed like a great red, white, and blue eagle in the distance—unblemished and untouched. Yet as I come closer, as I grow older, to the actual substance of the eagle, I realize that the eagle's paint is chipped, the red, white, and blue colors somewhat faded, and the eagle itself is scratched and scarred. Realizing these faults is not necessarily bad. It is up to my generation not only to realize the faults in America, but to avoid whitewashing them—not merely to repaint America in the red, white, and blue, but to check the foundations of freedom for which the colors, and the nation, stand.

The best way to reaffirm the principles of freedom is through knowledge. In our highly technological state, we often mistake facts and formula for timeless truths. We must instead study the lessons of history and aim at wisdom, a knowledge of abstract, human variables. Americans living today are the best-educated people the world has ever known, but we are still all too often ignorant of the human side of freedom. Ignorance forces us into corners. Young people today, following often limited perspectives, are often forced into two camps—those who are blindly patriotic to America, or those who are totally critical of the American system. Neither group furthers the cause of freedom.

As Americans, we need to broaden ourselves and to broaden our definition of freedom. A great American once said, "No man is free until every man is free." With our heritage of freedom comes the responsibility to bring all men, world-wide, closer to realizing the ideal of freedom. We can strengthen our definition of freedom by studying both the advocates and the critics of the American system. If that system is not strong enough to stand such close inspection, then it needs redirection. However, in the past, America has always been able to withstand, and has often profited from, the harshest criticisms and the closest examinations.

It was once said that "America is great because America is good, and when America ceases to be good, then it will also cease to be great." My generation inherits a great, and, for the most part, a good America. It is up to us, in appreciation for our heritage of freedom, to strive to strengthen and maintain America's goodness, and in this way to find the true meaning of patriotism.

#### THE INCREASE IN PRICE OF PLYWOOD AND LUMBER

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I addressed the House on several occasions in regard to the rapidly acceler-

ating prices of both plywood and lumber. At that time both lumber and plywood had increased in price over 100 percent in a matter of less than 6 months.

At the time I introduced a resolution calling for the investigation of the situation by the Banking and Currency Committee. The resolution promptly cleared the Rules Committee and was unanimously approved on the floor of the House. Such a hearing took place in a very short period of time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that within that 2½-week period of time after the Banking and Currency Committee began their hearings that prices of both plywood and lumber began to drop. They continued that decrease in price, and went down to prices that had been in effect 4 and 5 years ago. They remained at that point until recently.

Now, this price spiral is once again taking place. The mills again are becoming most greedy through price increases. Let me give you some figures.

Dimension lumber since the first of December has increased from \$75 per thousand to \$87, an increase of 16 percent.

Plywood, from the first of December, has increased from \$64 to \$86, a 35-percent increase.

It is time that the lumber manufacturers stop this practice of gouging the American homebuilder simply because there is currently an increased demand for lumber and plywood. If these price increases continue, I intend to again introduce a resolution calling for a congressional investigation in far greater depth than the hearings of 2 years ago.

All of the blame, however, cannot be placed on the lumber manufacturers for the increase in building costs. I cite below figures in regard to increases in wages in the construction industry versus all industry:

In 1965 construction industry workers received an average wage increase of 17.5 cents per hour; all industry 8.5 cents. In 1968 construction workers received an average increase of 49.6 cents per hour; all industry 18.5 cents. In 1969, construction workers 70.2 cents per hour increase; all industry 22.1 cents per hour. In 1970, the average increase for all construction workers amounted to 90.5 cents per hour versus 27.7 cents for all of industry.

The pay increases which the workers in the construction industry have received over the last few years are almost unbelievable. Irresponsible leadership of local craft construction unions have been responsible for this astronomical increase in construction workers' wages and the subsequent increase in the cost of housing.

The average family cannot afford to construct a new home today, because of the tremendously high labor costs.

As a result of recent increases in the cost of lumber and plywood, and of construction workers' wage rates, an immediate freeze should be ordered on both wages and prices in the construction industry for a period of at least 12 months. I urge President Nixon to take immediate action.

#### PLEDGE FOR VIGOROUS CONSUMER PROTECTION

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats, under your able leadership, are today reaffirming our commitment to the passage of strong, effective legislation to protect the American consumer. Recent Democratic Congresses have enacted landmark legislation in the field of consumer affairs, including the truth-in-lending, fair packaging, flammable fabrics, and wholesome meats laws.

We intend to improve on that record. Chairman HOLIFIELD has today announced that his Government Operations Committee will begin hearings next week on the proposal to establish a Consumer Protection Agency. The American consumer is the keystone of our economy.

In recent years, however, as our economy has grown and diversified, the consumer has found himself increasingly removed from manufacturers and increasingly the helpless prey of unscrupulous vendors. We believe he deserves a better deal. We think he is entitled to fair treatment in the marketplace. An independent consumer protection agency which will vigorously and effectively represent the interests of the consumer is a step in the right direction. We pledge our all-out efforts to achieve that goal in the 92d Congress.

#### PASSPORT OFFICE

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last week I called to the attention of Members of the House an excellent article in the New Yorker magazine by Edward Jay Epstein in which he exposed the disgraceful reporting by certain elements of the press concerning an alleged, but non-existent, national police conspiracy to eradicate the Black Panther organization.

Two of the country's self-proclaimed leading newspapers, the New York Times and the Washington Post, took the forefront in spreading this totally unfounded story, and their completely unprofessional actions—as detailed by Mr. Epstein—are shocking to the point of disbelief.

Never let it be said that the New York Times is inconsistent. Even before the ink was dry on Mr. Epstein's exemplary article the Times came out with a lengthy story purporting to "reveal" a "secret" file of names kept by the Passport Office for use in surveillance of passport applicants.

Mr. Speaker, shocked by this latest assault on credibility I asked the director of the Passport Office, Miss Frances G. Knight, for her comments, and I am sure the Members of the House and the American public will find them interesting.

I find it intriguing to learn that the

existence of this "file" was apparently a secret to the great and august New York Times when it has been a matter of public information for over a decade.

But, then, I found it intriguing to watch the New York Times unearth a land deal involving SPIRO T. AGNEW and try to smear him, on election eve in 1968, with a story which had been widely printed and dismissed many months earlier by every newspaper in the area.

I find it interesting that the reporter assigned to the AGNEW story is also the author of the current hatchet job on the Passport Office. It would also be interesting to learn whether the same New York based editor, who ordered the AGNEW stories, is behind the "discovery" of this one.

It must be admitted that the Times is busy forging a solid reputation as a leading exponent of yellow journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point a letter to me from Miss Knight, the New York Times story in question, an excerpt from the Warren Commission report and a copy of a State Department press release of April 5, 1966, consisting of a letter signed by Dean Rusk:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1971.  
Hon. H. R. GROSS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: This is in answer to your urgent telephone request this morning for information regarding newspaper stories on the "look-out file" maintained in the Passport Office. The news items you referred to were carried in the New York Times and I believe the Washington Evening Star has contracted to carry the New York Times News Service, which would explain why a local paper carried the same story. The file in question is too complicated a matter to explain over the telephone. I hope that this letter will be helpful to you.

I have had a number of inquiries regarding the scare headlines carried by the New York Times on February 11 and February 16, 1971. The first headline reads: "Passport Office has Secret File" and the sub-head reads: "243,135 Names in Computer—Applications Screened." The second article was headlined "Raw Material for Snoopers." The average reader would surmise from these scare-heads that the Passport Office is engaged in the surveillance of U.S. citizen travellers—a totally false accusation previously made by the New York Times and officially denied by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Inaccurate reporting was recently dramatized in a recent issue of The New Yorker Magazine which exposed sloppy, misleading reporting on the Black Panther-Police cases. On February 19, 1971, the Washington Post engaged in some editorial introspection and slapped its own wrists lightly for its contribution to the inaccuracies. Today, the Sunday Star also editorialized on "The Panthers, the Police and the Press." The important thing to remember, however, is that the misinformation has spread like a poison and the damage, whether by inadvertence or not, has been accomplished. Explanations and retractions never catch up with the original false accusations or implications.

You may be interested in the following background of the New York Times' pre-occupation with the contents of the Passport Office files and the operation of the Passport Office. On March 8, 1966, the Passport Office sent a routine classified message to the American Embassies in Moscow and Paris con-

cerning the travel abroad of Henry Stuart Hughes, a Harvard University professor on sabbatical leave. This message requested these embassies to notify the Department of State of any information received by them concerning Professor Hughes' activities abroad.

This classified message was "leaked" to the New York Times and was virtually quoted verbatim by that newspaper. In its issue of March 23, 1966, the New York Times touched off its ever-ready panic button and alleged the State Department was conducting a "surveillance" of U.S. citizens during their travel abroad. The article further stated that Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, "had been reprimanded by her superiors" for sending the message. Both statements were lies.

In a letter of March 23, 1966, Senator Edward M. Kennedy asked the then Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, to comment on the New York Times' article. The Department of State by Press Release, No. 74, dated April 5, 1966, set out the Secretary's reply to the Senator's letter. The Secretary stated in part:

"You inquired first as to the relationship between the Passport Office and the investigatory agencies of government, both in the granting of passports and in the surveillance of those who have received passports. First of all, I wish to emphasize most strongly that no question of surveillance or investigation by the Department of State or any American diplomatic post abroad is involved. The Department of State has traditionally been the agency of the Government to which other Departments turn for cooperation and assistance in aspects of their responsibilities relating to areas outside the United States. These have included requests for information the Department may receive concerning individuals travelling abroad. Requests of this kind have been sent routinely to the Passport Office in the Department. Also routinely, such requests have been passed on to our diplomatic missions abroad, with a request that the mission should forward to the Department any information that it may receive in normal course of business during the travel of an American citizen. The diplomatic missions have not been asked to conduct any surveillance or to engage in any investigative process. They have merely been asked to transmit certain information they may receive which, in the absence of a request from the Department, they might have no occasion to report." (Emphasis added.)

The Passport Office was merely following a routine practice established by the Department of State in cooperation with other areas of the Federal Government. Former Secretary of State Rusk answered this Congressional inquiry in a forthright manner which even the New York Times should be able to comprehend.

The current misrepresentation in the New York Times was occasioned by a speech made by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., on February 9, 1971, in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, expressing his legitimate concern with violations of the First Amendment Rights of free speech and freedom to associate. The Senator's speech has not been made available to me. No Passport Office representative was present when a spokesman for the Department of State briefed a member of the Senator's staff concerning Passport Office procedures. Therefore, I have no firsthand knowledge of what was said.

With specific reference to the New York Times article of February 11, 1971, it should be made clear that the Passport Office has statutory and regulatory authority for the maintenance of records of persons who for one reason or another, mainly citizenship, should not be issued a passport.

This authority is: 22 USC 211(a) and 212; 8 USC 1105; 8 USC 1185; Presidential Proclamation 3004; Executive Order 11295; and the Passport Regulations 22 CFR Parts 50,

51 and 53. In addition, the Passport Office is bound by the conclusion of the Warren Commission arising from its report on transactions between Lee Harvey Oswald and the State Department. The New York Times is aware of this fact in view of the ample lineage it gave the Warren Commission Report.

The New York Times article dated February 11, 1971 is captioned "Passport Office has Secret File." The fact that the Passport Office has such a file is not a secret; it was published in 1964 in the hearings of the Warren Commission; the categories of persons listed in the Passport Office "lookout file" have been discussed in various Congressional hearings available to the New York Times as well as to the public. Particular reference is made to a report of April 4, 1957 issued by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee. This report sets forth, at length, an exhaustive study of the passport procedures and was based on oral testimony before the Committee citing numerous studies. Further, so far as I am aware, Senator Ervin did not characterize the Passport Office lookout list as a "secret" file.

The New York Times article states: "A spokesman for Senator Ervin, however, said today that the State Department had reported to him in writing that the largest group of names on the list was in the 'known or suspected Communists or subversives' category and that the number of names under 'doubtful citizenship' ranked second."

I do not know the identity of the unnamed "spokesman" referred to in the article. However, the facts which the Passport Office furnished to the upper echelons in the Department of State handling all the contacts with Senator Ervin's office specifically indicated that the great majority of names contained in the lookout file relate to loss of citizenship, questionable citizenship or insufficient evidence of citizenship. Information to this effect was also furnished by me to Mr. Ben Franklin of the New York Times on February 10, 1971 in an interview requested by that reporter.

