

velopment, containment, the trigger mechanisms, and decay of the Sun's hot plasmas in both quiet and flare periods.

Solar observations will be the most important single task on board Skylab, in which the crew will play a crucial role in obtaining data and working in conjunction with ground observing teams. However, other important objectives will also contribute to the advance of science and technology in many ways. One of these is to find out how men and equipment perform in a condition of weightlessness for periods ranging from an initial 28 days to 56 days. Other experiments include observation of the earth in connection with NASA's Earth Resources Technology program; medical studies; astronomy; materials processing under zero-gravity conditions, and many others too numerous to mention now.

Skylab will be boosted into orbit, using the first two stages of Saturn V, and a day later the crew will arrive in an Apollo spacecraft placed into orbit by a Saturn IB. The Apollo command and service module will rendezvous with the space station and dock by means of a multiple docking adapter, through which they will slip into an airlock and then into the workshop.

When the 28-day initial mission is completed, the crew will return on board their command module, landing in the ocean for pickup. Three months later another crew will go up for 56 days, to be followed by a third visit of 56 days, after which the station will be placed in orbital storage for possible use in the future.

Skylab will be the last manned mission for the United States until NASA's space shuttle is launched later in this decade. Assuming the Congress approves, the first horizontal test flight of the shuttle will be made in 1975, sub-orbital vertical flight in '76, and orbital flight in 1977.

Much has been said about the space shuttle as just another manned extravagance having minimal usefulness. Actually, the shuttle is a new concept for putting scientific and technological payloads into space at costs far lower than we presently pay per pound of payload. For example, automated scientific and technological spacecraft now cost around \$15,000 and \$30,000 a pound just to build because we have to design into them such high reliability to guard against failure and loss of the entire experiment. To these costs we have to add the cost of the booster, amounting to \$20-\$30 million. Just last year we lost an expensive Orbiting Astronomical Observer because a shroud on the rocket failed to separate.

The monetary cost is perhaps the least of it. Scientists and engineers had been working on the OAO for almost ten years, and in a few seconds a good part of their careers became a useless piece of space junk. There is no way now to retrieve such a situation.

But if a shuttle had been available, the mission could have been saved by men in space, or the OAO brought back to the ground for whatever repairs necessary. Moreover, the shuttles can be launched for no more than about \$5 million as against the \$20-\$30 million for the conventional rocket booster.

The real savings will come, however, because automated spacecraft can be built with more conventional structural design and more off-the-shelf equipment. Also, when an experiment is completed, the shuttle will bring back the spacecraft from its orbit, and a new experiment installed, thus saving the cost of building a new vehicle. The same would be true of communications satellites or weather satellites that go wrong.

The shuttle system is a type of rocket transportation designed to operate for multiple missions. It will do away with the large stable of different boosters the United States now maintains because it will be able to put into space both automated, unmanned vehicles and scientists and engineers, and return them to the ground base when their missions are completed. They will land like airplanes on runways, and just as easily. It is a concept that will revolutionize space transportation, paving the way for increased use and usefulness of space to mankind.

In addition to NASA's manned space flight program, we have some very exciting programs to develop the practical applications of space technology and further scientific investigations into the grand design of the universe and of our own tiny corner of it called the solar system.

I mentioned a few moments ago the Earth Resources Technology program. This involves a satellite system that could lead to the intelligent survey and management of earth's natural and cultural resources. A global geological survey, for example, would be a natural application. This service would make available to each country an insight into its own resources they could not otherwise obtain as cheaply or rapidly.

Studies have already shown that the use of satellites for monitoring and managing water resources could fully pay for itself. In addition, crops and forests could be monitored by remote satellite sensing devices which could distinguish between healthy and diseased plants and trees as well as the different types. Geographic and hydrographic mapping by satellite, a process that now takes years to complete, would be both quicker and more accurate and up-to-date. Even the state of environmental pollution could be identified and monitored, a necessary part of pollution control programs.

The potentials of these aspects of space technology are not only inspiring, they are breathtaking. In achieving them, science and technology will advance on a broad front, providing mankind with additional tools to care for both himself and the environment.

On the scientific side of NASA's activities, we shall have further investigations of Mars and other planets. This year we plan to send two Mariner spacecraft to Mars, this time to orbit the planet instead of making the usual flyby mission. We hope they will perform like our Lunar Orbiters did several years ago, and send back thousands of pictures so that we can map the whole of Mars rather than to get only a brief glimpse of limited areas. Later, NASA would like to send Viking spacecraft to Mars which not only would orbit the planet but would send down a lander equipped with instruments to analyze the surface material. The data then would be radioed to the orbiting Viking which in turn would transmit it back to earth over tens of millions of miles. The information would permit further comparisons of earth with another body in the solar system, adding to our understanding of man's home planet.

Another spacecraft is planned to be sent by Venus and on to Mercury, using the gravitational pull of Venus to help swing it on to the innermost planet that swings around the Sun in an orbit of only 33 million miles or so.

Toward the end of the decade, we hope to take advantage of a relatively rare lineup of the outer planets that takes place only once every 179 years. The last time this occurred, John Adams, second President of the United States, was in office, and it offers scientists the opportunity of launching spacecraft on certain trajectories that will enable them to collect data from all five of the outer planets of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune and Pluto. It involves using the powerful gravitational field of Jupiter, which is so large that it is bigger than all the other planets combined, to swing the spacecraft onto courses that take them past all the rest. One operation will take the spacecraft to Jupiter in a precise approach so that two will be boosted on to Uranus and on to Neptune, while two others will take a somewhat different approach, causing Jupiter's gravitational pull to send them flying on to Saturn and Pluto, and right out of the solar system itself.

By this method, using a kind of interplanetary billiards shot, it is hoped we can visit all these planets in something like nine years, a tremendous saving in time and money, since a single shot at Pluto, for example, would take about 40 years to accomplish its mission.

Today, our manned and unmanned space flight programs are enriching mankind's knowledge of earth and the universe, and of man himself. They are helping us to form a more accurate concept of the Creator's physical works, and of our place in this incredible Design. We are standing only at the beginning of a comprehension of Works that inspire increasing awe the more we learn.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 25, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Haim Kemelman, the Jewish Center, East Brunswick, N.J., offered the following prayer:

O God, bless this House, for here democracy is made to work.

Here, votes are counted, but ideas count;

Here, the majority rules, but the voice of the people overrules;

Here, history is lived and the future is perceived.

Here, free men ask: "Why?" and noble men dream: "Why not?"

Here we pray that God shed His grace

upon this dome, under His heavens, and inspire our representative leaders to unite us in a moving dream so that we may move forward from our Apollo-moon project to an Apollo-man project: to banish dread disease; to conquer the dark craters of the mind; to heal bruised hearts; to master the inner space of man for peace in trust-power, as we have mastered the outer space of the moon with thrust-power; to see a new heart-rise of man, as we have seen a new earth-rise from the moon.

For Thine is the kingdom on this earth; and ours is the power to establish it in our midst, and the glory to rec-

ognize that it is more important to bring heaven down to earth than to bring man up to heaven.

God bless America. God bless the American dream.

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. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to extend the time for the proclamation of marketing quotas for burley tobacco for the 3 marketing years beginning October 1, 1971.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 52

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Allen of Alabama, and Mr. Griffin of Michigan.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Pell of Rhode Island, Mr. Cannon of Nevada, Mr. Cooper of Kentucky, and Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.

The message also announced the following appointments:

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-264, appointed Mr. EAGLETON as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the National Visitor Facilities Advisory Commission.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-372, appointed Mr. STEVENSON as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 83-420, appointed Mr. HUMPHREY as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 79-565, appointed Mr. BENTSEN as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-944, appointed Mr. GAMBRELL as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Senate Office Building Commission.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-380, appointed Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MUNDT as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-259, appointed Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. BOGGS as advisory members, on the part of the Senate, of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

The Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 87-758, appointed Mr. MAGNUSON as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

RABBI HAIM KEMELMAN

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today we had the pleasure of hearing Rabbi Haim

Kemelman, of East Brunswick, N.J., deliver the opening prayer.

Rabbi Kemelman is the spiritual leader of the East Brunswick, N.J., Jewish Center, a congregation which is really beautiful. He is the author of a book, "How To Live in the Present Tense," and also writes a weekly article, "Lines on Living," in many newspapers.

His book and articles really help bring about an optimistic outlook on life. They are full of not only rare eloquence, but great wisdom as well. He has profound faith in the goodness of man and has great compassion and love for people. After reading Rabbi Kemelman's articles and his book, one cannot help but feel better about many things, for his understanding of people and their problems and hopes is deep and magnificent.

How wonderful it would be if all of our people were as good Americans as Rabbi Kemelman, and loved this country and its institutions as much as he does. Mr. Speaker, I think that Rabbi Kemelman is truly great.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH REGARD TO TELLER VOTES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that there will be some preliminary business before the Chair will recognize Members under the 1-minute rule. The Chair will recognize Members under the 1-minute rule as soon as we have completed this preliminary business.

The Chair at this time would like to make an important announcement.

As Members are aware, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and House Resolution 5 of this Congress, agreed to on January 22, added an amendment to clause 5, rule 1 of the rules of the House. This amendment provides for a recorded teller vote.

The Chair has given careful consideration to the new rule and has discussed the procedure to implement it with other leadership Members. Until electronic voting becomes a reality, the method thought best for taking a recorded teller vote is as follows:

First, tellers must be ordered on a question by at least one-fifth of a quorum, or by the Chair, if he remains in doubt after a division vote.

Second, after tellers have been ordered, but before they are named by the Chair, a separate demand for tellers with clerks is in order. When such a demand is made, the Chair will put the question by asking those in favor of taking the vote by tellers with clerks to rise and remain standing until counted. At least one-fifth of a quorum must support this proposition to order a recorded teller vote.

If tellers with clerks are ordered, the Chair will name four Member tellers, two from each side of the question. The Chair will designate the aisle adjacent to the center aisle and to the Chair's left as the aisle for "aye" votes, and the corresponding aisle adjacent to the center aisle to the Chair's right as the aisle for the "no" votes.

Two Member tellers, one from each side of the question, will take their places in the "aye" aisle toward the rear of the Chamber, and the other two Member tellers will take their places in the "no" aisle toward the rear of the Chamber.

Two ballot boxes will be used. One marked "yea," with green trimming; The other marked "no," with red trimming. These boxes will be placed on seats along the "aye" and "no" aisles, respectively, immediately adjacent to the two Member tellers who have positioned themselves along those aisles. One tally clerk will stand behind each of the boxes.

Green "aye" and red "no" cards will be available in the cloakrooms and in the well of the House. These cards will have spaces for the Member to fill in his name, State, and district.

The Chair will state: "Members will pass between the tellers, be counted, and recorded." Members desiring to vote in the affirmative will proceed from the well up the "aye" aisle and, as counted by the Member tellers, will give their green "aye" card, properly filled in, to the "aye" tally clerk, who will, after examination, place it in the green ballot box.

Members who wish to be counted against the proposition will at the same time proceed from the well up the "no" aisle between the Member tellers and, as they are counted, will hand the filled-in red "no" card to the second tally clerk who will, after examination, place it in the red "no" box. The Member tellers will report to the Chair when all Members have been counted and have handed in their ballots.

To avoid confusion in the well, the Chair asks that Members obtain and fill in the appropriate green or red card in advance of the recorded teller vote, if possible.

After the "no" vote is reported, Members who arrive within the allotted time—which under the rule must be at least 12 minutes from the naming of tellers with clerks—will be permitted to fill in the card, be counted, and recorded. No Member will be counted unless, at the time he passes between the Member tellers, he hands a filled-in card to one of the two tally clerks.

The Chair will then announce the vote, but not before the expiration of at least 12 minutes from the naming of tellers with clerks, nor until the Chair ascertains that no further Members are present who desire to be recorded.

Immediately after the Chair has announced the vote and before any further business is conducted, Members wishing to be recorded as "present" will announce their presence to the Chair.

The names of Members voting in the affirmative, in the negative, those recorded as present, and those not voting will be printed in the Journal and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

One bell and light will signal that tellers have been ordered.