As reported by the New York Times, Senator Ervin is alleged to have said that while there might be legitimate reasons for maintaining portions of the Passport Office file, many of the justifications for it given to his subcommittee by the State Department were beyond any reason whatsoever.

Insofar as the Passport Office is aware, the Department of State was not asked and made no effort to justify the various categories in the lookout file. The New York Times listing of some of the categories deliberately impugns the necessity for and reasonableness of the lookout file and gives rise to some very pertinent questions:

1. Does the New York Times advocate the issuance of U.S. passports to persons who are not citizens of the United States in violation of law (22 USC 212)?

2. Does the New York Times advocate the facilitation of travel of arms smugglers, persons engaged in revolutionary activities or those who have a record of criminal activity abroad? These are examples of the persons whose "actions do not reflect to the credit of the U.S. abroad (1,040 persons)."

3. Does the New York Times advocate non-compliance with the conclusions of the Warren Commission and Presidential directives that all agencies cooperate with the Secret Service and other law enforcement agencies in reporting defectors, expatriates and repatriates who are considered to be a class potentially dangerous to the life of the President of the United States? Persons in this category meet the criterion established by Federal security agencies responsible for the program of protecting the life of the President of the United States and other Federal officials.

4. Does the New York Times advocate the issuance of passports to persons who are the

subject of criminal warrants of arrest issued by competent legal authorities? This question is particularly pertinent in the light of current domestic crime problems. In other words, does the Times advocate that the Passport Office refuse to cooperate with law enforcement agencies of the Federal and State governments?

5. Does the New York Times advocate a refusal to respect court orders granting the custody of children to one of the parents, thereby permitting through the issuance of a passport the other parent to illegally take children out of the country?

6. Does the New York Times advocate travel assistance to military deserters or selective service delinquents who are subjects of warrants of arrest?

7. Does the New York Times advocate non-cooperation and non-compliance with the security/intelligence agencies of the Federal Government in advising them of the travel or contemplated travel of known or suspected espionage agents, revolutionaries, communists and subversives who advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government?

8. Does the New York Times advocate the removal of the names of airplane hijackers and potential hijackers so that police authorities would not be appropriately advised of the prospective travel of such persons?

In its article of February 16, 1971, the New York Times also reports that the State Department had acknowledged maintaining a secret surveillance file of passport applicants.

The Passport Office has no information that the State Department or anyone connected with it "acknowledged maintaining a secret surveillance file of passport applicants". But I reiterate I do not know who the New York Times confers with in the Department of State. Nevertheless, the New York Times has available to it public information to the effect that the State Department has, in the past, denied emphatically that it maintains surveillance of passport applicants. As previously stated in this communication, Secretary Rusk in Press Release #74 of April 5, 1966, denied categorically any question of surveillance or investigation of passport bearers by the Department of State or any American diplomatic post abroad. That the State Department would now acknowledge maintaining a "secret surveillance file" is astounding. I am not aware of any such file.

As stated repeatedly, the lookout file maintained in the Passport Office is no secret. Its existence has been the subject of publication by the Warren Commission and others.

There is no surveillance, watch, observation, or other type of spying on passport applicants by the Passport Office, or by the Department of State.

At the conclusion of its article of February 11, 1971, the New York Times states: "Miss Knight said she would not necessarily notify anyone that he was included in the file even if the 'adverse action' were taken in her own office, through the denial of a passport."

This statement is misleading. I specifically stated to Mr. Ben Franklin of the New York Times, during the interview on February 10, 1971, that, if no adverse passport action was taken, the person would not be notified of the fact that his name was contained in the lookout file. Some names in the lookout file are not based on the contemplation of passport denial. They are there merely for the purpose of informing law enforcement agencies with a legitimate interest that a person is traveling abroad. If adverse passport action is taken, the Passport Regulations, which are distributed publicly and were handed to Mr. Ben Franklin by me personally, specifically require that the person affected be notified of the reasons for the action, of the evidence

upon which it was based, and of his right to a hearing.

The New York Times article, either deliberately or through misinformation received from sources outside the Passport Office, has created a totally erroneous impression of the Passport Office lookout file and has, as a result, completely distorted Senator Ervin's inquiry into an area of legitimate concern to him. The New York Times, it would appear, has either infected itself or is deliberately attempting to infect its readers with an Orwellian Syndrome.

It is abundantly evident that the New York Times could not control its phobia on the subject because three days later, on February 14, 1971, it published a picture of the New York Passport Agency and captioned it thus:

"Nearly 2 million Americans apply for passports every year. Last week another Passport Office service was revealed—a secret computerized file of 243,135 names that may be 'of interest' to Government law enforcement Agencies. The file is said to include 'suspected Communists and subversives' and those of 'questionable citizenship'."

Thus the New York Times published another calculated falsification. The 243,135 names are not related to "law enforcement agencies", as the caption indicates. A few are, but only a small fraction of the whole and the questions arise again—questions as to the persistent and extraordinary concern of the New York Times with protection of wanted criminals, espionage agents, individuals known to have engaged in passport fraud, child custody cases and so forth.

Finally, by February 16, 1971, the New York Times obviously worked itself up to such a mental sweat over the situation, that quasi-editorial by one Tom Wicker appeared and stated:

"Senator Ervin already has disclosed that the Dragon Lady of the State Department, Director Frances Knight of the Passport Office, has at her disposal a computer bank of 243,135 names of persons considered—not necessarily proven—to be subversive or to fail to 'reflect credit' on the United States."

Mr. Wicker is located with the New York Times staff in Washington and thus close to the source of primary information, but he did not choose to check his facts. Indeed, Mr. Wicker's statement is not a misunderstanding nor a typographical error nor a misquote. It is a deliberate and calculated lie and as such neither he nor the New York Times reflect any credit or honor on what was once upon a time regarded as a distinguished and respectable profession—namely, responsible newspaper reporting.

Sincerely,

FRANCES G. KNIGHT,  
Director, Passport Office.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1971]  
PASSPORT OFFICE HAS SECRET FILE; 243,135  
NAMES IN COMPUTER—APPLICATIONS SCREENED  
(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—The United States Passport Office acknowledged today that it keeps a secret, computerized file of 243,135 Americans whose applications for passports may be of interest to it or to Government law enforcement agencies. Persons listed in the file may never be aware of it.

The existence of the file was disclosed by Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr., the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, who is a persistent critic of what he considers Government surveillance and file-keeping abuses.

In a speech last night before a symposium at Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pa., Senator Ervin said he had discovered the Passport Office file through a reply to his subcommittee's questionnaires. He called it more proof that uncontrolled and undercover Government surveillance was a serious threat to the

exercise of the First Amendment rights of free speech and freedom to associate.

#### FILE IS DEFENDED

In an interview today Miss Frances Knight, the Passport Office director since 1955, said, "A passport is a United States document addressed to foreign Governments in which we are saying, 'This person is an American citizen.'"

She said that "a vast majority"—perhaps 90 per cent—of those listed in the file were persons of "questionable citizenship" about whom it was her obligation to be curious and cautious in issuing an official document.

A spokesman for Senator Ervin, however, said today that the State Department had reported to him in writing that the largest group of names on the list was in the "known or suspected Communists or subversives" category and that the number of names under "doubtful citizenship" ranked second. The number in each of these categories was not immediately available.

"We are guarding the integrity of the passport by verifying United States citizenship," Miss Knight said. But she expressed surprise at the large number of names on the list.

Miss Knight said she had been ill for the last three weeks and away from her desk. Until she summoned aides to her office this afternoon, she said, she was unaware that Senator Ervin had made official inquiries about the file or that it was a matter of controversy. The State Department's reply to Mr. Ervin's questionnaire was dated Jan. 4.

#### HEARINGS START FEBRUARY 23

Senator Ervin has scheduled nine days of public hearings before his subcommittee starting Feb. 23 on what he has called the growth of "police state" surveillance and dossier-keeping on perhaps 50 million Americans, most of them accused of breaking no laws.

The North Carolina Democrat, a former judge on his state's Supreme Court, said last night that while there might be legitimate reasons for maintaining portions of the Passport Office file, many of the justifications for it given to his subcommittee by the State Department were "beyond any reason whatsoever."

He said a State Department reply to a subcommittee questionnaire listed these categories:

["Individual's actions do not reflect to the credit of the U.S. abroad (1,040 persons)."]

["Defectors, expatriates and repatriates whose background demands further inquiry prior to issuance of a passport."]

["Persons wanted by a law enforcement agency for criminal activity."]

["Individuals involved in a child custody or desertion case."]

["Delinquents or suspected delinquents in military service."]

["Known or suspected Communists or subversives."]

#### "ORANGE CARD"

Senator Ervin said other categories included simply "orange card" and "miscellaneous."

"I don't know what 'orange card' means, and I don't think they know either," he told the Dickinson College gathering.

Asked if he thought the Central Intelligence Agency had inserted names in the file, Mr. Ervin said, "I can't prove it but I suspect the C.I.A. gets just about anything it wants."

He said the State Department had acknowledged maintaining a secret surveillance file of passport applicants in which "the individual is not told that he is in the file" until and unless "adverse action" is taken. It was not clear today how this would operate in actual practice.

Miss Knight said her office would merely report quietly to "the interested agency"—the Federal Bureau of Investigation or a

state law enforcement agency with a fugitive warrant, for example—that a person listed in the file had applied for a passport.

Whether "adverse action" would ensue was none of her interest, she said, and she would not notify the subject of his listing in the file.

Miss Knight said she would not necessarily notify anyone that he was included in the file even if the "adverse action" were taken in her own office, through the denial of a passport.

#### CONCLUSION OF THE WARREN COMMISSION FROM ITS INVESTIGATION OF TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN LEE HARVEY OSWALD AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Investigation of Oswald's complete dealings with the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service reveals no irregularity suggesting any illegal actions or impropriety on the part of government officials. The Commission believes, however, that in applying its own regulations the Department should in all cases exercise great care in the return to this country of defectors such as Oswald who have evidenced disloyalty or hostility to this country or who have expressed a desire to renounce their U.S. citizenship and that, when such persons are returned, procedures should be adopted for the better dissemination of information concerning them to the intelligence agencies of the Government. The operation of the "lookout card" system in the Department of State was obviously deficient, but since these deficiencies did not affect Oswald or reflect any favoritism or impropriety, the Commission considers them beyond the scope of its inquiry.

Especially while he was in the Soviet Union, Oswald's manner to Government personnel was frequently insulting and offensive. As one 1962 communication between the Embassy and the Department of State observed, "It is not that our hearts are breaking for Oswald. His impertinence knows no bounds." Nonetheless, the officials of the U.S. Government respected Oswald as a troubled American citizen and extended to him the services and assistance for which the agencies of government have been created. Though Oswald was known to be "an unstable character, whose actions are highly unpredictable," there was no reasonable basis in 1961 and 1962 for suspecting that upon his readmittance to the country he would resort to violence against its public officials. The officers of the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, acting within the proper limits of their discretion, concluded that Oswald's return to the United States was in the best interests of the country; it is only from the vantage of the present that the tragic irony of their conclusion emerges.

#### LETTER FROM SECRETARY RUSK TO SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
April 5, 1966.

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I appreciate your thoughtful letter of March 23 concerning a New York Times article on that day discussing the proposed travel abroad of Professor H. Stuart Hughes. I share your concern for the freedom of Americans to travel abroad without any surveillance on the part of American diplomatic missions. I am, of course, deeply disturbed that reports reflecting adversely on Professor Hughes came into the area of public discussion. I have caused a thorough inquiry to be made into this matter and have given a good deal of personal attention to it.

Your letter posed a series of questions which I will now undertake to answer.

You inquired first as to "the relationship

between the Passport Office and the investigatory agencies of government, both in the granting of passports and in the surveillance of those who have received passports". First of all, I wish to emphasize most strongly that no question of surveillance or investigation by the Department of State or any American diplomatic post abroad is involved. The Department of State has traditionally been the agency of the Government to which other departments turn for cooperation and assistance in aspects of their responsibilities relating to areas outside the United States. These have included requests for information the Department may receive concerning individuals travelling abroad. Requests of this kind have been sent routinely to the Passport Office in the Department. Also routinely, such requests have been passed on to our diplomatic missions abroad, with a request that the mission should forward to the Department any information that it may receive in normal course of business during the travel of an American citizen. The diplomatic missions have not been asked to conduct any surveillance or to engage in any investigative process. They have merely been asked to transmit certain information they may receive which, in the absence of a request from the Department, they might have no occasion to report.

The second question contained in your letter inquired as to the authority for requests to Embassies to transmit information concerning private U.S. citizens travelling abroad. This authority derives fundamentally from the statutes creating the Department of State and providing for the exercise of responsibilities by the heads of Executive Departments. These statutes are to be found in U.S.C. Title 5, sections 22 and 151. There is a further provision of law dealing expressly with action by American diplomatic posts abroad to comply with requests coming from agencies of the government other than the Department of State. That provision is contained in U.S.C. Title 22, section 846, which reads as follows:

"The officers and employees of the Service shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, perform duties and functions in behalf of any Government agency or any other establishment of the Government requiring their services, including those in the legislative and judicial branches, but the absence of such regulations shall not preclude officers and employees of the Service from acting for and on behalf of any such Government agency or establishment whenever it shall, through the Department, request their services."

The third question in your letter inquired as to "who is assigned the responsibility in our Embassies to survey the activities of American citizens abroad, and how is such information gathered?" As I have emphasized earlier, no question of surveillance of Americans is involved. Nor do our diplomatic posts make special efforts to secure or ferret out information in response to requests from the Department that have been made on behalf of the other government agencies. Instead, the diplomatic post simply forwards any information it may receive from items appearing in the local press, reports that may come to the attention of the post, or other routine receipt of information.

The fourth question in your letter, inquired as to the number of instances during the last year in which requests were sent to diplomatic missions for reporting on the travel of Americans abroad. The records of the Department show that there were approximately 150 such requests.

During the last week the Attorney General and I have reviewed with care the procedures of the Departments of State and Justice. We appreciate having the benefit of discussion with you on this whole matter. The following guidelines will govern henceforth the ac-

tions of our two Departments regarding requests for the transmission of information concerning American citizens travelling abroad; (1) such requests will be made by the Department of Justice only in cases where an important national interest would be served by the transmission of information that may be received; (2) as in the past, American diplomatic missions will engage in no surveillance; a mission will, on appropriate instructions from the Department of State, simply forward relevant information that may come to its attention; (3) requests for information will be initiated in the Department of Justice by a responsible officer, and the dispatch of a requesting message from the Department of State to a diplomatic mission will be handled by a responsible officer of this Department; (4) any such requesting message will be limited strictly to what is required for fulfilling the reporting function; (5) requests for information and any reports received in response will be handled on a restricted basis both at origin and destination, with distribution closely controlled to assure appropriate protection.

I believe these are sound guidelines that will advance the objectives we have in mind, to meet the legitimate needs of the government for information and to protect the rights of American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

#### RECKLESS CHARGES AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I noted with considerable resentment that over the weekend one of the self-proclaimed presidential aspirants of the opposition party spoke on national television and in effect called the President of the United States a liar. He said that the American people were not being told the truth about the war in Vietnam.

These are very serious charges. This has been an open administration. Our President has announced his overall aims, and he has kept his word. He is bringing the troops home on schedule. He has explained the purposes of his military moves to protect the lives of American fighting men still in Vietnam.

I would suggest that the member of the other body, who has leveled these reckless charges, do some leveling himself. He should document what he says. If he has any proof that what is going on in Southeast Asia differs from what the President has told the people, he has the obligation and the responsibility to come forth with it. Otherwise, he will have established early in the game a record of irresponsibility that can hardly create anything but distrust by the people.

Questioning a policy is one thing, but calling our President a prevaricator is gutter politics, unworthy and I am sure unacceptable to the American public.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once

again I rise in this Chamber to salute the people of Lithuania, as well as those Americans who trace their heritage to Lithuania, on the special and sacred occasion of the 53d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania—the day universally and popularly known as Lithuanian Independence Day. Last Tuesday, February 16, was the official occasion; but because of the fact that the House was in recess on that date, I am taking this opportunity today to commemorate the event.

Mr. Speaker, for 23 years, beginning on February 16, 1918, the proud people of the Republic of Lithuania maintained their free and democratic Republic. Its elected leaders brought about land reform, created and expanded industry, established an adequate transportation system, and enacted far-reaching modern social and education programs.

All this came to a sudden and tragic halt, of course, in 1940, when the Soviet troops moved into that thriving democracy and forcefully annexed it to the Soviet Union. The Communists crushed the Lithuanian Government and then began a typical Communist reign of terror, deporting an estimated 30,000 members of the intelligentsia to Siberia in a single night, and executing thousands of political prisoners. The brave Lithuanians continued their fight for freedom, however, and successfully overthrew their Soviet oppressors in 1941, only to have their new independence crushed once again by the advancing armies of Hitlerite Germany.

After the war Russia again annexed Lithuania and resumed their terrorism and their previous attempts to destroy the Lithuanian culture. But the strong national feeling and pride of the Lithuanian people were too strong. Geographically Lithuania may still be behind the Iron Curtain, but the historic Lithuanian culture has never died. It continues to be kept, both in Lithuania and here at home.

The desire for freedom is still very much alive too, and American-Lithuanians continue to proclaim the unspoken desire of their countrymen behind the Iron Curtain, that one day the curtain will be lifted, and Lithuanians once again will be allowed those rights and freedoms which Americans regard as belonging to all human beings from the moment of their birth.

I know Americans everywhere join today in support of the principles of the legislation which Congress enacted back in 1966. I strongly supported that legislation, too, House Concurrent Resolution 416. It passed both Houses of Congress unanimously. It is well for us to recall its wording now:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjugation of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia,

Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people; Be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—*

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the President of the United States to implement this resolution immediately and direct the attention of the United Nations to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Lithuania. I urge him to rally the force of world opinion on behalf of the restoration of these rights. We must not let the world forget the plight of the Lithuanian people.

Americans were reminded of that plight very dramatically in recent months, in the incident involving the Lithuanian sailor who tried to defect to America aboard a U.S. Coast Guard cutter. Instead he was denied asylum by top Coast Guard authorities more interested in fish than in human freedom, and he was beaten and dragged off the American vessel by Soviet sailors. I have loudly protested that action, and most recently joined in introducing legislation to change the name of that Coast Guard cutter from the *Vigilant* to *Simas Kudirka* in honor of the Lithuanian sailor.

Of course, renaming the *Vigilant* will not save Mr. Kudirka from the wrath of his Soviet oppressors, if he is still alive, nor will it bring him back to freedom. The tragic incident is past, and the damage to America's longstanding reputation as a haven for fugitives from tyrants has been done. The officer who gave the order to return the Lithuanian sailor to the Soviets has been disciplined, although that punishment was not nearly as severe as his actions warranted.

But, at least we can show our sorrow and chagrin by renaming the cutter in honor of the man who sought freedom so desperately and so unsuccessfully. And in so doing we may perhaps restore a measure of our self-respect and reaffirm for the whole world our contempt for forced repatriation and our continuing pledge to help those, wherever they may be, who seek asylum from Communist tyranny.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on this 53d observance of Lithuanian Independence

Day, I hope the American people will again pledge to continue to work for the day that the Iron Curtain will be lifted and Simas Kudirka and all other Lithuanians will be free to exercise their natural and unalienable rights as human beings and free men and women.

**HEW SECRETARY RICHARDSON CONFIRMS THAT MEDICARE IS NOT PAYING 80 PERCENT OF DOCTORS' BILLS, AS REQUIRED BY LAW**

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, I took this floor to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has for some months now been shortchanging millions of medicare clients by paying only 50 percent of their medical bills instead of the 80 percent legally mandated in the medicare law. At that time, I noted that I had written Secretary Richardson on January 5, 3 weeks earlier, to ask for a full explanation of what was going on, and had still not received a reply.

Two days later, on January 28, I received a reply from the Secretary enclosing a detailed memorandum on the issue written by Social Security Commissioner Robert Ball. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point, Mr. Speaker, the text of my original letter to the Secretary and his full reply to me:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1971.

HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,  
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,  
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There came to my attention the other day a rather startling report included in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post with respect to current operations of Medicare, which I am bringing to your attention and which I believe requires immediate and much fuller clarification.

According to this letter, a copy of which is enclosed, the Social Security Administration has ordered its regional offices to repay Medicare accounts, beginning July 1970, at 50 percent of the total bill rather than 80 percent.

Such action would appear to me to be not only contrary to the law but will obviously place very severe hardships on thousands of needy older citizens.

I would appreciate it if you could tell me whether this account is true, and if so why this order was issued.

Furthermore, I would like to know who issued the order, under what rules or regulations or legal authority it was issued, and in particular I would like to know whether, as the enclosed letter suggests, a deliberate effort has been made by the Social Security Administration, to keep this change of policy secret from the American public.

I would also like to know, in view of the recent announcement that Medicare premiums will rise effective July 1971, just what the significance of this action will be for the future operation of the Medicare system. I will be interested in your reply.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,  
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1971.

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STRATTON: This is in further response to your inquiry about a letter printed in the Washington Post on the subject of Medicare payment for physician fees.

I am glad to be able to reassure you that there is no rule or instruction for Medicare carriers to calculate the amount due a beneficiary as 50 percent of the amount of his physician's bill. The law provides for Medicare payment of 80 percent of the "reasonable charge" for the physician's services (after the \$50 yearly deductible is met) and that is the percentage that is paid.

Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, explains in the accompanying report the detailed application of the "reasonable charge" provision to individual cases.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,  
Secretary.

REPORT TO SECRETARY ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON  
REGARDING AN INQUIRY FROM REPRESENTATIVE  
SAMUEL S. STRATTON

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,  
Baltimore, Md.

The underlying question behind the letter to the Washington Post was that of how the reasonable charge is set. Under the law, the essential criteria are the individual physician's customary charge for the given service and the prevailing rate among physicians generally in the area for that service. Before a fee can be treated as customary it must be in effect for a reasonable period. Determination of what fees are prevailing for any given period, of course, requires a statistical analysis of fees for that period, so that this determination alone involves some lag between fee changes and their recognition under Medicare. Were Medicare to accept at once increases in charges as they are made, there would be room for rapid escalation of the rates on the basis of which the program makes payment.

The rates now in use by Medicare carriers are derived from 1969 experience on physicians' fees. Beginning July 1, 1971, the 1970 figures are to be used, with a similar progression at the beginning of each fiscal year thereafter. This, of course, means that where a physician has made recent increases in his level of charges, Medicare payment for his services may be less than 80 percent of his current billings. The data indicate that fees are rising on the average about 6 percent per year, but our information is that about one-third of fees are raised in a given year.

Medicare's reasonable charge may be less than the billed charge, not only because the program does not respond immediately to an individual physician's increase in his charges, but also because the physician's charge was above that charged by most other physicians in the area. The "prevailing" or limit at which a physician's full charge is recognized as reimbursable is set at the 75th percentile of the range of charges for a particular service in a locality. This does not mean, of course, that there is a 25 percent "cut" in the doctor's bill. His charge may be only 5 or 10 percent above the prevailing charge in the community and Medicare would recognize all but this amount as the "reasonable charge" for purposes of calculating its 80 percent reimbursement. Thus, in effect, Medicare recognizes the full customary charges for 75 percent of the services provided by physicians in an area. Where the patient goes to a physician whose fees are

higher than prevailing, he will be reimbursed as if the service had been provided at the prevailing rate.

Medicare's payment based on a figure lower than the billed amount does not necessarily mean that the patient makes up the difference. If the physician accepts assignment of the claim and sends his bill direct to Medicare, as he does nationally in three out of five cases (and in Representative Stratton's area the ratio is even better), he must as part of the arrangement agree to accept as his full charge the amount set as the reasonable charge for Medicare purposes. In the other cases, where the physician bills the patient and looks to him for payment, with the latter making claim to Medicare, the patient may be asked to pay any difference between the reasonable charge set for Medicare purposes and the amount of the physician's bill. In practice, in some of these cases the physician does not actually ask the patient to pay the difference.