Two bells and lights will indicate that a recorded teller vote has been ordered and is in progress. This second signal should be distinguishable from a two-bell and light rollcall vote because it will

come very shortly after the one bell and light teller vote call.

The first signal—for tellers—one bell and light—will be repeated at the end of 5 minutes. And, after a brief pause, the second signal—for recorded tellers—two bells and light—will also be repeated. At this point Members will be on notice that the recorded teller vote could be closed in 7 minutes.

May the Chair add that we believe this is the most practicable way in which to implement the rule. If time and experience prove otherwise, we can of course change the procedure.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN JOINT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 248) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 248

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hays, of Ohio; Mr. Brademas, of Indiana; Mr. Devine, of Ohio.

Joint Committee on the Library: Mr. Hays, of Ohio; Mr. Nedzi, of Michigan; Mr. Brademas, of Indiana; Mr. Schwengel, of Iowa; Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE DATE FOR TRANSMISSION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE REPORT OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 31.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 31

Joint resolution extending the date for transmission to the Congress of the Report of the Joint Economic Committee

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution extending the dates for transmission to the Congress of the President's Economic Report and of the Report of the Joint Economic Committee", approved December 31, 1970 (Public Law 91-602; 84 Stat. 1674), is amended by striking out "March 10, 1971" and by inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1971".

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR THE PROCLAMATION OF MARKETING QUOTAS FOR BURLEY TOBACCO FOR THE 3 MARKETING YEARS BEGINNING OCTOBER 1, 1971

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 44.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope I shall not have to object, I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky if I am correct in that this resolution merely provides for an extension—is that correct?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It makes no change whatever in respect to the law?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. No change whatever.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 44

Joint resolution to extend the time for the proclamation of marketing quotas for burley tobacco for the three marketing years beginning October 1, 1971

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture may defer any proclamation under section 312 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to national marketing quotas for burley tobacco for the three marketing years beginning October 1, 1971, until the date he determines is necessary to permit growers to be notified of their farm marketing quotas and the referendum to be held prior to normal planting time.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 365) is laid upon the table.

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON TUESDAY, MARCH 2, TO RECEIVE APOLLO 14 ASTRONAUTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess on Tuesday, March 2, subject to the call of the Chair.

I might add, for the benefit of the Members, that the purpose of the recess will be to receive in this Chamber the Apollo 14 astronauts.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MARCH 4, TO RECEIVE FORMER MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess on Thursday of next week, March 4, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the program for the week beginning March 1, is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day, and we have two suspensions, H.R. 460, care in community nursing homes, and H.R. 943, group mortgage insurance for service-connected paraplegic and quadriplegic veterans.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day, but there are no bills on the calendar, and as I announced a moment ago, the House will receive the Apollo 14 astronauts in recess.

Thereafter, for the balance of the week:

House Resolution 19, creating a Permanent Select Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 4713, 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, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

House Resolution 27, Committee on the District of Columbia Investigation Authority.

House Resolution 217, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 213, Committee on Education and Labor.

House Resolution 109, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

House Resolution 170, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 21, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

House Resolution 18, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 20, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 114, Committee on Banking and Currency.

House Resolution 142, Committee on Public Works.

House Resolution 161, Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 22, Committee on Agriculture.

House Resolution 243, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

On Wednesday, H.R. 4690, public debt limit, increase—modified closed rule—4 hours debate.

On Thursday as I have previously announced, the House will receive former Members of this body.

Any further program will be announced later.

THE DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1971

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

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

There was no objection.

OFFICIAL OBJECTORS—CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CAL- ENDAR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that I have designated as official objectors for the majority for the Consent Calendar the following Members: the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL); the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER); and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL).

I have also designated as official objectors for the majority for the Private Calendar the following Members: the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON).

OFFICIAL OBJECTORS—CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CAL- ENDAR

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing my appointments to the Republican official objectors committees for the Consent and Private Calendars.

For the Consent Calendar the Republican official objectors for the 92d Congress will be the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON), and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE).

For the Private Calendar, the Republican official objectors for the 92d Congress will be the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

RULES OF OPERATION OF OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR THE CONSENT CALENDAR

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important procedures that the House follows in considering legislation is known as the Consent Calendar operation. It is under this procedure that most of the acts of Congress which become public laws are considered by the House of Representatives.

It has been the practice heretofore of the official objectors for Consent Calendar committees—the majority members and the minority members—to agree upon rules of procedure at the beginning of a session. I would suggest, to the new Members especially, that they read the statement regarding these rules of procedure, which has the approval of and bears the initials of all the members of the Consent Calendar committees, three members of the majority and three members of the minority.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF RULES OF OPERATION OF THE OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR THE CONSENT CALENDAR

On February 18, the majority and minority floor leaders appointed their respective members of the official objectors committees, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs, appointed three members of his party and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Gerald R. Ford, appointed three members of his party. The objectors committees are unofficial committees of the House of Representatives, existing at the request and at the pleasure of the respective floor leaders of the two parties who, in order to facilitate the proper screening of legislation which may be placed on the Consent Calendar, designate Members of each side of the aisle charged with the specific responsibility of seeing to it that legislation passing by such procedure is in the interest of good Government. The rule which is applicable to consent calendar procedure is clause 4 of rule XIII, found in section 746 of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The operation of such procedure is described in Cannon's procedures in the House of Representatives.

For several sessions now objectors on both sides of the aisle have followed certain rules for consideration of Consent Calendar bills which they have made known to the Members at the beginning of a session. These rules are not publicized at this time to establish hard-and-fast procedures but rather to advise the Members of the House as to the manner in which the committee plans to operate throughout the 92nd Congress.

The members of the committees feel that generally no legislation should pass by unanimous consent which involves an aggregate

expenditure of more than \$1 million; second, that no bill which changes national policy or international policy should be permitted to pass on the Consent Calendar but rather should be afforded the opportunity of open and extended debate; third, that any bill which appears on the Consent Calendar, even though it does not change national or international policy, or does not call for an expenditure of more than \$1 million, should not be approved without the membership being fully informed of its contents, providing it is a measure that would apply to the districts of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, in which case the minimum amount of consideration that should be given such a bill would be clearance by the leadership of both parties before being brought before the House on the Consent Calendar.

It has been the policy of the objectors on the consent calendar heretofore to put such a bill over without prejudice one or more times to give an opportunity to the members to become fully informed as to the contents of such a bill, and the consent calendar objectors for the 92nd Congress wish to follow like procedure; fourth, that if a bill has been placed on the consent calendar and the members of the committee having jurisdiction over the legislation show that it has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, by the respective departments affected by such legislation, or that such reports from the committee or from the department show that the legislation is not in accord with the President's program, it should not pass on the consent calendar but that the chairman of the House committee having jurisdiction over the legislation, should either call it up under suspension of the rules with the permission of the Speaker or should go to the Rules Committee for a rule for such legislation. While the members of the objectors' committees feel that a report from the Bureau of the Budget is necessary before a bill should be placed upon the consent calendar, they do not wish to take the position that the report from the Bureau of the Budget must necessarily show the approval of such legislation by the Bureau. However, if such approval is not shown, than in the consideration of the legislation, even if considered on the consent calendar, the chairman reporting the bill, or the sponsor of the bill, should be willing to accept the responsibility of stating to the members the action of the Bureau of the Budget and the reasons for such action.

The members of the consent calendar objectors' committee also feel it fair to state to the membership that it is not their purpose to obstruct legislation or to object to bills or pass them over without prejudice because of any personal objection to said bill or bills by any one member or all of the members of the consent calendar objectors' committee, but rather that their real purpose, in addition to expediting legislation, is to protect the membership against having bills passed by unanimous consent which, in the opinion of the objectors, any member of the House might have objection to.

The members of the consent calendar objectors' committee earnestly request that the chairmen of the standing committees of the House having the responsibility for bringing legislation before the House take into consideration the contents of this statement before placing bills on the consent calendar. While it is not absolutely necessary that the sponsors of bills appearing on the consent calendar contact the various members of the consent calendar objectors' committee, nevertheless, in the interest of saving time and avoiding the possibility of having bills laid over unnecessarily, it is good practice to do so, and the objectors welcome the continuance of the procedure of getting in touch with them at least 24 hours before the legislation is called up under the regular consent

calendar procedure. In many instances such thoughtfulness on the part of the sponsors will clear away questions which the objectors have and consequently will make for the expeditious handling of legislation.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,

BILL ALEXANDER,

PARREN J. MITCHELL,

Majority Objectors.

DURWARD G. HALL,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON,

JAMES A. McCLURE,

Minority Objectors.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the senior member of the minority appointees.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Colorado yielding to me.

He is the distinguished senior member of long standing of the majority objectors on the Consent Calendar. And, certainly I want to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, if I might just make two additional observations: I would think it is most important for all Members to become familiar not only with the procedures of the Union Calendar and Consent Calendar but indeed even of the Private Calendar but the difference between the rules governing consent and certainly those governing the rules on suspensions.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado has said that the resolution and the agreement that were read and placed in the RECORD has been signed by all of us on both sides of the aisle.

That leads, Mr. Speaker, to my second observation. I oftentimes think in explaining the duties of a Representative in Congress to the folk back home that the name of "objectors" is unfortunate because so often during this time and place in history "objection" is related to obstructionism. More clearly defined, honestly, what the committee of objectors does is simply to do their homework before the fact with the reports and the bills or resolutions before us so that in truth we can testify to the other Members as their elected and appointed Representatives on either and both sides of the aisle that it is important in transacting the business of 435 Members in this vital Congress, the highest legislative organization in the world, that certain things can best be done by consent. In this spirit of dedication the distinguished gentleman from Colorado has, to my own personal knowledge, led a long and distinguished group in handling and expediting the business of the House of Representatives. I, for one, appreciate his dedication and willingness to continue to serve, as I do all of the other Members. I think it is a good tradition conducted in the highest spirit of cooperation, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank my colleague for his remarks.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (on behalf of Mr. BOLLING) from the Committee

on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 201, Rept. No. 92-15), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1973, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1973.

SEC. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be

furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 201.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 201

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of material, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense;

(2) relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense;

(3) involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense;

(4) involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense;

(5) relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services; and

(6) all other matters within the legislative jurisdiction conferred by law or the Rules of the House of Representatives upon the Committee on Armed Services.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said com-

mittee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, on the basis that I shall explain its general nature.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee for immediate consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike all after the word "Resolved," and insert in lieu thereof:

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction as set forth in clause 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

"Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act, subject to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

"(b) Pursuant to clause 28 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2, 1973, a report on the activities of that committee during the Congress ending at noon on January 3, 1973.

"Sec. 3. (a) Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the

use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

"(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

"(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

"(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

"(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

"(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones."

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, since it will be explained.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a routine measure setting up the investigatory status and authority of the Committee on Armed Services. This is written up to conform to the new rules of the House of Representatives, which have had the following impact on the language. One is in relation to the new rules whereby committees can sit during sessions of the House except when the Committee of the Whole is considering legislation under the 5-minute rule. Another departure with reference to the new rules of the House relates to firmly establishing the oversight authority of this committee, which is a standard measure which Members will recall applies to all committees of the House under the new rules. Then section 3-A is written so as to conform to the new rules regarding counterpart funds.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is needed because the Committee on Armed Services has certain urgent matters that it needs to start looking into. That is the reason for bringing it up today under a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

May I say, Mr. Speaker, this is not a custom but is a special situation that we have here today in order to take care of the investigatory jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. The Committee on Rules had to rewrite all of these in order to make them conform to the Legislative Reorganization Act. They have been written absolutely in accord with the regulations. We referred to rule XI setting up the jurisdiction of the committees. All of the others will be brought to the floor next week. The only reason we are bringing this resolution here today with regard to the Committee on Armed Services is because of a certain urgency. I can assure the House that this resolution is written in conformity with the rules of the Reorganization Act. The amendment as well as the resolution was gone over by the Committee on Armed Services, and we have done the very best we can in the Committee on Rules. I assure you it is all right to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the amendment and the resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Friday night to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1971.
The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 12:10 p.m. on Wednesday, February 24, 1971, said to contain a message from the President regarding Consumer Affairs.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
Attachment.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS: A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 92-52)

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The history of American prosperity is the history of the American free enterprise system. The system has provided an economic foundation of awesome proportions, and the vast material strength of the nation is built on that foundation. For the average American, this strength is reflected in a standard of living that would have staggered the imagination only a short while ago. This constantly rising standard of living benefits both the consumer and the producer.