We realize that any result that causes beneficiaries to be liable for more than the 20 percent coinsurance amount, which Medicare does not cover, will have its detractors and can be difficult for an individual beneficiary to cope with. The alternatives, however—recognizing increased rates of charges very quickly as they are made, or even paying fully customary charges regardless of how high—would greatly increase the cost of the program by failing to offer discouragement to increases in charges.

The problem you note here illustrates the difficulty of dealing with the major and general problem of how to cope with continued rises in the costs of health care. As you of course know, the Department is working on the problem from many directions and will need broad cooperation from the health care community and from the users of their services.

ROBERT M. BALL,  
Commissioner of Social Security.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the upshot of the Secretary's letter and the enclosed memorandum from Administrator Ball is that they have admitted, openly and publicly—and for the first time, I believe—that the payment schedule for doctors' fees under Medicare is: first, based on figures which are at least 18 months out of date, and second, regards fees charged by 25 percent of doctors in any area as automatically excessive and hence not subject to full 80 percent reimbursement as required by law.

It is, of course, quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary's letter, along with the enclosure, does not answer all the questions which I raised initially. And it also raises a number of other questions which make me wonder very seriously whether HEW is really carrying out the intent of Congress in providing help to our retired citizens.

For example, we are told that "reasonable" charges are now based on 1969 rates. But we are not told when that 1969 standard went into effect. My information is that until my complaint was aired publicly, the standard was 1968, and that this base was set—without any public notice—in the middle of 1970.

Second, the arbitrary basing of so-called prevailing rates on what 75 percent of doctors charge means that even without the 18 months time lag, 25 percent of all Medicare patients will be cheated out of the 80 percent reimbursement they have been promised and to which they are entitled under law.

Third, under the Department's procedures Medicare clients have not the slightest way of knowing whether any particular doctor is or is not within the 75 percentile group. Surely, if these people run the risk of being denied the funds to which they are entitled, then HEW ought to tell them where to go to get the full funds which Congress told them they had a right to expect.

Frankly, the Ball memorandum strikes me as an unconvincing ex post facto apology. Social Security was caught with their hand in the cookie jar, and this is their excuse. But they do not say anything—except too bad—about the millions of elderly recipients who are today having to pay for the results of a general price inflation out of their own hides.

I have very reliable information that the elaborate policy set forth in this memorandum has not been followed since the inception of Medicare but only went into effect last summer, and without any advance notice or warning. Fees that had not been raised at all since 1966, and that had been properly reimbursed at 80 percent during all those 4 years, were suddenly cut back by 25 to 40 percent last summer, I am told. Commissioner Ball and Secretary Richardson are completely mum on this point.

I do not intend to let this matter rest. I believe that the Nation's retired citizens are entitled to fair treatment and to open, honest, and understandable explanations of what is going on. I intend to press for more information from HEW and for corrective legislation in the Congress to prevent these outrageous evasions of the law, and this unfair and discriminatory treatment of our senior citizens.

#### SAM RAYBURN COMMEMORATIVE COIN

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, last year due to a parliamentary situation the Sam Rayburn commemorative coin amendment was not passed.

More than 50 Members of the House have joined in the sponsorship of this legislation which is being introduced today. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency which will handle the legislation, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is the sponsor of one measure with 25 Members, and I am introducing two other similar bills.

Mr. Speaker, no man deserves a commemorative coin more than Speaker Sam Rayburn, and I am pleased that the cosponsors of these bills come from both sides of the aisle, people who knew and loved Speaker Rayburn.

I trust this legislation will receive swift and favorable action by the Congress.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA AND DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601(a), Public Law 91-513, the Chair appoints as members of

the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS and Mr. CARTER.

#### CONGRESS MUST END RUSSIAN MONOPOLY OF WORLD CHROME MARKET

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today that gives Congress the opportunity to stop a gross mistake in our country's foreign policy. The cries of protest that this error should provoke have been muffled in stacks of bureaucratic papers and reports. Yet when this issue is brought into focus, the glaring error in judgment is magnified and we must demand a return to practical commonsense in this phase of our foreign policy.

First. Are you aware that the United States is cutting itself off from a vital strategic material, chromium, through its economic sanctions against Rhodesia?

Second. Are you aware that we are dependent on Russia for 60 percent of our supply of this strategic material?

Third. And are you aware that the Office of Emergency Preparedness is preparing to ask you, in this session of Congress to release 30 percent of our chromium from the Nation's strategic material stockpile in order to meet the demand for this vital metal? At this rate our stockpile will be completely depleted in just 3 years.

You may wonder why chrome ore is so important. Chromium is essential in the production of our military jet aircraft, missiles, and satellites. Commercially, chromium is the ingredient that makes stainless steel "stainless." Therefore, it is essential in the production of everything from industrial tools, to automobiles, to home construction, to kitchen items, and to multiple other areas.

Let us compare the statistics on chrome ore before the embargo went into effect. According to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Rhodesia supplied us with 37 percent of our total chromium import prior to the sanctions. At the same time Russia was supplying us with 27 percent of our chromium at a healthy competitive price of about \$30 to \$33 a ton. At this time, there was no shortage of this strategic metal. Russia had bought her way into our market by the good capitalistic method of pricing her chrome at slightly below Rhodesia's price.

But when the United Nations, with the compliance of our Government, put economic sanctions against Rhodesia, look at what happened in the free market. American-owned chrome-producing mines in Rhodesia became semidormant. I was interested to discover that the two largest chrome mines in Rhodesia were owned by American companies. Any profits were accruing to Americans. But with the economic sanctions we began channeling the same money that had gone to these American firms into the hands of the Russians. We do business with the Russians who are the major material sup-

port for our enemies in Vietnam. Hence, the United States is in the uncomfortable position of having to rely upon the Soviet Union for more than 60 percent of its chrome requirements.

What is more, the Soviets, taking advantage of the stranglehold they have on us, have skyrocketed the price of the ore to almost three times the presanction costs. Russia's presanction prices were lower than Rhodesia's. Today we pay Russia approximately \$28,000,000 a year when we could be receiving the same amount from American firms in Rhodesia for approximately \$17,000,000. One American company which buys from Russia reports that it has been forced to accept 1 ton of sub-standard ore for every ton of high-grade ore purchased.

Understandably enough, the State Department has realized this embarrassing situation and has now quietly recommended to Congress that we supply the deficit in our need for chromium from our emergency stockpile instead of becoming more dependent on Russia. If our rate of dependency on Russian sources continues to increase as it has so far, in a few short years we would be 95 percent dependent on Russia for this strategic material.

To become this dependent on Russia is bad enough but let us take a look at the alternative offered by the OEP. We retain our 60-percent dependence on Russia without increasing it. At the same time we take 30 percent chromium ore out of our stockpile on an annual basis. In 3 short years our stockpile is depleted and if the Russians cut off our supply, we are left with extremely inadequate sources of import, with no reserves in our stockpile, and with no more stainless steel. I am assuming that this is in time of peace. In the case of a national emergency, I do not need to tell you how crucial this would be.

To bring the issue more sharply into focus, let us listen to the warning of a past Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, Mr. Fred Russell, in his testimony before the Digg's committee on October 31, 1969. Mr. Russell said:

Further sales from the stockpile would only serve the need for the relatively short time it would take to exhaust the stockpile excess. Assuming that the U.S.S.R. would continue to ship chrome ore to the United States at the present level indefinitely, realizing that the other known amounts of chromium ore elsewhere in the world gradually are becoming exhausted, and knowing that the U.S. chrome ore needs are increasing each year, there is no way to see chromium ore needs of the United States being met without chromium ore from Rhodesia.

Let us review a few other curious facts. Communist China imports no chromium ore from the U.S.S.R. I quote from a London Times article entitled, "Who Buys Rhodesia's Chrome?":

It has been going to Communist China. Because she is not a member of the U.N., China is not bound by the resolution. Peking Radio calls the Rhodesians "fascist aggressors" but Peking buys Rhodesia's chromium. China uses it in her defense industries and it may well have accelerated her progress towards becoming a nuclear power.

Another curious incident is to be found in the case of the Japanese, who, like the United States, support the U.N. trade sanctions against Rhodesia. Japan has substantially reduced her chrome imports from Russia but has moved ahead of the United States in her production of stainless steel. Is Japan buying Rhodesian chrome?

Our last startling fact is that the U.S.S.R. is self-sufficient in 29 major industrial raw materials whereas the United States is only self-sufficient in 10. The more dependent we become on Russia for our resources, the more vulnerable becomes our national security. We must not be blind to the fact that this fits right into the Russian General Logarskij's theory in his book, "Strategy and Economics," in which he expounds his "weak link commodity" theory. This theory explicitly calls for Russia to develop strategic material markets until other countries slowly develop a weak link in their own supply line, thus becoming completely dependent on Russia. We are doing just this and handing Russia a powerful weapon.

Congress is the only governmental body that can change this state of affairs. It is obvious that the State Department must place the needs of the United States uppermost, and no longer continue to weaken our national security. Why we should try to hurt the small country of Rhodesia and help Russia is beyond my comprehension. And at the same time we are seriously impairing our own national economy.

Gentlemen, the issue is quite clear. Will the United States buy chrome so as to profit Russia, or will we buy chrome so as to build national security for the United States?

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. Frenchman Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber made some rather profound observations about American know-how in his best seller, *The American Challenge*:

During the past ten years, from the end of the cold war and the launching of the first Sputnik, American power has made an unprecedented leap forward. It has undergone a violent and productive internal revolution. Technological innovation has now become the basic objective of economic policy. In America today the government official, industrial manager, the economics professor, the engineer, and the scientist have joined forces to develop coordinated techniques for integrating factors of production . . .

America today still resembles Europe—with a 15-year head start. She belongs to the same industrial society. But in 1980 the United States will have entered another world, and if we fail to catch up, the Americas will have a monopoly on know-how, science, and power.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE MENDEL RIVERS STILL PRODUCING SHOCK WAVES THROUGHOUT THIS NATION AND THE FREE WORLD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the death last month of Congressman Mendel Rivers is still producing shock waves throughout this Nation and the free world. Many of us might be inclined at this late date to merely pay lip service to the event of his sad death as simply the loss of another noble statesman.

To those of us who knew Mendel Rivers, his stature as a noble statesman was beyond the ordinary. He was a giant among legislators in his day and the alertness and concise logic of his oratory will, to be sure, echo through the Halls of Congress for years to come.

That Mendel Rivers was a champion in the cause for a strong, secure America is an understatement. His stand against those who would rather see America's defense posture reduced to the gutless shambles of the pre-World War II broomstick Army era, will not soon be forgotten. Mendel Rivers knew and saw the enemy within and without for every diabolical capability that enemy represented. And he never once considered lowering the storm warning flag to effect a compromise on the question of exactly how strong America should remain. He plotted his course to this end early in life and never wavered from it.

Across the pages of history, the name of Mendel Rivers will stand tall alongside those of the world's greatest prophetic thinkers. He was a spirited inspiration to free men everywhere.

#### OIL PRICE STATEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, for too long now the American people have been enduring a terrible inflation that has brought despair and discouragement and financial disaster to many. In these times our people look to the Congress to provide the leadership, vision, and determination to help bring about the national climate required to ease these burdens of our citizens, so as to renew the faith and trust of all Americans who seek economic security.

Today, I would like to discuss one area deeply affected by inflation and a source of great anxiety to all of us.

It is particularly distressing to me that the people of New England and of my State of Connecticut have been for many years now required to pay excessively high fuel oil prices. The startling and disappointing fact is that the combination of artificially high oil prices and serious fuel oil shortages in New England result not from a lack of available oil resources, but from a failure to prop-

erly distribute those resources which we are blessed with in this country and which are available from distant lands for use in the United States.