In today's marketplace, however, the consumer often finds himself confronted with what seems an impenetrable complexity in many of our consumer goods, in the advertising claims that surround them, the merchandising methods that purvey them and the means available to conceal their quality. The result is a degree of confusion that often confounds the unwary, and too easily can be made to favor the unscrupulous. I believe new safeguards are needed, both to protect the consumer and to reward the responsible businessman.

I indicated my deep concern for this matter in my special message to the Congress of October 30, 1969. At that time I urged the Congress to enact a legislative program aimed at establishing a "Buyer's Bill of Rights." This proposal found little success in the 91st Congress. But putting the remedies aside has not sufficed to put the problems aside. These remain. They must be dealt with.

Accordingly, I am again submitting proposals designed to provide such a Buyer's Bill of Rights by:

- Creating by Executive Order a new Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President which will be responsible for analyzing and coordinating all Federal activities in the field of consumer protection;
- Recognizing the need for effective representation of consumer interests in the regulatory process and making recommendations to accomplish this after full public discussion of the findings of the Advisory Council on Executive Organization;
- Establishing within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a product safety program. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have authority to fix minimum safety standards for products and to ban from the marketplace those products that fail to meet those standards;
- Proposing a Consumer Fraud Prevention Act which would make unlawful a broad but clearly-defined range of practices which are unfair and deceptive to consumers and would be enforced by the Depart-

ment of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. This act, where appropriate, would also enable consumers either as individuals or as a class to go into court to recover damages for violations of the act;

- Proposing amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act which will increase the effectiveness of the Federal Trade Commission;
- Calling upon interested private citizens to undertake a thorough study of the adequacy of existing procedures for the resolution of disputes arising out of consumer transactions;
- Proposing a Fair Warranty Disclosure Act which will provide for clearer warranties, and prohibit the use of deceptive warranties;
- Proposing a Consumer Products Test Methods Act to provide incentives for increasing the amount of accurate and relevant information provided consumers about complex consumer products;
- Resubmitting the Drug Identification Act which would require identification coding of all drug tablets and capsules;
- Encouraging the establishment of a National Business Council to assist the business community in meeting its responsibilities to the consumer; and by
- Other reforms, including exploration of a Consumer Fraud Clearinghouse in the Federal Trade Commission, increased emphasis on consumer education and new programs in the field of food and drug safety.

NEW OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

The President's Committee on Consumer Interests has made important gains on behalf of the American consumer in the past two years.

It has brought a new and innovative approach to the problem of keeping the consumer informed and capable of handling the complex choices presented to him in today's commercial world. One such measure involves the dissemination of information which the United States Government, as the Nation's largest single consumer, collects on the products it uses. In my message of October 30, 1969, I announced that I was directing my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs to develop a program for providing the buying public with this information.

On the strength of her recommendations, on October 26, 1970, I signed Executive Order 11566 which establishes a means for making available to the public much of the product information which the Federal Government acquires in making its own purchases. A Consumer Product Information Coordinating Center has been established in the General Services Administration with continuing policy guidance from my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs to make these data available to the public through Federal information centers and other sources throughout the country.

In addition, the Committee on Consumer Interests has made significant strides in developing Federal, State and local cooperation in consumer programs,

encouraging establishment of strong State and local consumer offices, and advising on the enactment of effective consumer laws and programs.

Nevertheless, further cooperation among Federal, State and local governments is essential if we are truly to insure that the consumer is properly served. Therefore, I am asking my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs to intensify her efforts on behalf of the consumer at the State and local level. I am also directing her to conduct regional meetings with State officials concerned with consumer issues, with consumer groups, and with individual consumers to discuss common problems and possible solutions.

But I believe the greatest overall accomplishment of this office has been to give the consumer new assurance of this administration's concern for his and her welfare in the marketplace. In manifesting this concern during the past two years, the responsibility of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests has grown, as has its impact on consumer problems. I have therefore signed today a new Executive Order creating a new Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President. I am appointing my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs to be Director of this new office. This change reflects the increasingly broad scope of responsibilities assigned to the Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs and will increase the effectiveness of the Office. The Office will advise me on matters of consumer interests, and will also assume primary responsibility for coordinating all Federal activity in the consumer field.

Finally, while I am deeply concerned with obtaining justice for all consumers, I have a special concern to see justice for those who, in a sense, need it most and are least able to get it. Therefore, I am directing my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs to focus particular attention in the new Office on the coordination of consumer programs aimed at assisting those with limited income, the elderly, the disadvantaged, and minority group members.

A CONSUMER ADVOCATE

In my message of October 30, 1969, I pointed out that effective representation of the consumer requires that an appropriate arm of the government be given the tools to serve as an advocate before the Federal agencies. I proposed then that this function be performed by a Consumer Protection Division created for the purpose and located within the Department of Justice. That proposal was not acted on.

Since that time my Advisory Council on Executive Organization has completed its Report on Selected Independent Regulatory Agencies. This report makes sweeping recommendations on the reorganization of those agencies for the purpose of helping them better serve the interests of the consumer.

One specific recommendation involves the creation of a new Federal Trade Practices Agency dealing exclusively with matters of consumer protection. This Agency would result from a general restructuring of the Federal Trade Com-

mission. The report specifically suggests that a consumer advocate might be placed within the Federal Trade Practices Agency.

I believe that this is a better approach than the creation of still another independent agency which would only add to the proliferation of agencies without dealing with the problems of effectiveness to which the Advisory Council report addresses itself.

As I indicated at the release of the Advisory Council's report, I am delaying legislative proposals on these issues pending full public discussion of the findings and recommendations of the Council. I urge that those who comment on the Advisory Council recommendations also focus on the manner in which the consumer interest can best be represented in Federal agency proceedings. I further urge the Congress to view the problems of consumer advocacy and agency structure as part of the general problem of making the Federal Government sufficiently responsive to the consumer interest.

After April 20, when comments have been received, I will make the recommendations I consider necessary to provide effective representation of consumer interests in the regulatory process. If the Congress feels it must proceed on the matter of consumer advocacy prior to receiving my recommendations, then I strongly urge and would support, as an interim measure, the placement of the advocacy function within the Federal Trade Commission.

A PRODUCT SAFETY ACT

Technology, linked with the American free enterprise system has brought great advantages and great advances to our way of life. It has also brought certain hazards.

The increasing complexity and sophistication of many of our consumer goods are sometimes accompanied by the increasing possibility of product failure, malfunction, or inadvertent misuse resulting in physical danger to the consumer.

Therefore, I propose legislation providing broad Federal authority for comprehensive regulation of hazardous consumer products.

This product safety legislation will encompass five major responsibilities which would be assigned to a new consumer product safety organization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Through this organization the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will:

1. Gather data on injuries from consumer products;
2. Make preliminary determinations of the need for particular standards;
3. Develop proposed safety standards with reliance on recognized private standards setting organizations;
4. Promulgate standards after a hearing and testimony on the benefits and burdens of the proposed legislation; and
5. Monitor industry compliance and enforce mandatory standards.

The mechanisms which will be included in this bill provide for full participation on the part of private organiza-

tions and groups in the development of standards.

NATIONAL ATTACK ON CONSUMER FRAUD

Consumer fraud and deception jeopardize the health and welfare of our people. They cheat consumers of millions of dollars annually. They are often directed against those who can least afford the loss, and are least able to defend themselves—the elderly, the handicapped, and the poor.

At the same time, the honest businessman is damaged by fraud and deceptive practices every bit as much as the consumer—and perhaps more. He is subjected to the unfair competition of the unscrupulous businessman, and he loses money. He is subjected to the opprobrium of those who have suffered at the hands of unscrupulous businessmen, and he loses the goodwill of the public. For it is a fact, however unfortunate, that in the area of business especially, the many are commonly judged by the actions of the few.

Efforts to eliminate these unethical business practices have not been successful enough. It is commonly profitable for unscrupulous businessmen to operate in defiance of the enforcement authorities, to accept whatever penalties and punishments are incurred, and to continue to operate in spite of these. The penalty is just part of the overhead. I want these practices brought to an end.

With this message I am committing this administration to a full and forceful effort to see that they are brought to an end.

CONSUMER FRAUD PREVENTION ACT

I am again submitting and I urge prompt attention to a bill to make unlawful a broad but clearly defined range of practices which are deceptive to consumers. The legislation would provide that the Department of Justice be given new powers to enforce prohibitions against those who would victimize consumers by fraudulent and deceptive practices.

It would give consumers who have been victimized by such practices the right to bring cases in the Federal courts to recover damages, upon the successful termination of a government suit under the Consumer Fraud Prevention Act.

I am also recommending civil penalties of up to \$10,000 for each offense in violation of this act.

The Department of Justice has created a new Consumer Protection Section within the Antitrust Division, which has centralized the Department's enforcement in the courts of existing statutes designed to protect the consumer interest. Thus the Department of Justice is prepared to enforce promptly the proposed Consumer Fraud Prevention Act.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

While there is a need for new legislation to insure the rights of the consumer, there is also a need to make more effective use of the legislation we already have, and of the institutions charged with enforcing this legislation.

A principal function of the Federal Trade Commission has historically been to serve as the consumers' main line of resistance to commercial abuse. In the

past year the Commission, under new leadership, has been substantially strengthened. A major organizational restructuring has produced within the Commission a Bureau of Consumer Protection, a Bureau of Competition, and a Bureau of Economics. An Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation has been created to establish a more effective ordering of priorities for the Commission's enforcement efforts.

In order to make FTC procedures more responsive to the needs of consumers, responsibilities of the eleven Commission field offices have been extended to include trying cases before hearing examiners in the field, negotiating settlements, conducting investigations, and referring complaints to the Commission. Six Consumer Protection Coordinating Committees have been established in selected metropolitan areas.

I am submitting today legislation which would provide the FTC with the authority to seek preliminary injunctions in Federal courts against what it deems to be unfair or deceptive business practices. The present inability to obtain injunctions commonly results in the passage of extended periods of time before relief can be obtained. During this time the practices in question continue, and their effects multiply.

The proposed bill would expand the jurisdiction of the Commission to include those activities "affecting" interstate commerce, as well as those activities which are "in" interstate commerce.

Finally, I recommend that the penalty schedule for violation of a Commission cease-and-desist order be adjusted from a maximum of \$5,000 per violation to a maximum of \$10,000 per violation.

GUARANTEES AND WARRANTIES

A constant source of misunderstanding between consumer and businessman is the question of warranties. Guarantees and warranties are often found to be unclear or deceptive.

In 1970, I submitted a proposal for legislation to meet this problem. I am submitting new legislation for this purpose.

This proposal would increase the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to require that guarantees and warranties on consumer goods convey adequate information in simple and readily understood terms.

It would further seek to prevent deceptive warranties; and it would prohibit improper use of a written warranty or guarantee to avoid implied warranty obligations arising under State law.

CONSUMER FRAUD CLEARINGHOUSE

My Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs is examining the feasibility of a consumer fraud clearinghouse—a prompt exchange of information between appropriate Federal, State and local law enforcement officials which can be especially helpful in identifying those who perpetrate fraudulent, unfair and deceptive practices upon the consumer and deprive the honest businessman of his legitimate opportunities in the marketplace.

Upon her recommendation, I am asking the FTC to explore with State and

local consumer law enforcement officials an effective mechanism for such an exchange.

CONSUMER EDUCATION

Legislative remedies and improved enforcement procedures are powerful weapons in the fight for consumer justice. But as important as these are, they are only as effective as an aware and an informed public make them. Consumer education is an integral part of consumer protection. It is vital if the consumer is to be able to make wise judgments in the marketplace. To enable him or her to do this will require a true educational process beginning in childhood and continuing on.

The Office of the Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs has established guidelines for consumer education suggested for use at the elementary and high school level. Those guidelines have been sent to every school system in the country, and their reception has been encouraging. I believe they mark an effective step toward developing an informed consumer. The office has also begun the development of suggested guidelines for particular emphasis on special socioeconomic groups and senior citizens.

Now, in order to expand and lend assistance to Consumer Education activities across the nation, I am asking the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in coordination with my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, to work with the nation's education system to (1) promote the establishment of consumer education as a national educational concern; (2) provide technical assistance in the development of programs; (3) encourage teacher training in consumer education; and (4) solicit the use of all school and public libraries as consumer information centers.

I am also asking the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in coordination with my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, to develop and design programs for the most effective dissemination of consumer information, and particularly to explore the use of the mass media, including the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS CONSUMER REMEDIES

As we move to shape new consumer legislation, I believe we must also review all consumer remedies. Although this is primarily a matter of State and local responsibility, I believe that the problem is also of national concern. Accordingly, I am asking the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States to join with other interested citizens representing a broad spectrum of society to undertake a thorough study of the adequacy of existing procedures for resolving disputes arising out of consumer transactions.

The study would (1) focus particularly on the means of handling small claims and explore methods for making small claims courts more responsive to the needs of consumers; (2) examine existing and potential voluntary settlement procedures, including arbitration, and potential means of creating incentives to voluntary, fair settlements of consumer disputes; (3) address the diffi-

cult and troublesome questions presented by mass litigation; (4) examine problems and solutions at the State as well as the Federal level; and (5) draw on the experience of other nations in improving consumer remedies.

The purpose of this study will be to gather those facts needed to determine the means of gaining the greatest benefit to consumers with the least cost to production processes and to the country. I urge Federal, State, local and private bodies to cooperate in this effort. I also ask that recommendations to the President, the Congress, the courts and the general public be made within the shortest practicable time.

FOOD AND DRUG PROGRAMS

Events in the past year have reaffirmed the need for urgent action to insure thorough and effective quality control through the Food and Drug Administration over the food Americans consume and the drugs they take.

In my message of October 30, 1969, I called for stronger efforts in the field of food and drug safety.

At that time I announced that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had initiated a thorough study of the Food and Drug Administration. As a result of that study, a number of management reforms have contributed to a more effective functioning of the FDA.

Food. During the past two years consumer concern about the quality of certain foods in this nation has become acute. I have instructed the Food and Drug Administration to develop new and better methods for inspecting foods—domestic and imported—to insure that they are entirely free from all natural or artificial contamination. In addition, a major study is underway reviewing the safety of all food additives. Finally, because too many Americans have no understanding of the most basic nutritional principles, the Food and Drug Administration has developed programs of nutritional guidelines and nutritional labeling. Different approaches to labeling are presently being tested for method and effectiveness.

Drugs. In the past year the Food and Drug Administration has been engaged in an extensive program to insure the effectiveness of the drugs Americans use. Decisions have been made on some 3,000 drugs marketed between 1938 and 1962 and representing 80% of the most commonly prescribed drugs.

In addition, the Food and Drug Administration will expand its research efforts aimed at insuring that all drugs available on the market are capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed for them.

I have resubmitted legislation requiring the identification coding of drug tablets and capsules to prevent those poisonings which result from the use of drug products of unknown or mistaken composition.

A CONSUMER PRODUCT TEST METHODS ACT

Consumers are properly concerned with the reliability of the information furnished them about the goods they buy, and I believe they have a right to such information.

Accordingly, I again propose legislation aimed at stimulating product testing in the private sector. Under this leg-

islation, the Secretary of Commerce, through the National Bureau of Standards, in consultation with my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, would identify products that should be tested. Competent Federal agencies would identify product characteristics that should be tested and would approve and develop, where necessary, testing methods to assess those characteristics. Suppliers of goods would be permitted to advertise their compliance with government approved testing standards. In addition, interested private organizations may receive accreditation indicating their competence to perform the approved tests, and the use of an accredited organization in testing a product may be advertised.

NATIONAL BUSINESS COUNCIL FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Most businessmen recognize and accept their responsibility to the consumer, and in many cases they have voluntarily undertaken efforts to assure more fully that these responsibilities are met throughout the business community.

To emphasize and encourage such voluntary activity, a National Business Council for Consumer Affairs will be organized by the Secretary of Commerce. It will work closely with my Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, the Federal Trade Commission, the Justice Department and others as appropriate in the further development of effective policies to benefit American consumers.

The Council will be a vehicle through which Government can work with business leaders to establish programs for accomplishing the goal I stated in my 1969 message on consumer protection of fostering "a marketplace which is fair both to those who sell and those who buy." And it will encourage everyone who does business to do an even better job of establishing competitive prices for high quality goods and services.

CONCLUSION

In submitting the foregoing proposals, I want to emphasize that the purpose of this program is not to provide the consumer with something to which he is not presently entitled; it is rather to assure that he receives what he is, in every way, fully entitled to. The continued success of our free enterprise system depends in large measure upon the mutual trust and goodwill of those who consume and those who produce or provide.

Today, in America, there is a general sense of trust and goodwill toward the world of business. Those who violate that trust and abuse that goodwill do damage to the free enterprise system. Thus, it is not only to protect the consumer, but also to protect that system and the honest men who have created and who maintain it that I urge the prompt passage of this legislative program.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 24, 1971.

SECOND ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-53)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read

and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In a democracy, policy is the public's business. I believe the President has an obligation to lay before the American people and its Congress the basic premises of his policy and to report fully on the issues, developments, and prospects confronting the Nation.

Shortly before my inauguration, I concluded that an annual Presidential report on foreign policy would serve these ends well. Each report would measure progress and outline what remains to be done.

I hereby transmit to the Congress the second annual Presidential review of United States foreign policy.

This year my message will be supplemented by two major documents: the Secretary of State's review—the first of its kind—and the annual Defense Report by the Secretary of Defense. Both of these will be comprehensive and detailed accounts, filling out the basic framework and philosophy set forth in this Presidential message.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1971.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President's second state of the world message is an excellent exposition of American foreign policy.

It is further testimony that President Nixon has taken the American people into his confidence more fully than any President before him.

The section on Indochina outlines our military and diplomatic moves directed toward peace in Southeast Asia more clearly than has ever been done before. The President places the blame for conflict throughout Indochina precisely where it belongs—on the Communist leaders in Hanoi.

In the section on the Middle East, the President points up the constant danger of a United States-Soviet confrontation there. One of the administration's great accomplishments stemmed from the low-keyed manner in which the administration steered away from that danger during the Jordanian crisis last September.

All in all, the President's second state of the world message is a valuable contribution to an understanding of U.S. foreign policy—not only by the American people but by peoples throughout the universe.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 16 United States Code 513, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. COLMER and Mr. SAYLOR.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section I, Public Law 86-417, the Chair appoints as members of the James Madison Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SLACK, Mr. CELLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, and Mr. WAMPLER.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provision of section I, Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. YATRON, Mr. BYRON, and Mr. MIZELL.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL PARKS CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 91-332, the Chair appoints as members of the National Parks Centennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. SKUBITZ.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CAMP.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. FREY.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 104(3), Public Law 91-405, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FUQUA and Mr. NELSEN.

And the following members from private life: Mrs. Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, of Washington, D.C., and Mr. John B. Duncan, of Washington, D.C.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(b), title 4, Public Law 91-510, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CHAIMO, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. HALL, and Mr. CLEVELAND.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF FATHER MARQUETTE TERCENTENARY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1(a), Public Law 89-187, the Chair appoints as members of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GRAY, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. RUPPE.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 202(b), Public Law 90-259, the Chair appoints as members of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. PETTIS.

FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last June, the Democrats in the House proposed that the President have standby wage and price authorities as a tool in the fight against inflation.

The education of the Nixon administration on this issue has been a wondrous thing to watch:

May 29, 1970: "We have not run for the superficially attractive solution of wage-price controls. . ."—Vice-President Spiro Agnew, quoted in the New York Times, May 29, 1970.

June 17, 1970: "I will not take this nation down the road of wage and price controls. . . This is not the time for Congress to play politics with inflation by passing legislation granting the President standby powers to impose wage and price controls."—President Nixon in a national television speech on the economy.

June 22, 1970: "Wage and price controls must be ruled out completely. . ."—under-Secretary of the Treasury Charles E. Walker, testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

August 15, 1970: "Price and wage controls simply do not fit the economic conditions which exist today." President Nixon on the signing of the Extension of the Defense Production Act which included standby wage and price authorities.

December 4, 1970: "There is no change in the President's attitude about wage and price controls."—White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler.

February 1, 1971: "I do not intend to im-

pose wage and price controls which would substitute new, growing, and more vexatious problems for the problems of inflation."—the Economic Report of the President submitted to the 92nd Congress.

February 23, 1971: "We . . . accept Section Two of H.R. 4246 which extends the President's standby authority to set up wage-price controls."—Secretary of the Treasury John Connally testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it took 9 long months to convince the Nixon administration of the value of these standby wage and price authorities. We are happy to have our GOP friends aboard and I hope that we can discover the means to cut down the long leadtime in gaining administration understanding of the Nation's economic problems.

TAX RELIEF FOR APARTMENT TENANTS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide a tax deduction for part of the rent paid by tenants. One of the most critical problems facing our cities is how to keep a viable middle-class occupying apartments under lease in the central city.

A homeowner is permitted to deduct the property taxes on his home and the interest on his mortgage. The owner of a cooperative apartment is permitted to deduct that portion of his rent or "maintenance" which represents the property taxes on his building and the interest on the mortgage. A tenant, on the other hand, can obtain a deduction for rental payments only by establishing that such payments were incurred for the purposes of his trade or business. Renters must adhere to the general Internal Revenue Service rule that "no deduction shall be allowed for personal, living, or family expenses."

It is apparent that there has developed in the tax system an arbitrary discrimination in favor of homeowners and against those who rent their homes. It is equally apparent that this discrimination operates to the particular disadvantage of the urban dweller where tenancies are the rule and homeowning the exception.

In 1942, when the tax law was amended to permit cooperative owners to deduct part of their payments, the Senate Finance Committee stated that its general purpose was "to place the tenant-stock holders of a cooperative apartment in the same position as the owner of a dwelling house so far as deductions for interest and taxes are concerned." I believe that it is now time to place the ordinary tenant in the same position as homeowners and owners of cooperative apartments so far as deductions for interest and property taxes are concerned.

Accordingly, I have proposed that each tenant be permitted to deduct that part of his rent payments which represents the proportionate share of the property taxes and mortgage interest paid on his apartment building.

Mr. Speaker, if our cities are to sur-

vive, they must be vital, vibrant centers, not areas inhabited only by the very rich and the very poor. To halt the growing exodus of the middle-class from our cities, we need to eliminate the present tax discrimination and provide equal tax treatment for tenant, cooperative owner, and homeowner:

H.R. 842

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"SEC. 218. DEDUCTION OF TAXES AND INTEREST BY TENANT.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts not otherwise deductible paid or accrued to a lessor within the taxable year, but only to the extent that such amounts represent the individual's proportionate share of—

"(1) the real estate taxes which are allowable under section 164 as a deduction to, and which are paid or incurred by, such lessor or any other person on the house or apartment building used by such individual as his principal residence, and on the land on which such house or apartment building is situated, and

"(2) the interest which is allowable under section 163 as a deduction to, and which is paid or incurred by, such lessor or any other person on indebtedness contracted—

"(A) in the acquisition, construction, alteration, rehabilitation, or maintenance of such house or apartment building, and

"(B) in the acquisition of the land on which such house (or apartment building) is situated.

"(b) PROPORTIONATE SHARE.—For purposes of this section, the 'individual's proportionate share' of real estate taxes and interest shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(c) LESSOR TO FURNISH WRITTEN STATEMENT.—Every lessor of premises to an individual who uses such premises as his principal residence shall furnish such individual with a written statement showing the amounts deductible by such individual hereunder, whether or not paid or incurred by such lessor, on or before January 31 of the succeeding year."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 218. Deduction of taxes and interest by tenant.

"Sec. 219. Cross references."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970.

DEBT-CEILING BILL

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is currently considering the \$430 billion debt-ceiling bill reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Included in this bill is a proposal to exempt \$10 billion in long-term bonds

from the statutory long-term 4½-percent interest ceiling.

I oppose the interest rate exemption. It is not related to the debt-ceiling issue. These are separate issues which should be separately voted upon.