Presently, we are faced with a drastic increase in energy use in this Nation which has risen at a rate of approximately 5 percent per year since 1965, compared to an average of less than 3 percent during the previous 20 years. In 1969, Connecticut consumers used over 22,673,000 barrels of fuel oil, according to the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Also, the cost to consumers of No. 2 oil in my State has risen sharply to nearly 20 cents per gallon from 15.2 cents per gallon in 1965. Connecticut homes are paying 28 percent more for No. 2 fuel oil per year than consumers in Montreal who are not under an import quota system. The costs of residual oil for heating schools, factories, and other similar establishments have nearly doubled for the month of January 1971 from January 1969.

There are two major reasons why we in the northeast and throughout the country are experiencing this fuel oil crisis. One is the problem of inequitable but mandatory oil import quotas, instituted in 1959, which have drastically limited the supply of oil entering the country. Of course, it must be quickly pointed out how undesirable it would be for the United States to be in a position of heavy reliance on oil sources from outside this country, particularly from politically volatile areas such as the Middle East. However, in February of 1970, President Nixon's Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control reported that these quotas cost American consumers over \$5 billion annually in artificially high prices. The Task Force further stated that the present quotas are not justified on grounds of national security, which had been the chief reason for their original implementation. Mr. Speaker, I would favor the abolishment of the import quota system in favor of a tariff to permit greater imports of oil at lower prices. This too was a recommendation contained in the President's Task Force; however, no action has been taken as yet to apply these recommendations.

The present tight fuel supply dilemma, coupled with the exorbitant prices should provide sufficient proof that the oil quotas have not been able to guarantee the adequate supplies of fuel oil needed by our people.

Another more troubling situation exists in the form of the Connally "Hot Oil" Act. This act prohibits interstate movement of oil not produced in conformity with State prorationing laws, and provides the legal justification for the States' restraints on free commerce in oil. In the name of conservation, this act enables major oil producing States to fix a production quota for each well in cooperation with the oil industry in order to insure that supply will never exceed demand and that prices can be maintained at continually high levels. The conservation theme lost its credibility when foreign oil became a strong influence and threatened the prorationing system—thereby opening the way for import quotas which now form a vital part of

the scheme to control fuel resources and prevent price competition in the oil industry. At the opening of his subcommittee hearing on pollution and alleged price-fixing in the oil industry during the last session of Congress, Senate PHILIP A. HART suggested that if States stopped curbing off-shore production, existing wells in Federal waters would increase their output by some 500,000 barrels a day. That fuel source, Senator HART predicted, would drop the prices of domestic crude by 30 cents a day and save consumers up to 10 percent in gas bills. Mr. Speaker, I would strongly support the repeal of the Connally Act.

In my view the proper way to deal with our present fuel oil difficulties is to divorce ourselves from the piecemeal policies which have greatly distorted the national perspective on oil and to plan out immediate and far-ranging steps by which we can insure the future fuel oil security that American consumers desperately need and rightly deserve.

Among immediate areas to consider is insuring a substantial increase in domestic production of residual oil. Also, we must encourage the building of low-sulfur, low-pollution residual fuel oil refining capacity on the east coast. In addition, import controls on No. 2 home heating oil should be eliminated, particularly because the pressure on No. 2 has increased so much as a result of its growing use as a substitute for residual oil. Quotas on crude oil from Canada, imposed last March, should be lifted since it is estimated that Canada can add 150,000 barrels a day to present pipeline oil shipments.

In addition, the President should insure that an emergency allocation system is devised to assist areas when acute heating oil crises develop during the winter months. Such a system could help prevent fuel oil shortages in areas of high consumption, including my own Sixth District in northwestern Connecticut.

As we look to the future, basic oil policy for our people must provide an effective free enterprise economy through competition in this area of fuel oil resources. Too often one energy-producing company overlaps in its interest in or control of other fuel companies.

In addition, tax incentives for overseas production of petroleum should be limited so that the incentive to explore for new oil reserves at home would be greater. Considering that a large part of our oil investment abroad lies in the politically unstable Middle East, we still allow the same depletion allowance for overseas production of petroleum as for domestic. The practice of allowing companies to credit income taxes paid to a foreign country as a direct setoff against U.S. taxes ought to be reviewed.

Also, I believe that we need a basic review of our national energy policies to determine their adequacy and their economy, now and in the future. The idea mentioned by some experts in the field, calling for the creation of a single, independent agency to oversee our energy minerals is certainly an idea to which the Congress should give its full consideration. With respect to this

agency, the Nation would be in a position to considerably increase the amount and quality of energy research toward seeking new ways of producing energy with greater efficiency, and thereby conserving fuel.

There is certainly no excuse for wasting energy, and up to now all of us as consumers can take responsibility for the lack of proper controls and proper education as to the need and importance of conserving our energy base.

Not too long ago, crude oil prices jumped by 25 cents per barrel. This action which is presently under investigation was the fourth effort since February 1969 to raise gasoline prices nationally. These developments forced President Nixon on December 4, 1970, to increase allowable imports from Canada and to end the practice of limiting Federal off-shore oil production in voluntary compliance with State production controls.

These actions of the President were desirable and timely; however, it is disappointing that the administration decided in January to cut back by one-third the amount of fuel oil imports to the northeast. Also, it is essential that the Congress take further steps to broaden and strengthen efforts to ease our fuel oil problems. Mr. Speaker, this whole subject of American fuel oil policy has been explored repeatedly by many oil experts during the course of countless hearings, reports, and commission studies. However, one need not be an oil expert to know that the present policies are having a decidedly dreadful impact on the day-to-day lives of millions of Americans. Many of my constituents have informed me of their hardships under the present inflationary cycle, often including copies of their fuel oil bills over a period of months as vivid proof of the great burdens they now endure. It is my firm belief that we can and must ease these burdens and I pledge my efforts in this direction.

#### HOW TO HELP THE STATES AND CITIES

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee today, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, and I set forth our views on general revenue sharing. We made three basic points:

First. If the Federal Government wants to initiate revenue sharing, it had better make sure that it has enough revenues to share.

Second. Unless incentives are given to States to reform their own and particularly their local governments, and to move in the direction of modernized, fiscally equitable, and humanized local government, Federal revenue sharing will simply act as a crutch to perpetuate obsolete State-local governmental systems, instead of as a catalyst to induce modernization. The Humphrey-Reuss revenue-sharing bill (S. 241 and H.R. 4617) provides incentives to reform.

Third. An economically and socially desirable package combining a phased

Federal takeover of the welfare system, and revenue sharing with reform, could prove politically feasible in this Congress.

The text of our joint testimony follows:

We appreciate this opportunity to present our point of view on how the Federal government can most effectively come to the rescue of the beleaguered state and local governments. This issue is central to the President's Budget and Economic Report. We would hope that it would also be central to this year's report of the Joint Economic Committee.

Last month a number of the nation's governors and mayors came before this committee and testified eloquently to the fiscal plight of their states and cities. No one on this committee, we are confident, doubts either the reality of state-local governments' plight, or the need to effect large scale reorganization of our federal-state-local governmental system.

We make today three points:

I. If the Federal government wants to initiate revenue-sharing, it had better make sure that it has enough revenues to share.

II. Unless incentives are given to states to reform their own and particularly their local governments, and to move in the direction of modernized, fiscally equitable, and humanized local government, federal revenue-sharing simply act as a crutch to perpetuate obsolete state-local governmental systems, instead of as a catalyst to induce modernization.

III. An economically and socially desirable package combining a phased federal takeover of the welfare system, and revenue-sharing-with-reform could prove politically feasible in this Congress.

#### I. WHAT REVENUES?

He who would share revenues must first answer the question: Where are we to get the revenues to share?

These revenues were supposed to come from the peace-and-growth dividend. But there is no peace, and there is no growth. Instead, there is a widened war in Cambodia and now in Laos. Instead, the defense budget, after having headed downward for a couple of years, is now on the way up again, with an increase in outlays of \$1.5 billion for the next fiscal year, and a whopping \$6.9 billion increase in spending authority, which will mortgage budgets for years to come.

Instead of non-inflationary, revenue-producing growth, we have 6 percent unemployment, 6 percent cost-of-living inflation, and for the first time in many years, zero economic growth in 1970.

The Administration has come forward with an expansionary "full-employment" budget which proposes to reverse these trends virtually overnight. Even if we accept the Administration's \$1,065 billion estimate for GNP for FY '72, and its 9 percent growth prediction, our fear is that most of the 9 percent will be in inflation rather than in real growth. For the Administration refuses to use the tools the Congress has given it to keep inflation from eating up growth.

Slow growth, eroded by inflation, does not and will not provide the revenues needed for adequate revenue-sharing—or adequate anything else, for that matter. Moreover, slow growth will intensify the plight of states and cities, which have already seen their revenues sharply reduced and the cost of services in their communities sharply increased as a result of inflation combined with recession.

So, for the sake of both direct and indirect relief for our cities, an adequate rate of non-inflationary growth must be restored to this country.

There is an additional way in which to attain some of the revenues that are

needed—and a way that will add to the progressivity of an overall Federal state-local tax system which has grown increasingly less progressive in recent years.

That way is to finish the job of plugging loopholes in the Federal tax system which was timidly begun in the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

The Administration should immediately prepare, and forward for action to the tax-writing committees of the Congress, a Round II of tax reform designed to close those loopholes which have enabled wealthy individuals to escape billions of dollars in Federal taxes each year for decades past.

But the Administration has indicated that there will be no message on tax reform. Instead, the Administration has punched another loophole in the Federal income tax structure by easing depreciation rules across the board, thus depriving the federal government of some \$2-3 billion in annual revenues. The revenues lost by this new loophole could surely have been more productively used by state and local governments.

If the Administration will not do the job of tax reform, Congress must.

More real economic growth to produce additional revenues from the existing tax system, coupled with a program of loophole plugging to augment these revenues, is a necessary answer to those who now oppose revenue-sharing on the ground that there is precious little revenue to share.

#### II. REVENUE-SHARING WITH REFORM

Money alone, however, is not the answer to the problems of our states and cities. State and local governments face not just a fiscal crisis; they also face an organizational crisis.

The great defect in the Administration's general revenue-sharing proposal is that it responds to the first crisis but not to the second. The risk in this approach to revenue-sharing is that the money sent back to the states and localities may not do much good for those most in need, and may do harm by giving out-of-date structures and practices a new lease on life.

The President has said he aims to give greater responsibility to State and local government. The question should be asked: "To which governments?" To the 600 towns, cities and villages in the state of Wisconsin each with less than 500 in population? To the 299 separate but overlapping governmental units in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, each with taxing jurisdiction? To the several states which have not yet taken steps to increase their revenues by adopting the progressive income tax? To the states which have denied to their cities adequate taxing and borrowing powers?

HUD Secretary Romney said in his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on February 17: "The community development this nation has experienced to date has fragmented and balkanized our metropolitan areas into so many political jurisdictions that it is difficult if not impossible to mount an effective attack on current problems." The President's revenue sharing proposal permits continued fragmentation of responsibility, inefficiency and paralysis.

The President has also said he aims to rationalize federal aid programs for states and localities. What is the point, we ask, in streamlining the federal grant process if state and local governments remain mired in their own red tape, archaic fiscal practices and overlapping jurisdictions?

We have joined to put forward an alternative approach to revenue-sharing which we believe responds to both crises of state and local government—H.R. 1091 and S. 241. We see these advantages in the Humphrey-Reuss proposal:

First. Revenue-sharing and state and local government modernization are linked. In order to qualify for shared revenues in the

second and subsequent years of a revenue-sharing program, the governor of a state must come forward with a modernization plan for his state and local governments.

For those who oppose "stringless" revenue-sharing, here is a string with a constructive purpose. At the same time, the string is not onerous. The flow of funds to a state is tied neither to the contents of the plan nor to progress made in fulfilling it. The governors can draw from a suggested check-list of reforms in the Humphrey-Reuss bill. The recommendations of numerous bodies stand ready at hand—the Committee for Economic Development, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, to mention just three.

Moreover, in many states, existing task force reports or studies under way could provide a good first step toward development of the governor's modernization plan required by the Humphrey-Reuss bill. In the state of Minnesota, for example, the legislature is considering authorization of full-scale studies of the metropolitan regions in the state—the goal, governmental reform. In the state of Wisconsin, the 1969 Report of the Task Force on Local Government Finance and Organization awaits implementation.