I urge the adoption of a modified rule which will permit the House to strike out this objectionable feature of a conglomerate bill.

This is not the time to raise interest rates on public borrowing. Economic forces are currently reducing interest rate pressures.

We should not legislatively reverse this trend toward lower interest rates.

THE REPORT OF THE CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON STATE LEGISLATURES

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, a self-appointed group that calls itself the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, has issued its report. Thanks to the overplay given it by the national news media, this report has risen in stature far above what I believe it deserves. To say that this report is self-serving and lacking in factual information to back up its findings, is probably the understatement of the year. In my judgment, this report constitutes a rather interesting little ruse which has been combined with some sophisticated public relations techniques in order to pass itself off as judge of what our State legislatures, all 50 of them in your mind, should be.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the report was produced under the direction of one Larry Margolis, who was the chief designer of the formula by which the legislatures would be rated. It is my further understanding that the report based its figures not on the actual achievements of the legislatures but on the structure. It does not rate the individual members of the legislatures, but only the system under which the members operate. It does not measure the merits or demerits of the laws passed.

As I am sure every Member here knows Mr. Speaker, it is possible for any individual to set up a citizens committee, obtain financial backing, establish criteria, and make a report which reflects what this individual would like it to reflect. It should be pointed out that of the 29 citizens who made up the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, 12 are from States which ranked 1-2-3-4.

How can any individual or group of individuals say that what works for a legislative body in a State on the west coast will work for Alabama. Or that methods used by the State legislature of a small eastern State should be adopted by the Alabama State Legislature? Obviously, it should not be attempted. Each State is uniquely different. Each State has its problems and its potential. The people in each State have decided who they want to serve in their legislatures. If they wish changes, I am sure they will let their lawmakers know.

I was privileged to serve 8 years in the Alabama State Legislature under two

different Governors. During this time, I found the great majority of my colleagues to be conscientious, hardworking men and women dedicated to improving the life of every Alabama citizen. I believe this is as true today as it was when I served. There is always room for improvement in legislative procedures, and this too is being accomplished.

Our legislature has helped bring new industry to the State. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been made available. The legislature has contributed much toward achieving a sound rural-urban balance. It has helped in the development of Alabama's waterway systems. And programs are being instituted to preserve and protect the natural resources of our State.

Throughout Alabama one can see evidence of the progress we have made as a result of the fine work of the legislature. True, much remains to be done. We all know that many of our problems are far from being solved. The present Alabama legislature is faced with the challenge of identifying and solving these problems. And I know it will do the job.

We may not be the State with the most people. We may not be the State with the largest welfare rolls, or debt. But the people of Alabama are independent, resourceful, and capable of running their own affairs.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL SAFETY

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the hideous tragedy of the Sylmar Veterans Hospital in the recent Los Angeles earthquake must never be repeated.

In my home city of San Diego, a new 811-bed VA hospital is nearing completion. Local veterans groups, who have struggled for years to get this facility, are naturally now concerned that every possible precaution be taken to protect it from earthquake—always a very real threat in California.

Our new hospital looks solid enough to withstand any seismic disturbance, and the word so far from the Veterans Administration is encouraging. Viggo P. Miller, assistant VA administrator for construction, has advised a member of my staff that "we think we have all the protection we need built into the design" of the new facility. Mr. Miller also pointed out that every VA building constructed in California since 1935 fully complies with the State's own relatively stringent code requirements for reducing the dangers of earthquakes. The parts of the Sylmar Hospital that collapsed had been constructed in 1925, prior to the promulgation of the California standards.

While I am pleased that the Veterans Administration has exercised such care in planning its more contemporary hospitals, I nevertheless am still plagued by some doubts about the ultimate ability of the San Diego hospital to withstand the most severe kind of shocks.

Are we certain, for instance, that the present standards for earthquake-proofing are good enough, in view of the trend toward higher buildings in California since adoption of the code in the 1930's? The basic steel-beam construction of the San Diego hospital is unquestionably sound, but the building is also 6 stories tall.

I am no construction engineer, and I do not pretend to have the answers to questions that might be asked about the durability of this or any other structure in earthquake-prone areas.

Surely it is incumbent on this body to get these answers for the 28 million veterans we jointly represent. Our own Committee on Veterans' Affairs has moved with commendable dispatch, sending a special subcommittee to Los Angeles last week for a day of hearings and an on-site investigation of the Sylmar tragedy. The concern of the committee was matched at all levels within the Veterans' Administration and by volunteers, in a magnificent display of ingenuity and devotion to the needs of the surviving patients and staff of the Sylmar Hospital.

To prevent or at least minimize the chances of a recurrence of this disaster we should now, I believe, make much greater and more systematic use of expert consultants to evaluate hospitals already operational, under construction, or still in the planning stage.

Structural engineers, seismologists, and geologists could all contribute substantially to any hospital-by-hospital study of earthquake vulnerability. These professionals, working under the auspices of Congress or the Veterans' Administration, would generate new knowledge in such arcane but critical areas as ground motion, the relative strengths and properties of various building materials and overall earthquake engineering.

On the basis of the findings of such a comprehensive study, the Government could then adopt, either administratively or by statute, whatever controls and standards the experts had deemed necessary to provide the fullest possible protection in earthquake-prone areas.

Devastating as it was, the earthquake which rocked the San Fernando Valley February 9 registered a relatively mild 6.5 on the authoritative Richter scale. In contrast, the San Francisco earthquake of 1906 had a magnitude of 8.3 on this scale of 10. Scientists agree that a quake of this violence can be expected to occur in California every 60 to 100 years—an eventuality which none of us likes to consider but for which we should be planning.

THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION SHOULD BE EXTENDED

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill authorizing a 4-year extension of the Appalachian Regional Commission. The bill is similar to legislation introduced in the Senate by Senator RANDOLPH.

In the absence of new legislation, the Commission which has administered the 13-State regional development program during its 6 years of operation will expire on June 30, 1971.

I have been disturbed by reports that the President's revenue-sharing plan calls for the dismantling of the Appalachian program after 1 more year of operation and the inclusion of the \$280 million annual appropriation to the Appalachian program into the President's proposed \$1 billion pool to be distributed among the 50 States for rural development.

The Appalachian program was established by Congress to meet the special needs of the Appalachian region and should not be engulfed in and eliminated by the revenue-sharing plan.

I am convinced that the Appalachian program has made more progress per dollar spent in the district that I represent in Congress than has any other Federal program. The Appalachian program has already made an impact on economic conditions in Appalachia by attracting industry and tourism, by better roads, airports, and vocational educational facilities.

Of the 2,571 miles of Appalachian Corridor Highways authorized, about 20 percent have been completed, another 15 percent is under construction, and 93 percent of it is in some stage of development or planning. To stop this road program now would be folly. The Appalachian program was conceived and approved by Congress as a unique and innovative effort to meet the special needs of the Appalachian region. It is not right and not fair to Appalachia that funds authorized by Congress for this regional program be made a part of a nationwide pool for revenue sharing.

This program is one of the Nation's best examples of teamwork by Federal, State, and local units of government. In my opinion, it is the best administered program in Washington. Its strength, in part, lies in its adaptability from State to State—each State using it to solve its own problems and to meet its own needs. It has permitted national goals to be translated into workable programs to meet local needs. It is providing hope and economic uplift to an important section of our Nation, and it deserves the continued support of Congress.

INCREASED FIGHTING AND THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW OF THE STATE OF THE WORLD

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

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, just an hour ago the President, Mr. Nixon again justified his broadening of the war in terms of saving American lives.

This incredible spectacle of the Nixon administration blindly embarking on new invasions into the countries neighboring on South Vietnam in violation of Laotian neutrality, the Geneva Accords and of the language and quite possibly the letter of legisla-

tion passed in the 92d Congress, in direct repudiation of the mandate received from his electorate which has consistently expressed itself in increased percentages of Americans favoring immediate withdrawal, now 73 percent, has been fantastic. And to justify it in terms of saving American lives is yet another attempt at anesthetizing the American people he is repudiating.

The invasion of Laos by the South Vietnamese Army with U.S. air support, and perhaps ground support, has not only doubled weekly casualties since it started, but has resulted in an additional 15 Americans missing in action with every possibility that these soldiers are now prisoners of war. It has resulted in a great increase in South Vietnamese casualties, with two fire bases already overrun and how many yet to come?

It has resulted in the official loss of 29 helicopters in 13 days which cost a minimum of \$14.5 million. Field reports estimate some 70 helicopters have been downed which would run the cost in downed equipment alone well over \$35 million and probably closer to \$50 million—all money which could have been spent more fruitfully here at home.

The President's remarks concerning Cambodia with inferences that the invasion there has cut U.S. casualties by half completely leaves out any mention of what is happening to the Cambodians. Where they were at peace, their country is now engulfed in war. We are having to destroy the country and from the air while claiming to save it. Justification for the continuing and increased killing of Asian lives to save American lives is unacceptable.

This "saving of American lives" has meant not only expanding the war geographically but increasing the intensity, also peculiar rationale, the Associated Press reported yesterday, February 24, from Saigon that the U.S. command announced its launching of the heaviest air strike in months: 50 fighter bombers, accompanied by 20 support planes bombing in North Vietnam. The New York Daily News reports that the strikes were the hardest hitting of any single day in the entire Indochina war.

And the threat that as long as one American is held prisoner of war, American troops will remain in Southeast Asia is an indication of how completely the administration will go to deny the will of the American people. To justify the continuation of the war because Americans are prisoners when it is the war that has made them prisoners and continues to make 300,000 American soldiers fighting in Southeast Asia prisoners, to justify continuing the war, continuing to make more prisoners of war is the height of the administration deceptive rationale.

The President has warned that time is running out and that the North Vietnamese may find themselves negotiating with the South Vietnamese. He is for once right. Time is running out. But inducing them to negotiate by increased bombings and expansion of the war is insane. The North Vietnamese should find themselves negotiating with the South Vietnamese, the Laotians, the

Cambodians because that is the best solution to the problems. And this 92d Congress must act in concert to bring this about and to end U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, immediately.

THE MISSISSIPPI TORNADOES

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday I had the sad experience of touring those counties of my congressional district that were the victims of the multiple killer tornadoes this past Sunday. Of the some 90 persons who lost their lives, 38 were from the Fourth Congressional District. Another 500 persons have been hospitalized to recover from their injuries and estimates of property damage is well over \$7 million.

The people are still in a state of shock as a result of this great tragedy, but they are already talking of rebuilding their homes and businesses.

At the request of Mississippi's congressional delegation and the Governor, President Nixon has declared our State as a Federal disaster area. This means the people will be able to apply for assistance under the Disaster Relief Act of 1970.

Officials from the Office of Emergency Preparedness have already met with Governor Williams to determine the top priorities for providing relief. Other Federal agencies such as the Small Business Administration and Farmers Home Administration are making plans to set up offices in the affected areas.

As would be expected, the top priority is to provide mobile homes for temporary housing. Once this has been accomplished, Federal officials will begin processing low-interest loans so people can begin rebuilding their homes, farms, and places of business. If OEP and other Federal agencies work as efficiently as they did during the trying months following Hurricane Camille, the people in my congressional district will be able to recover from the devastating tornadoes. It is not until you come face to face with a tragedy of this magnitude that you realize the importance of the Congress having passed the Disaster Relief Act of 1970.

EXTENDING COOPER - CHURCH AMENDMENT TO NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the danger that the United States will become extended even further in southeast Asia through an invasion of North Vietnam seems to be ever increasing.

Despite the administration's oratorical withdrawals from that bloodied part of the world, our commitment in a military way is daily becoming greater, and our contribution to the misery and death and homelessness of thousands of

people in a faraway land mounts with every hour.

Without Congressional sanction, without declaration of war, the United States is now fighting in three nations—in South Vietnam, in Cambodia, and now in Laos.

I fear that North Vietnam is next. A report this morning by the Washington Post Foreign Service is headlined, "Thieu asks why not attack the North."

Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill which extends the language and spirit of the Cooper-Church amendment to North Vietnam.

Senator MONDALE is introducing an identical measure concurrently in the Senate.

The bill would prevent, without congressional approval, a U.S. invasion of North Vietnam or U.S. air or logistical support for such an invasion by any other nation.

I confess to some reluctance to engage in still more rhetoric designed to limit United States participation in Indochina.

The process of trying to force U.S. extraction has been a wearisome process, and the administration has repeatedly disregarded national abhorrence of this disastrous mis-adventure in the Far East.

Instead we—the Nation and the Congress—have been faced with elaborate subterfuge to sanctify forays and turn invasion into incursions. But the casualty figures go up. Six more helicopters were destroyed yesterday. And the number of U.S. airmen down over new war-torn lands grows and grows.

I introduce this bill not only with the hope that the intent of the measure itself be debated and passed, but also to call upon the Congress to rally itself and to thwart, at every possible instance—in the budgetary deliberations, in the foreign relations hearings, and in the requests for armed services—the efforts to continue the Indochinese participation of the United States.

THE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL DECISION APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN MADE ON POLITICAL AND ECOLOGICAL MISINFORMATION

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Linville, president of the Cross-Florida Canal Association read to me just now over the telephone a memorandum which was in the form of recommendations from Mr. Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality to a member of the White House staff. Apparently this was the basis of the President's decision to halt construction of the canal. Mr. Linville has today released this information to the news media, as I understand it.

I have not yet read the paper myself and do not know how it was obtained. When I receive a copy of it I plan to send a copy of it to Mr. Train and to ask him if it is authentic or inaccurate in any respect.

The paper as it was read to me led me to the impression that the President's decision on the canal was: First, not the result of any action taken by the Council on Environmental Quality but only on a personal recommendation from Mr. Train and, second, based on personal recommendations of a political nature wherein both political and ecological statements were inaccurately made. All of this could have been avoided if fair play and constitutional processes had prevailed to allow public hearings before an unbiased tribunal.

The Nixon administration has so far refused to allow me and other proponents of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal to rebut the ecological information upon which the canal was halted by the President; and has refused to furnish me the information upon which the decision was rendered; and has refused to give any legal authority for the action by the President.

I have been furnished with a 24-page summary of one-sided ecological information on the canal, but it was admittedly something compiled after the President's action and was frankly not the basis for that action.

On the illegality of the President's action, I point out the recent ruling of the Comptroller General which ruled illegal the administration's proposal to close administratively Public Health Service clinics. I take this opportunity to refer again to my remarks on February 11 concerning the unconstitutionality of the President's actions in halting construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. They appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 2675.

I cited there many Supreme Court and other Federal court decisions which clearly show the President acted unconstitutionally.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation which for the first time grants every American citizen a federally guaranteed right to a pollution-free environment and new standing to bring suit against the Nation's polluters.

I am proud to be joined by 66 of my colleagues in introducing this bill.

The bill makes four key changes in existing law:

It grants all citizens a federally guaranteed right to a pollution-free environment which they have not previously had.

It gives all citizens an effective means of enforcing that right by opening up the Federal courts to citizen suits to protect the environment.

It gives citizens standing before administrative agencies and regulatory bodies to present the environment's side of the coin during the decisionmaking process.

It gives citizens standing in Federal court to challenge administrative de-

cisionmaking where it is lax in the enforcement of existing antipollution standards and in the implementation of environmental policy in general.

Last year this bill was introduced as the Environmental Protection Act of 1970. This year it is being introduced as an amendment to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The reason for this is quite simple, Mr. Speaker. The few lawsuits that have been successful to date in halting activities that adversely affect the environment have relied in large part on the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act. So that the debate on my approach is conducted with all relevant facts in mind, I thought it appropriate to bring it within the ambit of the 1969 act.

The need for this bill was great last year, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it to be even greater now. Let me give one example. As a result of publicity surrounding the growing number of environment lawsuits and Michigan's passage of the Environmental Protection Act, and thanks to the prodding of my good friend and colleague, HENRY REUSS, the Nixon administration announced that it would begin prosecuting polluters of our water under the 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act. This law requires the Justice Department to prosecute anyone dumping foreign substances and pollutants into the Nation's navigable waters.

There are hundreds of firms that are in violation of the 1899 act, but to date only a limited number of suits have been instituted under it. It is hard to say why the Justice Department is reluctant to use the leverage it has in halting water pollution. Perhaps in some cases fact finding is proving more difficult than originally expected.

What is more likely, Mr. Speaker, is that politics is once again entering into administrative agency decisionmaking concerning the environment. Among those who continue to pollute with impunity is the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.—commonly known as 3M. Congressman Reuss has revealed that one of 3M's Wisconsin plants has been pouring acid wastes into a Mississippi River tributary that are strong enough to corrode manhole covers. The Justice Department has given no indication why it is reluctant to bring suit against 3M. It may be just a coincidence, but the record shows that top management of the company contributed \$50,000 to the Republican Party in 1968.

In how many other cases of Justice Department laxity will we find a similar situation? I suspect many. Just last Thursday John M. Burns, the ousted Federal prosecutor of pollution cases in New York, stated that the administration's future plans for use of the 1899 act would take the teeth out of enforcement procedures that he helped devise while executive assistant to the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York. If you will remember, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Burns was the man relieved of his duties for wanting to bring charges against General Motors for pollution of the Hudson River.

I do not cite these occurrences to malign the good people of the Justice De-

partment. If the Democrats were running the show, I am not sure that similar events would not happen. I only bring these matters up to underscore the need for the proposed amendment. If we do not take politics out of the fight to save the environment, we will continually be frustrated by the lack of progress toward a better world. In this struggle, Mr. Speaker, time is not on our side.

It is legitimate to question the effectiveness of the courts before involving them in a struggle of such importance. I realize that the courts are now struggling under a tremendous workload, but I do not think we can afford to leave them out. A lawsuit can be an effective tool in not only halting a specific harm, but in alerting others that they best modify present activities or face a lawsuit themselves. Litigation also attracts the media's attention and publicity will often give the same result in a much shorter period of time.

There is a recent example of this phenomena. For almost 10 years the Corps of Engineers has been constructing a barge canal across the State of Florida. The purpose of the project was to connect the Atlantic with the Gulf of Mexico, thus shortening the distance for shipping goods by water. But in building the canal, the corps tried to utilize existing waterways, including the Oklawaha River, one of Florida's most beautiful. Many Floridians were incensed by the threat posed to this scenic river and questioned the utility of the project itself, since it was an established fact that it would be cheaper and far less harmful to the environment to construct a railroad for the same purpose. Recognizing the validity of these objections, the Environmental Defense Fund brought suit against the corps on the narrow ground that an environmental impact statement had not been prepared as required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

A Federal court issued a temporary injunction, as is the common practice where a permanent injunction is sought. It is important to note that this procedural victory in no way settled the lawsuit. A temporary injunction only buys time and I assume that the corps would have been off the hook just as soon as the required statement was prepared. Nevertheless, within 4 days, the President of the United States announced that the project would be abandoned because of the threat posed to Florida's environment.

It may be pure conjecture to say that the President was influenced by the lawsuit. However, the lawsuit did focus publicity on the project and the temporary injunction gave the President an excuse to make to those in favor of the canal in explaining his action.

If all environment disputes ended as satisfactorily as this one, there would be no reason for introducing this amendment. Unfortunately, they do not and that is why I urge my colleagues today to join with me in passing this needed legislation. If we can open the courts to give citizens a real chance at halting pollution, we will have added potent allies in our common effort. Outraged and concerned citizens willing to take their

grievances to court have had a healthy impact on the fabric of law that governs our lives. The fight to save the environment is too important to leave citizens out.

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our colleague and friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) has recently been mentioned prominently in the public press. As a result, Miss Elaine Shannon, Washington staff writer for the Nashville Tennessean has written an article which accurately sets forth events involving him.

Prior to my request for unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD, I would like to express my profound respect for my friend and colleague, Representative BILL ANDERSON.

During my entire life, I have never had the privilege of knowing any individual who was more patriotic, more loyal to his country, nor have I known an individual more dedicated to the service of his Nation.

For 6 years, I have been closely associated with him in the House of Representatives and have found him to be one of the most able men in this body, and one who has always expressed his personal convictions regardless of the apparent political disadvantage of doing so. To be an able legislator, to be a dedicated legislator, and to be a legislator who legislates and speaks out on public issues with strong conviction is indeed a trait to be admired.

I respectfully request that each of his colleagues read the following article:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Feb. 14, 1971]

REP. ANDERSON CHALLENGES HEAVYWEIGHTS HOOVER, AGNEW—NAVAL HERO ANDERSON WANTS WAR TO END

(By Elaine Shannon)

(NOTE.—Congressman William R. Anderson, the Middle Tennessee Democrat, came from a rural farm background to become a career naval officer and a national hero. He is a fundamentalist on religion—a member of the Church of Christ. He has worked for the American Heritage Foundation, an organization noted for giving prizes for patriotism. He has been a hawk on the war in Vietnam. But suddenly he has been projected into the midst of national controversy, criticizing J. Edgar Hoover and being criticized by Vice President Spiro Agnew. Here is an analysis of what happened to put the Waverly Congressman on the spot.)

WASHINGTON.—Stepping into the crossfire between J. Edgar Hoover and the peace movement, Rep. William R. Anderson is suddenly the focus of national attention, beset by reporters from everywhere clamoring to explain him.

"What's this with Anderson? He's from someplace in the South, isn't he?" they mutter in the press galleries as they gaze in wonder at a politician—a rural southern politician, at that—who is suddenly not playing "the game."

"YOU GO ALONG"

"The game," everyone here says, is getting re-elected, first of all, and keeping one's con-

stituents pacified. You go along and you get along, they say.

Anderson dared to call down the aging but formidable Hoover, who answers to no man, for what he considered a violation of the constitutional rights of two men, two peace activists, of whom the FBI chief did not approve.

He said Hoover was using "scare tactics reminiscent of McCarthyism" and was throwing the matter into "the trial by headline arena."

A highly decorated naval officer whose chief claim to fame was commanding the nation's first nuclear submarine, Nautilus, on the first voyage under the North Polar icecap, Anderson has become abruptly vocal in his opposition to the lengthening Southeast Asia entanglement.

"END THE WAR"

He has accused President Nixon of "playing politics with American lives" and is one of the chief House sponsors of the Hatfield-McGovern amendment to end the war by Dec. 31, 1971.

Politicians and politician-watchers here privately express admiration for the Tennessee congressman's "guts," but they are mystified.

Why is he sticking his neck out? Doesn't he know a congressman from a conservative fundamentalist Bible Belt district is supposed to stick to supporting "safe" issues, like the flag, motherhood and national PTA week?

That old image is dying. "People in Tennessee and the South are a lot more open-minded and tolerant than a lot of people up here think," Anderson remarked.

Oddly, Anderson's conservative Sixth District seems to produce non-conformist congressmen—his predecessors, Pat Sutton and Ross Bass, were each noted for a "maverick" streak.

Nevertheless, Anderson agrees that what he is doing isn't politically "safe."

"But some of us had better really get down to work and worry a little bit less about getting re-elected and a little more about the growing list of problems that affect this country's future," he said last week.

MORE ACTIVIST

"You can do that in a way that is nothing but middle of the road. It's not so much, what part of the political spectrum you are in but the way in which you approach responsibilities—the way in which you use a lot less rhetoric and become more activist in facing the problems of this country."

This past week Anderson came back to Tennessee to visit the voters in his district. There he explained that he is convinced that the war in Asia—now going on in three countries—must end or it will spread. He was seeking to let the voters know that there is a danger that statements by public officials—J. Edgar Hoover, Spiro Agnew, or others—may stir up the public mood and continue the American participation in the Asian conflict.

He was once called a hawk on the war. But as the war has spread his attitude has changed and now he is urging that the American soldiers be brought home this year.

Bill Anderson considers himself a moderate, a "very strict" constitutional constructionist, an old-fashioned populist.

Then why did he get involved with the Berrigan brothers, two activist Catholic priests now serving time in Danbury, Conn., for destroying draft records?

"Too many people say I'm defending the Berrigans," he explained. "I'm not. I'm defending their rights, or what are supposed to be their rights. It wouldn't have mattered who they were or what church they belonged to."

He knew them, he said. He knew their writings. He did not agree with everything

they said. He did not approve of the act of civil disobedience for which they are imprisoned.