Second. States lacking state income taxes are given a specific incentive to adopt them. (States at present without income taxes are Connecticut, Florida, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Washington and Wyoming.) After July 1, 1974, a state's income tax revenues are counted twice in the formula that apportions funds among states on the basis of population and revenues raised in relation to total personal income in the state.

Third. Our procedures for allocation of shared revenues to localities provide the flexibility needed to encourage consolidation of inefficient units, and to take account of the relative fiscal needs of localities.

If a state does not choose to negotiate an allocation agreement with a representative number of its cities and counties, we would require that the state set aside an amount for its localities that will average over 50 percent nation-wide. To this point we and the Administration both travel the path recommended by the national organization of cities, mayors, governors and counties.

But then—if the negotiation does not come off—the Administration requires a mandatory distribution to all 63,000 local governments, whether rich or poor, archaic or efficient.

We instead allow distribution among localities pursuant to a state law which may "favor localities that are relatively more populous, contain relatively more low-income families, or have high local tax burdens in relation to individual income." We thus provide room for the fairest possible local distribution.

Fourth. We propose a four-year authorization and annual appropriations for revenue-sharing, rather than a permanent appropriation, as a percentage of the personal income tax base. We are sensitive to the need of state and local governments for some predictability in the revenues they will be receiving from the Federal government. But we are equally sensitive to the prerogative of the Congress, along with the President, to decide spending priorities in any given year. This prerogative has already been eroded by existing trust funds. We do not believe that it should be further eroded by what amounts to another trust fund for revenue-sharing.

Annual appropriations will, for example, permit the Congress to allot more or less for welfare assistance and revenue-sharing, depending on year-by-year needs, particularly if these two major forms of assistance to state-local government are linked in one package. At this point, if any priority is to

be established among the programs proposing additional aid for states and localities, we believe welfare would have to be at the top of the list.

Further, a four-year authorization will give Congress an opportunity to review the use of revenue-sharing funds, and progress in the modernization of state-local government, before approving another multi-year authorization.

### III. PACKAGE OF WELFARE TAKE-OVER AND REVENUE-SHARING

Finally, we must ask whether the annual sums suggested to be spent on revenue-sharing by the revenue-sharing purists—\$5 billion or \$10 billion or more—are best spent strictly on revenue-sharing (either of the Administration variety, or of the Humphrey-Reuss revenue-sharing with reform variety), or should instead be split in some fashion between revenue-sharing and a substantial (and ultimately total) federal take-over of the financial cost and administration of welfare.

We conclude that such a split package is not only *more desirable* from the economic and social standpoint, but *more feasible* from the political standpoint.

*First.* From the economic and social standpoint, the costs of welfare require additional federal support. The nation's welfare system is approaching a crisis. The federal government now pays about \$7 billion of an estimated \$14 billion annual welfare cost. Astronomic increases are in sight. Putting, say, one-half of a generous revenue-sharing pot into a substantial initial federal take-over of financing welfare could provide a better welfare system, reduce the interstate competition which now plagues states seeking to have adequate welfare systems of their own, and channel the "local share" just where help is most needed—to those states and communities with the greatest welfare cost.

To the extent that funds are channeled to the states and cities by a federal welfare take-over, rather than by federal revenue-sharing, the agonies of apportioning the "local share" are avoided.

By an increased federal responsibility for welfare costs, many local communities would be protected against endless increases in the extremely regressive property tax, which falls largely on the homeowner. Instead, they could anticipate more adequate funds with which to pay their policemen, collect their trash, and perform all the other manifold daily tasks of local government.

If the idea of a federal welfare take-over is so good, one may ask, why have revenue-sharing at all?

There are two answers. The revenue-sharing concept permits, as we have said, the provision of incentives to state and local governments to modernize and reform themselves; it would be difficult or impossible to attach such reform conditions to a welfare take-over program.

Moreover, in some states revenue-sharing permits a surer distribution to hard-pressed localities than a welfare take-over, since in these states the local welfare contribution (and hence the prospect of relief from a federal take-over) is comparatively small.

Accordingly, there is a strong case for a welfare-revenue-sharing package, with a generous pot split in two portions of a size that will provide meaningful relief under both programs.

*Second.* From the political standpoint, if the revenue-sharing purists insist on all for revenue-sharing, and if the welfare purists insist on all for welfare take-over, the end result is likely to be a political impasse, with the states and localities consigned to outer darkness.

A fair number of leading Congressional Democrats are digging in their heels against revenue-sharing.

Equally, the Administration is freezing

itself into a position of opposition to a federal take-over of welfare. The Secretary of HEW recently derided the proposal as too costly.

So the Congress may not act on revenue-sharing, and the Administration may veto a welfare take-over. This would be tragic for the states and cities.

But this need not be. A combination of Republican and Democratic ideas now floating around may prove politically feasible.

Let the Administration start to work out with the House Ways and Means Committee a proposal for a complete federal take-over of welfare, phased over several years. Let the Administration at the same time express interest in revenue-sharing-with-reform supported by annual appropriations. The Government Operations Committees in both houses may then be encouraged to get to work on the Humphrey-Reuss proposal and related proposals which have been referred to these committees.

Saving the states and cities from insolvency and obsolescence is too important a task to let it founder on the rock of political partisanship.

### COMPENSATORY EDUCATION—AN UNEXPECTED BONUS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a newspaper article appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle on January 12, 1971, and an abstract of a report by Dr. Ruth Love Holloway under date of August 1970, dealing with a study made of the impact on education of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I think that this study reflects very accurately what is happening in school systems throughout the country. Federal dollars under title I are not only enhancing learning opportunities in most schools with large concentrations of educational and disadvantaged children but also is having a favorable influence on improving the quality of education in all elementary and secondary schools.

Items referred to follow:

#### COMPENSATORY EDUCATION—AN UNEXPECTED BONUS

(By Ron Moskowitz)

Compensatory education programs in California have proved so helpful for disadvantaged children that they have been used for other children as well.

A study released yesterday shows that the methods used in the programs benefit average white middle-class children as well as children from the ghettos.

Since their inception in the early 1960s, the United States Office of Education's compensatory education programs have provided for smaller classes, individual tutoring, new teaching methods and staffing patterns and special books and other learning materials for the poor.

The programs, which have cost the federal government millions of dollars, do help children from deprived families achieve better in school, many studies have shown.

#### IMPACT

But until yesterday there were no research findings available on what impact the programs have had on the average child in a regular school program.

A year ago, Dr. Ruth Love Holloway, who is in charge of program development in the State Department of Education's Compensatory

Education Division, set out to answer that question.

She surveyed 11 school districts and one county board of education in California, which runs the biggest compensatory education business in the nation. A few of the 11 had no compensatory education programs, as such.

#### SURPRISE

"I knew there must have been some impact on the regular school program," she said. "But I was surprised to learn just how great it was."

"Compensatory education has had a greater impact on the regular education than on the disadvantaged," her report concludes.

The school districts surveyed, she found, have all adopted many of the new instructional materials and teaching strategies for their regular classes patterned after programs created initially for the poor.

Moreover, while they require state or federal funds to implement the programs for the poor, they have made the innovations for the other children using their own local school district funds, Dr. Holloway discovered.

#### USES

Local district funds are now being used for a variety of compensatory-initiated programs for entire school districts, including individualized instruction, teacher aides, reading specialists, advisory committees, multi-cultural instructional materials, new equipment and teaching aids.

The process of involving parents, teachers and administrators together in school program planning was first used in compensatory education programs and "established a trend in education," the report notes.

The use of both professional and non-professional auxiliary personnel in the schools was also, to a large degree, initiated by compensatory education programs.

#### GREATEST

The study found that compensatory education's greatest impact in the area of instruction "is in the impetus given to individualized instruction," the report stated.

Compensatory education programs have also led the way in teaching school districts how to systematically plan, evaluate and modify programs—introducing for the first time the idea of assessment or accountability.

They have also revolutionized teacher education programs. Before compensatory education programs started, the idea of pulling teachers out of their classrooms for in-service training was almost unheard of. Now it is common practice.

#### THE IMPACT OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ON THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION

(By Ruth Love Holloway)

Scope and method of study: The purpose of this Study was to determine the extent to which programs and the process of compensatory education activities were approximated in non-target area schools or non-funded programs in selected school districts in California. It is not the purpose of the study to evaluate the results of compensatory education, but rather to *assess its impact on education generally.*

The type of research implemented was survey research. The principle instruments employed for obtaining data were the questionnaire and personal interview. The comprehensive questionnaire provided data in response to three major questions:

Are the comprehensive compensatory education program components being replicated in non-target schools or non-funded programs?

Has the process of involving parents, teachers and administrators influenced methods of project planning in regular educational programs?

Has the employment of specialized person-

nel, i.e., teacher aides, instructional specialists, tutors, home-school coordinators affected employment practices in non-compensatory programs?

To determine whether or not compensatory education had a significant effect upon regular school programs, the questionnaire developed by the writer contained five topical areas:

- (1) Pre-compensatory education perceptions of disadvantaged children and general educational practices.
- (2) Impact of compensatory education components and activities.
- (3) Instructional changes and staffing patterns.
- (4) Effects of process of involving parents, teachers, administrators in program planning.
- (5) System of dissemination of information.

The personal interview was held with a total of six administrators who are involved in compensatory education programs, four project directors and two superintendents.

There were six different types of schools surveyed in eleven districts and one county office of education. The types of schools were:

Type A—Entire school totally saturated with compensatory education services.

Type B—Demonstration projects in reading and mathematics in one, junior high school grade level.

Type C—A laboratory project within a school providing compensatory education to selected children from multiple grade levels.

Type D—A school outside the target area with no federal funds.

Type E—A school outside the target area with limited federal funds.

Type F—A school in which compensatory education funds have been reduced or eliminated.

In each type of school surveyed, a team of three individuals was asked to respond; the principal, a teacher and a community representative (teacher aide, parent, etc.). The project director completed a questionnaire for district point of view.

Results of data were analyzed and presented in tabular forms, first in terms of total group respondent indices, secondly in terms of impact by type of school, and thirdly in terms of impact reported by respondent category. Most of the tabulations were in frequencies and percentages and a lesser number in rank order distribution.

#### SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This study has been concerned with investigating the impact of compensatory education programs on education generally. Four aspects of compensatory education were studied: (1) perceptions about disadvantaged children; (2) the components and activities relating to instruction, curriculum materials and teaching strategies; (3) the process of involving parents and personnel in planning school programs; and (4) the employment of specialized staff.

A review of literature indicated that no known study existed which researched the relative effects on compensatory education on regular education. Much of the literature related to the need for educational reform and interventions which may assist in bringing about needed changes. Compensatory education had its beginning in the early 60's with its major peak in the mid-60's. It was one of vehicles envisioned to equalize educational opportunities and break the cycle of poverty. Questions were raised about the program's validity in the latter 60's. On the one hand, Clark and others were concerned about fragmentation and remediation as opposed to a revitalization of the total education institution. Jensen questioned the program's reliability as a mechanism for improving education for "this segment" of the school population due to their "inherent limitation" in intellectual capacity.

Research illustrates, however, that compensatory education, when administered properly, holds the potential for substantially improving the quality of education for the disadvantaged as well as influencing education for all children.

The major results of this study indicate the approximation of specific variables in compensatory education in non-funded programs and schools. Each of the four areas studied shows a positive impact on education—change in perceptions of individual differences in children, the replications of programs of reading, bilingual education, mathematics and minority history, the increased emphasis on techniques of individualizing instructions, the initiation of advisory committees and local school planning teams, and the employment of aides and specialists outside the target area schools.

In terms of program impact as observed by types of respondents, community representatives indicated the most significant effect in parent involvement in classroom as aides, etc. and their participation on local advisory committees in helping to plan school programs. Project directors, principals and teachers tended to agree that the most significant impact was in the areas of:

1. Reading and language development;
2. Individualized instruction;
3. The use of teacher aides;
4. Local staff involvement in program planning;
5. Staff development techniques;
6. Advisory committees;
7. Use of instructional specialist;
8. Minority culture and history; and
9. Pre-school and early childhood emphasis.

It should be pointed out that the replication of activities and elements beyond the funded programs relates to several variables other than priority for children. Observations during this study as well as personal interviews indicates that the following factors frequently influence whether and which activity will be maintained or introduced:

- (a) The cost or resource necessary to implement activity.
- (b) The degree of community and/or staff pressure.
- (c) The ability of district to obtain additional funding.
- (d) Flexibility and willingness of district staff to alter practices and procedures.

There were six types of schools included in eleven districts and one county office. Each type reflected different categories of projects. The types of schools surveyed were:

Type A School (Saturated School Project)—A school located in an intensive poverty impacted urban area which is saturated for total program service. Such schools include entire school populations in compensatory education and both regular and added staff are involved in the program.

Type B School (Single Grade Level Project)—Demonstration projects in reading and mathematics operate in selected school districts (14). All such programs are funded at the junior high level exclusively. It is a longitudinal program beginning with the 7th grade, with students in entire grade levels participating in the project.

Type C School (Laboratory Project)—The laboratory projects operate in schools in which multiple grade levels are served. Selected children are taken from regular classrooms for short periods of time in order to receive special instruction in a laboratory or "pull-out" situation. It is a common organizational approach in compensatory education.

Type D School (Non-Federal Resources Project)—A school located outside the designated target area which has no federal funds but has altered aspects of the school program.

Type E School (Limited Federal Funds Project)—A school located outside the target

area in which additional federal funds are being used (other than compensatory education funds). The school program has been altered to some extent.

Type F School (Program with reduced or eliminated resources)—It is a school in which compensatory education funds were reduced or eliminated and specific aspects of the previous project is still in operation.

The types of schools showing the greatest impact were Types A, B, and F. It is noteworthy that Type C schools, those most representative of compensatory education programs in California, did not reveal the greatest impact on education generally. Both schools with saturated services by entire school or grade levels illustrated significant impact. As mentioned earlier, schools in which funds were reduced or eliminated tended to assume certain practices and procedures.

It should be pointed out that the school sample surveyed is populated by low-income, underachieving children, many of whom are ethnic minorities. The sample respondents did not, however, reflect a high percentage of ethnic minorities in any one of the categories of respondents.

Generally, then, the results of the study show a range of impact of compensatory education, depending upon sets of circumstances. The program, while designed to improve education for poor children, has had a significant impact on education of non-poor middle-class children.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study suggest that compensatory education in California made a significant impact on regular education. Foremost, as a result of innovative features of programs for the disadvantaged, education of middle class children has benefited.

The primary goal of compensatory education is to close the achievement gap between poor and non-poor children. Historically, children from poverty families achieve at a rate of .7 months per month of instruction. The evaluation findings in California indicate that on the average, participants in compensatory education are making month per month gains as is the pattern in middle-class schools. Even at an equitable rate of achievement between the two socioeconomic groups, lower-class children remain below district norms, because they began behind their counterparts who are not poor.

This fact, coupled with the replication of compensatory education concepts and practices outside the target schools, leads to the conclusion that compensatory education has had a greater impact on regular education than on the disadvantaged. Moreover, this conclusion is further supported by the use of regular district resources for initiation of activities such as individualized instruction, teacher aides, reading specialists, advisory committees, multi-cultural instructional materials, new equipment and teaching aids, and release time for inservice education. For disadvantaged children, such interventions are added with special federal or state resources.

The process of involving parents, teachers and administrators in program planning established a trend in education. This emerging practice of localized participation by client and practitioner has been aided by both the advocates for local control as well as educators, especially teachers who want a voice in the decision-making. The institution of advisory committees and school program task forces outside of compensatory education supports the assertion that compensatory education is a leading innovation in the education arena.

Another area of significant impact is the employment of a variety of specialized personnel in non-target area school or in other specially-funded projects. It is concluded, therefore, that a major contribution of com-

pensatory education is in the fresh nexus of school staff:

*Professional*

Instructional specialist (reading and mathematics).  
Multi-media specialist.  
Home school coordinator.

*Paraprofessional*

Teacher Aide.  
Community Aide.  
Counselor Aide.  
Health Aide.  
Tutors.

Such individuals, by a variation of titles, have found their way into the mainstream of American education.

This study suggests that compensatory education's greatest impact in the area of instruction is in the impetus given to individualized instruction. Diagnosing and prescribing for needs and strengths was not heretofore a systematic part of the educational program.

The final conclusions relate to trends which have been established by compensatory education endeavors. One is the emphasis on early childhood education; pre-school and primary levels. The thrust of Headstart led to a new focus on kindergarten and the first three grades, in terms of curricular, teaching methodology, parent participation evaluation.

The data suggests also a recognition of the value of children's native language. This recognition and current social pressure had generated programs of bilingual instruction for children whose native language is one other than English. The bilingual education programs are broader in scope than mere language, but include a focus on culture and coupled with ethnic identity movements have given rise to increased appreciation for cultural diversity and individual differences. The present study supports the finding of impact in the area of individual differences and perceptual attitudes toward children classified as "different". The results support the conclusion that this area of personalizing education has made a substantial imprint in the regular program of instruction.

In recent years, a great deal of dialogue occurred about the need for a systematic approach to education. Without using the term for all of compensatory education, in California a systematic plan has evolved. Results of the study showed an impact on education in terms of planning, evaluating and modifying programs. The following perhaps best illustrates the cycling and recycling process: Program planning—Implementation—Evaluation—Modification of Program—and so on.

Compensatory education offered the opportunity to test hypothesis, to explore and experiment. It came into focus when the protest against education was emerging. The program was on the cutting edge of issues in this post-Sputnik era. A review of its contributions to education is indeed appropriate as compensatory education stands as a potential for general aid to all children. To capitalize upon its assets will perhaps help not only to salvage the limping program, but more importantly will aid the torturous process of updating regular education.

A historical analysis indicates that compensatory education antennae have veered in four directions; they initiated trends, they served as models, they changed perceptions, and they highlighted institutional needs and weaknesses.

Many of the emerging trends are reflection of pedagogical dialogue of earlier eras, and represent reaffirmation of other trends ascribed to compensatory education programs in this research, which include:

Multiple approaches to reading and mathematics using audio-visual aids.

Using relevant instructional materials reflecting multisocial society.

Involving industry in teaching curricular development.

Needs assessment.

Performance criteria (objectives).

Compensatory education has forged a new, more intrinsic, definition of equality of educational opportunity. The new, albeit, definition involves not only improving performance of disadvantaged children but is functionally linked to breaking the cycle of poverty.

The program initiated and established models for replication in teacher education, thereby challenging colleges and universities to re-assess their training practicisms and develop more realistic programs. It also is credited with developing evaluation models which transcend programs for the poor; and focuses on performance accountability and modification of program based upon objective data. The patterns of utilizing teacher aides and other para-professionals illustrated multiple methods of providing additional services to each child.

The belief that parents generally are concerned about their children's education and have a right to be involved in decisions which influence their destiny, created new and viable roles for parents of the poor. Removing stereotypes regarding the abilities of disadvantaged children and their families has served to change perceptions and expectations.

The program, broadly defined, changed power relationships with the schools and community. It aided the school in more accurately reflecting the society and gives recognition to the dignity and value of the contribution of all citizens. In essence, compensatory education pointed up the strength and weakness of the school and challenged other social institutions to relate to the needs of their clients. This research opines that these claims which rest with an infantile program can only be interpreted as a meager beginning toward the immense journey of transformation and reformation of public education.

**REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS TO SERVE AS CHAIRMAN OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was announced by the distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, Mr. MAHON, that our colleague and the dean of the Tennessee delegation, Congressman JOE L. EVINS, will serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee.

This is a tremendous responsibility and undertaking. Mr. EVINS is certainly equivalent to the task. I join with my other colleagues in extending my congratulations to him and I include in the RECORD, at this point, editorials from the Nashville Banner and the Nashville Tennessean noting this new responsibility undertaken by Mr. EVINS:

[From the Nashville Banner, Feb. 12, 1971]

**CONGRATULATIONS, JOE EVINS**

Committee responsibilities constitute an important part of a Congressman's work—assigned on merit indeed where the stewardship is treated in the spirit of the trust it

conveys. And on that basis of merit those who know him applaud the choice of Rep. JOE L. EVINS for chairmanship of the House Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations.

He long has been a member of the Appropriations Committee, a key agency in the vital business of screening governmental expenditures; a powerful body indeed, and the subcommittee a unit far from subordinate in the efficient handling of that responsibility.

Representative EVINS has been a hard-working Congressman in behalf of his Fourth District constituency—and absorbed no less in the long-range interests of his state and nation. In party identification a staunch Democrat, his concept of duty and service is not limited by any partisan boundary.

He has earned the committee post assigned—and it is a responsibility in good hands. It reflects honor on the state, and Tennessee extends congratulations.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Feb. 12, 1971]

**MR. EVINS GOOD MAN FOR JOB**

Rep. JOE L. EVINS of Tennessee's Fourth District has been named chairman of the House subcommittee on public works, succeeding the late Rep. MIKE KIRWAN, D-Ohio.

Mr. EVINS was appointed to the chairmanship, at his own request, by Rep. GEORGE H. MAHON, D-Texas, chairman of the full Appropriations Committee. Mr. EVINS had been a member of the subcommittee since it was formed in 1955, and thus had seniority. But it appears that his keen interest in public works appropriations and his skill in finances played an important role in his selection as chairman.

As a member of the subcommittee, Mr. EVINS has been of tremendous influence in looking out after the interests of TVA, the AEC, the U.S. Engineers, the Appalachian Regional Development Commission and other agencies of importance to the mid-South.

As chairman of the committee, Mr. EVINS will be in even stronger position to see that public works projects vital to the economic development of this region will get equal consideration with those of other regions of the nation.

While it is true that a congressman, especially the chairman of a strong subcommittee, should not adopt a provincial attitude, this principle has not always been applied in the past when the voters of this region had no strong voice in appropriations.

Mr. EVINS can be expected to treat all sections of the country alike—and that is the reason the people of this state and region should be happy and proud to have him heading the public works subcommittee.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) for Monday, February 22, and Tuesday, February 23, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. LATTA (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

**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. DU PONT) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SEBELIUS, for 60 minutes, on March 1.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WAGGONER), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GRASSO, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PERKINS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DORN, for 60 minutes, on March 3.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GERALD R. FORD to extend his remarks following the message from the President of the United States.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DU PONT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LENT.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. ZWACHE.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. McCLOSKEY in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. McCLOREY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WAGGONER) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. STUCKEY in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BEGICH.

Mr. GRIFFIN in three instances.

Mr. SISK.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

Mr. SIKES in 10 instances.

Mr. BARING in two instances.

Mr. CLAY in six instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in six instances.