But when J. Edgar Hoover stood before a Senate committee and branded the men "conspirators," without benefit of trial or even indictment, Anderson felt he had to do something.

So he went onto the House floor and demanded that Hoover "put up or shut up"—indict the accused or be silent. When the indictment came down, Anderson said he was glad they would receive due process of law.

Then Vice President Spiro Agnew got into the act, accusing the Tennessee congressman of speaking "self-serving claptrap" and "popping off for political advantage."

"Political advantage?" the congressman smiled wryly.

But the vice president has made many celebrities. Hungry for fresh faces, the "eastern establishment press," as Agnew likes to say, asked themselves, "has Congressman Anderson gotten radicalized or at least liberalized?" And they rushed to interview him.

That idea got Bakersville's Bill Anderson on the cover of Time, a big spread in the Washington Post, on the Dick Cavett show and in countless Washington columns, from the cool analysis of Evans and Novak to Betty Beale's giddy society page report.

CURRENT FAVORITE

The Post writer called Anderson "a current blue-eyed favorite of the country's anti-war and pro-liberal forces."

But that writer went on to say that Anderson is really still "substantially conservative."

Labels like those are an over-simplification, of course, and things in Washington, like everywhere else, do tend to get over-simplified.

Anderson himself does not think he is changing—perhaps, he said, he was type cast before.

"I guess everyone assumed that because I spent 20 years in the Navy that I'd be a super-hawk," he said.

PRETTY CONSERVATIVE

Of the Berrigan case, he said he felt his stand was "pretty conservative—it is a concern for individual citizens' rights within the framework of the Constitution."

Bill Anderson, 49, came to Congress from a Church of Christ upbringing in Humphreys County, Tenn., from Columbia Military Academy and Annapolis, from World War II combat service in the Pacific, from the famous Nautilus voyage under the North Pole, from the Navy's Pentagon staff.

In Congress, he has done his homework and moved quietly within the structure, concentrating on agriculture and rural community aid bills, legislation to upgrade law enforcement and now toward changing the prison system.

He supported President Johnson's war policy and, until recently, President Nixon's. He voted for, and will continue to support, all military appropriations bills for Vietnam. He explained:

"Rightly or wrongly, we are very heavily committed. Our military forces have to be supported. That's the very least we can do when our men are dying out there."

But after last summer's trip to Indochina, he said what he felt was a corrupt regime feeding off the war. He found a miserable stinking prison on the island of Con Son. After that, the justification for U.S. presence there began to push him and nag him.

His uneasiness about the conflict crystallized into forceful opposition.

"It is so clearly evident," he said, "that President Nixon's strategy in regard to Southeast Asia is extremely, if not predominantly influenced by the presidential election timetable here at home."

"What this amounts to in final essence is playing politics with American lives, not to

mention the fantastic amount of money urgently needed to do things here at home to help get our economy back on its feet."

This is hardly an unusual stand—Anderson points to the Gallup Poll showing that 73% of the American people want out of the war.

But these confrontations with the Nixon administration and with Hoover were somewhat unexpected, coming from a lesser known congressman from a small Southern district.

The limelight they brought is uncomfortable for a quiet introspective man not given to impulsiveness or flamboyance, not used to the glare of national attention.

NO RETREAT

He knows it will cost him—unfavorable response from the Sixth District has been steadily coming in—but Anderson apparently is not going to retreat to the comfortable anonymity of the safe political game.

"It does provide the opportunity to reach out into additional forums and perhaps make a larger contribution to the country's future," he said of his sudden celebrity.

"We don't solve the problems of society looking with blinders . . . I don't see how you can deal honestly with gigantic problems without stirring up the waters."

AN APPROACH THAT WOULD DESTROY THE SMALL FARMER WITHOUT BENEFITTING ANYONE

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

Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues in the other body, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Moss) has introduced again this year the same legislation the Congress rejected last year to abolish the price support program for tobacco.

Let us examine his proposal logically for a moment. What potential does it have for good? The answer is absolutely none at all. The major tobacco companies might be temporarily inconvenienced if the present system of growing and selling leaf tobacco were discontinued, but within a very short time through acquisition of their own lands; through leasing arrangements; grower's contracts, or any of a number of devices, the companies can assure themselves of an adequate supply of leaf tobacco for their needs.

So the proposal will not hurt the tobacco companies. It will not make it any more difficult for them to obtain and process leaf tobacco. It will not reduce the number of cigarettes being manufactured and sold.

What potential does it offer for harm? Plenty: Thousands of acres of farmland highly suited for tobacco farming have changed hands in recent years with a large percentage of their valuation derived from the fact that tobacco allotments were assigned to these lands under our present tobacco program. The ad valorem tax base of hundreds of counties in the leaf tobacco areas would be adversely affected. Banks and mortgage companies would suddenly find that the value of their security had dropped drastically. Many thousands of elderly persons who rent their "tobacco allotment" and who supplement their social security

in this manner would suddenly be deprived of their livelihood. All of this economic chaos would do absolutely nothing toward accomplishing the goal of the gentleman from Utah and those who share his views regarding smoking and health.

The actual cost of the program in dollars to the Federal Government over the years has been extremely small and for the most part, tobacco bought on the auction floor by the Stabilization Corporation and taken under Government loan because it does not bring the established Government support price is eventually sold to either domestic or export markets for as much money as the Government has in it and even—sometimes—at a profit.

The gentleman from Utah and others question the rightness of the United States trying to develop foreign markets for tobacco. Do they really think that the foreign use of tobacco is going to diminish because we limit our exports? If that is their thought they again delude themselves. Obviously other tobacco-producing nations—and their number is increasing—will take up the slack: Canada, Rhodesia, and other African nations are already aggressively seeking to expand their foreign markets. Abolishing our American tobacco programs will only serve to further damage our balance-of-payments position without contributing anything positive to reduction of use of tobacco overseas.

No doubt the gentleman from Utah means well. No doubt his intentions are good. No doubt he envisions highly beneficial results if his proposal were adopted by Congress.

Unfortunately, he is wrong on every count. The only result which could come from the enactment of his proposal would be irreparable injury to every person whose livelihood is now dependent upon raising leaf tobacco without reducing by a single cigarette the amount of smoking being done.

OUR VITAL PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

(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, much has been said in recent days concerning the Nation's oil industry and the effect of imports on the domestic producing economy. In a speech before the Southwestern Legal Foundation, Chairman Byron Tunnell, of the Texas Railroad Commission, delivered an accurate and comprehensive appraisal of the situation our petroleum industry faces today. Because of the timeliness of his comments, I would like to share them with my colleagues:

THE IMPORT POLICY AND ITS EFFECT ON THE DOMESTIC PRODUCING ECONOMY

I am sure you will agree that literally millions of words have already been written and spoken on the subject of U.S. oil imports policy, both before, during, and for that matter, since the Presidential Task Force's investigation of the subject a year ago. Which might prompt the question: "What, then, can we usefully say on this topic today?"

We need to impress upon the minds of all Americans that our national security depends in a large measure on the preservation of a viable domestic petroleum industry, and our oil imports policy is, or certainly should be, designed so as to preserve this industry in the national interest.

The scope and nature of the debate on oil imports policy seems to me to have shifted in recent months to the point that I believe there is a growing recognition that our national security is vitally affected by these oil policies.

I have no doubt that the world will continue to see a struggle between competing ideologies and the superpowers that hold them for many years to come. In that struggle, the Middle East—where most of the world's proven oil reserves are—will continue to play a pivotal role. We cannot either now or in the future hand to the Soviet Union a card marked "U.S. dependence on Middle Eastern oil" without gravely compromising our whole international position and giving the Soviets a decisive advantage over us. It is, thus, essential that we retain present policies and adopt whatever new ones are needed to assure our nation an adequate source of petroleum which is both secure and dependable.

As a prelude, perhaps of things to come, the OPEC countries even now are serving us notice, and not too subtly I might add, that they intend to exact a far higher price for their crude than they have in the past. In so doing, they have destroyed the myth, beloved by many ivory-tower economists, that all the U.S. had to do was drop its import barriers to set off a cut-throat competition among foreign countries to supply us with cheap oil. Regrettably for this theory, the oil-producing countries are showing a degree of cohesion in their actions which indicates that they can and will apply pressure on the industrialized nations for greater and greater concessions. These recent events in the Middle East, particularly with the cut-back in Libyan crude production and the sabotage of tapline, have demonstrated rather forcefully once again the potential problems of undue reliance on uncertain and volatile sources.

Hopefully, then, we have passed intense debate on whether there is a national security question involved in oil imports policy, to a discussion of how this policy can best be implemented in the light of changing supply and demand patterns.

A look at the record will be useful at this point. Since the Mandatory Oil Import Program went into effect in 1959, the U.S. has added 29.3 billion barrels of crude oil and 195.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to its reserves, not counting the discoveries on the North Slope of Alaska. These achievements have been due in large part to an effective oil import control program, tax policies that encouraged exploration, and conservation of our resources through prorationing.

Let me say a word on this last topic, since it is one with which I am concerned as a member of the Texas Railroad Commission. You know, as I do, that there is a school of thought which asserts that import controls and the domestic production allocation and control program known as proration are a kind of dual technique whereby the price of oil in the U.S. is kept artificially high. The facts, of course, are otherwise. You are no doubt familiar with what happened 40 years ago, when the great East Texas Field, the Oklahoma City Field, and the Seminole Field were discovered. These discoveries set off the wildest excesses the oil industry has ever seen. Each property owner tried to drill as many wells as he could and produce as much oil as he could as fast as he could. Great quantities of natural gas were flared and wasted, and millions of barrels of oil were made unrecoverable from their reservoirs be-

cause of wasteful production practices. Law enforcement broke down and troops were called in.

We have progressed a long way since that time. Regulatory statutes adopted as a result of the lessons we learned during this chaotic period have both protected individual property owners and prevented the waste of valuable oil and gas resources. Largely through proration, the equivalent of more than 11 billion barrels of recoverable oil was preserved in Texas alone during the period 1952-1962. This included 15 trillion cubic feet of casing head gas which would otherwise have been vented into the atmosphere and wasted. Four billion barrels of additional oil were recovered from secondary recovery projects in the same period. In the period since that time, largely because of improved technology and more stringent regulations on the flaring of gas, I believe you will find the record of conservation even more impressive.

While, as I shall discuss presently, our reserves have not kept pace with our growing demands, we can look back on a good record of discovery and conservation of our petroleum resources over the past decade. This record, however, has been achieved in the face of steady and substantial increases in finding and development costs, wages, extraordinary capital expenditures required to meet anti-pollution objectives and of course the self-defeating wellhead regulation of natural gas prices, which has contributed to critical shortages in natural gas. A recent cut in percentage depletion and the addition of other tax burdens has further reduced the capital and incentive available to the oil industry for further exploration. Consequently, the decline in spare producing capacity which has been taking place can be expected to accelerate.

This country does not have near the spare producing capacity that some ill-advised, self-proclaimed experts would have you believe.

In my own state, the amount of non-wasteful production capacity in excess of present allowances has declined sharply. Our rate is now regularly near 80+ percent Market Demand Factor and each percentage increase in allowable factor brings less and less increase in production.

This picture, I should add, is not significantly brightened, at least in the short term, by the prospect of Alaskan oil. It is true that the Department of Interior has now recommended that a pipeline be built across Alaska. But the delays already encountered make it extremely doubtful that substantial quantities of Alaskan oil will flow southward before 1974, and even this may be an optimistic estimate.

At the same time, U.S. demand for petroleum products continues to climb significantly every year. Petroleum demand is up 50% over 1960, and our energy demands are expected to almost triple between now and the year 2000. While foreseeing the future is always a hazardous exercise, it's pretty obvious that oil and gas will continue to be major contributors to our energy requirements as far ahead as we can see.

Faced with a declining reserve/production ratio in both oil and natural gas, we face the dismal choice of cutting back our living standards, or increasing imports to a level which is unacceptable from a national security standpoint, unless we can stimulate enough exploration to develop sufficient new reserves to meet our needs.

For the immediate future, some increase in imports may well be unavoidable. Certainly a gradual increase is preferable to a sudden one, which might be necessary if we continued to produce our domestic reserves without significant discovery of new ones.