Mr. STOKES in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA in three instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. ICHORD in two instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in four instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. NEDZI in three instances.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 670. An act to authorize further adjustments in the amount of silver certificates outstanding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, February 23, 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:

300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the 1970 crop year, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

301. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report for the month of December 1970, on the operation of section 501 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970, establishing a limitation on budget outlays in fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

302. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" for fiscal year 1971, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

303. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits" for fiscal year 1971, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

304. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and detailed to the Army General Staff, on December 31, 1970, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 3031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

305. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the sixth annual report of program activities and accomplishments of the Office of Water Resources Research, pursuant to the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

306. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed amendment to a concession contract authorizing the continuance of the operation of golf courses and the provision of related facilities and services for the public in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, pursuant to 67 Statutes 271 and 70 Statutes 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

307. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Nationality Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth prefer-

ence classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

308. A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report for calendar year 1970 on civilian positions established in NASA under 5 U.S.C. 3104(a)(8), pursuant to section 3104(c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

299. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended June 30, 1970, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827 (H. Doc. 92-51); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

309. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the need to reevaluate packing specifications for cabinets, lockers, and wardrobes, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

310. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Ferris Corp. against the United States, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 236; 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. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 7. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-12). Referred the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4690. A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4690. A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4691. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands in the State of Nevada are held by the United States in trust for Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4692. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony certain lands in Washoe County, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4693. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to regulate the mailing of advertisements of, and offers for the sale of, merchandise and products manufactured outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross

income allowances paid under section 5942 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4695. A bill relating to the use of the Naval Air Station, Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractor's services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4697. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 4698. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide that the Congress may not adjourn sine die in any session of Congress or recess after December 31 of each year until all appropriation measures for the fiscal year concerned have been considered and disposed of, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CABELL, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. MAHON, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H.R. 4700. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life of the Honorable Sam Rayburn and to assist in the support of the Sam Rayburn Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BARING, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HALEY, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOLFELD):

H.R. 4701. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life of the Honorable Sam Rayburn and to assist in the support of the Sam Rayburn Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEED, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 4702. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life of the Honorable Sam Rayburn and to assist in the support of the Sam Rayburn Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4703. A bill to establish a national land use policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4704. A bill to provide for the cooperation between the Federal Government and the States with respect to environment reg-

ulations for mining operations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 4706. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4707. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.R. 4708. A bill to provide more efficient and convenient passport services to citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOW, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4709. A bill to make available to certain organized tribes, bands, or groups of Indians residing on Indian reservations established under State law, certain benefits, care, or assistance for which federally recognized Indian tribes qualify as recipients; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 4710. A bill to make available to certain organized tribes, bands, or groups of Indians residing on Indian reservations established under State law, certain benefits, care, or assistance for which federally recognized Indian tribes qualify as recipients; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unmarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 4712. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to prevent the imposition thereunder of any prohibition on the importation into the United States of any metal-bearing ore from any free world country for so long as the importation of like ore from any Communist country is not prohibited by law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of California, and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct an omission in existing law with respect to the entitlement of committees of the House of Representatives to the use of certain currencies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4714. A bill to provide standby authority for wage and salary control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4715. A bill to provide standby authority for price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. POWELL, Mr. LENT, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HALPERN,

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CONTE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ROBINSON of New York, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. O'KONSKI):

H.R. 4716. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4717. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. DOW, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 4718. A bill to require the Department of Defense to determine disposal dates and methods of disposing of certain military material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. DOW, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. STEELE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 4719. A bill to prohibit the discharge into any of the navigable waters of the United States or into international waters of any military material or other refuse without a certification by the Environmental Protection Agency approving such discharge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4720. A bill to adjust the pay of employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 4721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DOW, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. NEZBI, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 4722. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, to provide for the removal of names from mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4723. A bill to regulate the dumping of material in the oceans, coastal, and other waters and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 4724. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4725. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4726. A bill to amend title 18, United

States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual who has a service-connected disability incurred or aggravated while on active duty in a combat zone and rated by the Veterans' Administration at 50 percent or higher, or who dies as a result of disease or injury incurred or aggravated while on such duty, shall be considered to be fully insured, and to be insured for disability benefits, under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 4728. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT (for himself and Mr. ARENDS) (by request):

H.R. 4729. A bill to amend section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships for the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 4730. A bill to clarify the coverage status under the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program of certain service performed after 1950 and before 1969 by the auto license agents of the Department of Motor Vehicles of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4731. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to preserve competition among corporations engaged in the production of oil, coal and uranium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 4732. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 4733. A bill to amend the Fur Seal Act of 1966 by prohibiting the clubbing of seals after July 1, 1972, the taking of seal pups, and the taking of female seals on the Pribilof Islands or any other land and water under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 4734. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code to provide that members of the armed forces captured by hostile forces may accumulate leave without limitation during the period of their capture and receive payment for such leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4735. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of land in the Pueblo of Nambe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4736. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Pueblo of Cochiti approximately 3,308 acres of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4737. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Ana certain public domain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4738. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act granting land to the city of Albuquerque for public purposes," approved June 9, 1906; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4739. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make

Indian hospital facilities available to non-Indians under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4740. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the estate tax treatment of community property interests in employees' trusts and retirement annuity contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 4742. A bill to designate Route 74 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the State of Illinois as the Everett McKinley Dirksen Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4743. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 4744. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 4745. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4746. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4747. A bill to authorize the District of Columbia to compensate holders of class A retailers' licenses issued under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act who return such licenses to the District of Columbia for cancellation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4748. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 20 percent, and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men or women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4749. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for a current listing of each drug manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed by a registrant under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 4750. A bill to establish the Rancho Guajome National Historic Site in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 4751. A bill to equalize civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4752. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the small issue exemption from the industrial development bond provision from \$5 million to \$10 million; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 4753. A bill to authorize the partition of the surface rights of the Hopi and Navajo Indian Tribes in undivided trust lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4754. A bill to authorize the partition of the 1934 Navajo Reservation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal income tax exemptions to \$800 for 1974, to \$900 for 1975, and to \$1,000 for 1976 and subsequent years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 4756. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4758. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4759. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish medical services for nonservice-connected disability to any war veteran who has a total disability resulting from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 4760. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation payable for injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by peacetime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4761. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation and death compensation payable to certain parents of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4762. A bill to amend section 5055 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to establish and carry out a program of exchange of medical information; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 4763. A bill to make rules respecting military hostilities in the absence of a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 4764. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 4765. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if the father or a brother or sister of such member dies, is in missing status, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4766. A bill to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4767. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Richard M. Nixon National Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4768. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations

governing the humane treatment of animals transported in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4769. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4770. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4771. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4772. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of material harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4773. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to change the age and service requirements with respect to the retirement of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4774. A bill to amend the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ROUSSELOT, and Mr. SCHMITZ):

H.R. 4775. A bill to provide for the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California to hold court at Santa Ana, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 4776. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations requiring certain modes of public transportation in interstate commerce to reserve some seating capacity for passengers who do not smoke; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4777. A bill to amend section 351 of title 38, United States Code, relating to benefits for veterans disabled by treatment or vocational rehabilitation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 366. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 367. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare 1 week each September as "National S.S. Hope Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MANN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. STUBBLEFIELD):

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on the Environment.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.J. Res. 370. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriation of funds to assist school districts adjoining or in the proximity of Indian reservations, to construct elementary and secondary schools and to provide proper housing and educational opportunities for Indian children attending these public schools; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to authorize

the President to designate the period beginning March 21, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 372. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period April 19 through April 24, 1971, as "School Bus Safety Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 373. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 16, 1971, through May 22, 1971, as "D for Decency Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 374. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLANTON (for himself, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. ROUSH, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. DOW, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. STEELE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. HORTON):

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the pollution of waters all over the world and the necessity for coordinated international action to prevent such pollution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. RED of New York, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. FLOWERS):

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. Route 219 should be designated as part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution to curb illegal production and illegal international traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution for the control of international drug traffic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H. Res. 241. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to expedite the enactment of general appropriation measures, to facilitate the making of appropriations for subsequent fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. Res. 242. Resolution creating a select committee to be known as the "Committee on the House Restaurant"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 243. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 244. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

24. By Mr. BRASCO: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing the Congress to use all means to persuade the Soviet Union to change its oppressive policies toward Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

25. By Mr. LENT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York in the form of a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to use all means to persuade the Soviet Union to change its oppressive policies toward Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

26. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to amending the Constitution of the United States to allow Bible verses and prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 4778. A bill for the relief of Sister Giditta Cocca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 4779. A bill for the relief of Nina Daniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4780. A bill for the relief of Keoklis Alkiviades Meimaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 4781. A bill for the relief of Sahera Saka, Wahidollah Saka, and Wajma Saka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4782. A bill for the relief of Pietro Binaggia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4783. A bill for the relief of Salvatore, Giovanna, and Mary Lou Calandra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4784. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria A. Cappadona and daughter, Graziella Cappadona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4785. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Castellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4786. A bill for the relief of Maria David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4787. A bill for the relief of Maria Drag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4788. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ferraluolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4789. A bill for the relief of Bruno Gaglioti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4790. A bill for the relief of Lusaper Kalenderaglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4791. A bill for the relief of Yasuo Kayaba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4792. A bill for the relief of Edna Leers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4793. A bill for the relief of Maria Librizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4794. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Onofrio Milazzo and their children, Angela and Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4795. A bill for the relief of Bozena and Irena Milewska (Aka Grygleiko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4796. A bill for the relief of Reuben A. Moreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4797. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ottavia Olante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4798. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pernice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4799. A bill for the relief of Alfio Quaceci, his wife, Antonina, and their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4800. A bill for the relief of Rita Swann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4801. A bill for the relief of Andrea Vitranio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4802. A bill for the relief of Helena Wilk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4803. A bill for the relief of Takayuki Yoshida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4804. A bill for the relief of Joseph Zippetelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 4805. A bill for the relief of Graziella and Libora Spinnato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 4806. A bill for the relief of Roland S. Uyboco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 4807. A bill for the relief of David J. Powell, his wife Janet Powell, and their children Robert S. Powell and Stuart S. Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (by request):

H.R. 4808. A bill for the relief of Francesco Giuliani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

31. The SPEAKER presented petition of Barbara Grafton, Windham, Ohio, et al., relative to appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE—Monday, February 22, 1971

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1971)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We shall pray today in the words of President George Washington's prayer for his country.

Let us pray:

"Almighty God: We make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And finally that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 50)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Nearly a year ago, in my first special message on higher education, I asked the Congress to join me in expanding higher education opportunities across the nation. First, I proposed to reform and increase aid to students. Second, I proposed a National Foundation for Higher Education designed to reform and strengthen post secondary education.

Neither house of Congress acted on these proposals. Now the time for action

is growing short. Existing legislative authority for the basic Federal higher education programs expires at the end of the current fiscal year.

1971 can be a year of national debate on the goals and potentials of our system of higher education. It can be a time of opportunity to discover new concepts of mission and purpose, which are responsive to the diverse needs of the people of our country. I therefore again urge the Congress to join with me in expanding opportunities in two major ways:

*To help equalize individual opportunities for higher education, I am proposing the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1971.*

*To broaden opportunities through renewal, reform and innovation in higher education, I am proposing a separate act establishing the National Foundation for Higher Education.*

#### EQUALIZING INDIVIDUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

At the present time, a young person whose family earns more than \$15,000 a year is almost five times more likely to attend college than a young person whose family earns less than \$3,000.

At the present time, Federal student assistance programs do not always reach those who need them most.

At the present time, there are just not enough funds to go around to all deserving students. Needy students often do not have access to grants. Higher-income students are frequently unable to borrow for their education, even when loans are guaranteed by the Federal Government.

I repeat the commitment which I made in my message of last year: that no qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money. The program which I am again submitting this year would benefit approximately one million more students than are currently receiving aid. It would assure that Federal funds go first, and in the largest amounts, to the neediest students, in order to place them on an equal footing with students from higher-income families. Abundant resources for loans would also be available to students from higher-income families. The budget I submitted in January provides funds for these reforms and stands behind the commitments of this administration. Failure to pass this program would not only deny these benefits to many students, but also would limit their opportunity to make major choices about their lives.

A major element of my higher education proposal to the last Congress is the creation of a National Student Loan Association. For too long, the volume of funds available to students for federally insured loans has been arbitrarily restricted by the lack of a secondary market in which lenders could sell paper in order to replenish their supply of loan capital.

Establishment of the National Student Loan Association would relieve this squeeze on liquidity by making available an additional \$1 billion for student loan funds. The Association would be authorized to buy student loans made by qualified lenders—universities as well as commercial lending institutions. This secondary market would enable universities and commercial lenders to make loans to students in far greater quantity than they have in the past.

It is important to be clear on what this reform would mean. It would mean that higher education would be open to all the people of this country as never before. It would mean that students still in high school would know that their efforts to qualify for college need not be compromised by doubts about whether they can afford college. It would mean that their choice of a college would be based on their educational goals rather than upon their family's financial circumstances.

#### RENEWAL, REFORM AND INNOVATION

If we are to make higher education financially accessible to all who are qualified, then our colleges must be prepared both for the diversity of their goals and the seriousness of their intent. While colleges and universities have made exceptional efforts to serve unprecedented numbers of students over the last decade, they must find additional ways to respond to a new set of challenges:

—All too often we have fallen prey to the myth that there is only one way to learn—by sitting in class, reading books, and listening to teachers.

Those who learn best in other ways are rejected by the system.

—While the diversity of individuals seeking higher education has expanded in nearly every social dimension—age, class, ethnic background—higher education institutions have become increasingly uniform and less diverse.

—Increasingly, many colleges, and particularly universities, have become large, complex institutions which