But, if these trends continue and domestic exploration and production rates remain substantially unchanged, we face the prospect of being dependent on imports for anywhere from one-third to one-half of our petroleum needs within 10 years, depending on whose forecast one takes.

Perhaps I can best emphasize the danger of this dependence by pointing out that if half of our petroleum needs in 1980 will have to be imported, this will amount to more than 10 million barrels per day, which is more than the present U.S. Production in the lower 48 states. Now, I don't know much about diplomatic relations, but if this country ever becomes that dependent, there are some countries that might not supply us at any price . . . even if we said pretty please.

What, then, remains to be done? First, I think it should be clear that we have no alternative but to rely on petroleum as our major energy source for the foreseeable future. Almost everyone agrees on this. Nuclear power plants are years behind expectations, and over-optimistic nuclear forecasts have served to delay needed expansion of coal production. Synthetic oil production from coal or shale is regrettably not on the immediate horizon. In the light of these considerations, there are three things which I feel must be done:

Continue to restrict our oil imports to a percentage of total production consistent with our national security;

Provide greater incentives for further U.S. exploration; and

Make better and more effective use of the resources we have.

On the first of these, the continued need for import restrictions, I will not say much. Since the right to import into a controlled market is valuable, it is to be expected that there will always be some disagreement about precisely who shall get what. I am not concerned with these issues here. Let me only say that we hope that this and succeeding administrations in Washington will succeed in developing an effective and workable, as well as an equitable program, one which is purged of the complexities and the special exceptions which disfigured it in the past.

On the question of incentives, I should like to be more specific. We have to believe there are significant quantities of oil waiting to be discovered in the United States. Successive studies by the Potential Gas Committee, the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Petroleum Council, and numerous individuals have all concluded that there is more oil and gas remaining in the United States than has so far been discovered. While we should certainly expand offshore exploration and give full attention to Alaska and any other "glamor queens of the oil patch" as Hollis Dole of the Department of the Interior has so aptly named them, we should not pass up prospects in the continental United States. To locate them, we must provide the incentives in the form of a profitable and stable investment climate to attract the money for exploration and development. In that way, we can at least begin to generate some of the billions needed to start the reserve/production ratio rising instead of going constantly down.

In this connection, the axiom that oil security is a national necessity carries with it the implication that we should be prepared to pay for it. No insurance policy comes without a premium. We should be willing to pay higher prices for our petroleum products if this is the only way in which the oil industry can raise sufficient funds to find and develop essential new reserves.

Finally, we must begin to make better use of the energy supplies we have, and of those we expect to find in the future. For many years now, we have used our energy reserves

prodigally simply because they were available, and because they were cheap. Now we can no longer take the continued availability of unlimited oil supplies for granted. We need much more research to determine how best we can conserve and use our energy supply. We must recognize the possibility that there may well be a need to reconcile our urgent environmental quality needs with those of our expanding demand for energy.

As a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas, I feel I can speak out strongly on this point for, indeed, conservation of energy has been the overriding concern of the Commission and without its activity—and that of similar bodies in other states—our reserves would be in a much more perilous state than they are.

Even with our Texas wells producing at or near their maximum efficient rates, I can assure you that conservation will remain a vital concern of the Commission. We shall still be concerned with the prevention of waste, the protection of correlative rights and with the proper utilization of reservoir energy. We shall also continue to be concerned with the whole range of environmental tasks to which we have attended long before the quality of the environment became a national issue—such as the disposal of produced salt water, limiting the flaring of gas at the wellhead and at gas plants, and the plugging of wells, and others.

I have spoken here today, both as a concerned American and as a conservationist, about what I think our future oil policies should be. The decisions we make in working out our national energy policy over the next decade will not be easy ones. Simply stated, we must meet a spiraling demand for petroleum products from dependable sources. Both our security and our future living standards will depend upon our success. This is our challenge. A challenge that will require a close cooperation and understanding if we are to meet it.

The Oil and Gas Industry, Independent, major, and all who comprise it, is truly one of the Great Industries, an industry built on vision and ingenuity.

Our government is comprised of intelligent men, whose concern for America is unquestioned.

Our petroleum-producing states and their regulatory agencies have acquired a wealth of technical know-how through years of experience.

With the understanding of each, and the cooperation and dedication of all, we can, and indeed we will, meet this challenge, just as Americans have met all other challenges which have threatened their country's security.

PLIGHT OF AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, all of the House Members interested in the plight of the sickest part of our economy, the most basic industry in this Nation—agriculture—are called to a caucus Monday afternoon here on the floor of the House.

It will be a unique caucus, Mr. Speaker, it will be bipartisan, both Republicans and Democrats alike, will participate in the caucus on the problems of rural America.

Three hours in special orders have been reserved, one each with Congress-

man NEAL SMITH, Congressman KEITH SEBELIUS, and myself to discuss the Nation's problems in agriculture, the rural economy, and life in the rural areas.

With dwindling numbers, American farmers and ranchers produce more food products than ever before in our history yet they are deeper in debt, older on the average, and being forced into liquidation in large numbers.

Where does it all lead? Family by family, farm people are driven from the rural areas to the urban areas. Land is swallowed into larger and larger farming units.

Increasing acreage is going into corporate farms. Smaller farming towns gradually decline and disappear. Businesses are closed. Then the economic shock waves move on to industrial centers, where the orders from the rural areas no longer arrive. Food is at an all time low in cost measured by disposable income—16 percent, an historic low. Farmers and ranchers who produce food in America receive only 5 percent of the Nation's disposable income for their products. The extent of the severe economic squeeze is reflected in the harsh fact that farm prices are at 68 percent of parity, lowest since 1933.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need to discuss these problems. We have asked a special order so that there will be time for all of us to participate in joint discussion of what can be done to improve the sick agriculture economy, to improve rural living and to stop the migration from farms and ranches and the small communities of America to our cities.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Let me briefly outline the nature of the bill I propose and then proceed to give my reasons for this legislation.

The present proposal is a revision of the one I offered several years ago, revised because debate in the other body made it obvious that there was concern about possible effects of a runoff election if no pair of candidates received 40 percent of the popular vote. Some feared the mechanical difficulties in setting up a runoff election; others that this would irrevocably and inevitably destroy the two-party system, encouraging a number of candidates to enter the field.

Accordingly, Senator BAYH and other distinguished Members of the other body agreed to revise their direct election proposal. I endorse this revision because I believe this moves us a step nearer passage of this vitally important legislation and that it will eliminate some of the opposition thereto.

The present bill provides that if no pair of candidates received 40 percent of the vote, but if the pair of candidates with the largest popular vote wins an electoral college majority, that pair of candidates would be elected President and Vice President. In this case, the votes are cast automatically under the unit rule on the basis of the popular outcome in each State. This is a purely mathematical computation based on the winner of the popular vote.

If no pair of candidates is selected under either of these alternatives, the final election would be made by the new Congress, meeting in special session. Each Member of both Houses would choose between the two pairs of candidates with the largest number of popular votes.

In addition, this bill anticipates the fact that another presidential election would occur before the 2-year implementation period of this legislation had passed. Thus, it provides that during that 2-year period only, the so-called automatic plan would be used. This is simply the present elector system, with one change, the independence of the elector would be removed as presidential electors would be required to vote for the person pledged to vote for.

I recognize this proposal sounds complex, but certainly it is no more complex and a great deal more reasonable and representative than the present electoral college system which a special commission of the American Bar Association has aptly described as "archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous, indirect, and dangerous." The present system is all of these things and more. This system has been the subject of suggestions for change since the first Congress convened in the spring of 1789 and the failure to change the system has been due largely to the inability to devise a system that would not endanger the balance of power among the States. Probably this system has been the subject of more proposed amendments than any other provision of the Constitution. It is about time we make the necessary change to insure that in this 20th century the people actually elect the man they choose: that the man who becomes President actually is the choice of the people.

I think it extremely important that this Congress finally act to amend the Constitution to allow the American people to elect the President and Vice President. It sounds ridiculous to suggest that we do not; yet that is the case. Originally, a small percentage of the American people, namely those who held property, were males and were freemen, were the only citizens who were allowed to vote in Federal elections, and all they could vote for was Members of the House of Representatives. Not until 1913 and the 17th amendment were the U.S. Senators also chosen by the American people.

As we all know, the electoral college was a compromise between those favoring and those opposing popular participation in the choice of the President. The early founders of this country were

democratic for their day and time, but certainly many of those participating in the Constitutional Convention—Thomas Jefferson was not there—shared Alexander Hamilton's fear of and disdain for popular participation in the governing Nation. Should we continue this attitude by perpetuating the electoral college system which removes the people from the actual choice of their President and Vice President?

Evidently the American people do not think so. The Harris and Gallup polls have shown that 78 percent and 81 percent, respectively, of the American people favor direct popular election. A number of national organizations, including the chamber of commerce, the American Bar Association, the AFL-CIO, the United Auto Workers, the League of Women Voters—have expressed their approval. It is time that we listened to the voice of the people who are asking for direct participation in all phases of the Government which is supposed to be theirs. This bill will show that we are, indeed, listening.

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Minnesota has raised its voice to join the growing chorus of anger and frustration with regard to the treatment of American prisoners of war by the Government of North Vietnam. On February 19, final action was taken on a joint Minnesota House and Senate resolution memorializing the Government of North Vietnam to provide fair treatment for prisoners of war and adequate information about men missing in action. Gov. Wendell Anderson approved the resolution.

Many of us in the Congress have sponsored resolutions calling attention to the plight of the POW's/MIA's, and it is an honor for me today to insert in the RECORD the text of the resolution from Minnesota as additional evidence of a national concern.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, nearly 1,600 members of the Armed Forces of the United States are officially listed either as missing in action or as prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, these men have suffered and continue to suffer pain, imprisonment, deprivation of their rights, prolonged separation from their loved ones, and the peculiar mental and physical anguish which is the unique lot of the prisoner of war; and

Whereas, their wives, children, parents and other relatives in the United States suffer with them the agony of separation and of loneliness; and

Whereas, these men have carried out, and continue to carry out their duties to their country in accordance with their military orders; and

Whereas, it is entirely just and in accord with humanitarian instincts that we, the American people, remember these men, cherish their contributions to our security, and

pray for their safety and their speedy return to their homes and families; and

Whereas, these gallant men have borne so great a burden and must not be forsaken and we pray to the God of Justice that their burden be lifted and that strength be given to strike the shackles that deny them freedom; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, that we call upon the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, Vietnam, and their allies, to:

Release the identification of all American servicemen who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia;

Provide them better treatment and inspection of their facilities by an impartial neutral commission;

Provide immediate repatriation of the sick and wounded;

Permit the right of free communication between prisoners and their families;

Live up, in all respects, to their commitments under the 1949 Geneva Convention on treatment of prisoners as they have signed an agreement to so do; and,

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota send a copy of this resolution to the President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, Vietnam.

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to Xuan Thuy, Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, 8 Avenue General Leclerc, 94 Choisey-le-Roe, Paris, France.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and members of the Minnesota Congressional Delegation with a request that copies of the resolution be inserted into the Congressional Record.

RIGHT TO VOTE FOR CITIZENS 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age, and older.

This joint resolution is similar to the measure which I offered in the last Congress, and which was bypassed in favor of legislative action intended to achieve the objectives of the proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution.

In view of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *State of Oregon versus Mitchell*, holding that the action taken in the last Congress is effective only with respect to Federal elections, I am now reintroducing a constitutional amendment to make this change effective likewise in State and local elections.

Mr. Speaker, it may not be necessary to reiterate the reasons for my support of voting rights in favor of citizens who are 18, 19, and 20 years of age. Nevertheless, I take occasion to point out that, of the some 10 million citizens within this age category, more than 5 million are employed and paying Federal and other taxes, an estimated 1 million are housewives and managing their own homes and families, and more than 750,000 are bearing arms. One of the most

persuasive arguments for extending the franchise to this age group was made by President Nixon in a campaign speech in 1968:

I am for the 18-year-old vote. The reason I think 18-year-olds should vote is that they would add to the interest in American elections, they would add to the quality of the debate—the younger generation today is better educated, it knows more about politics, more about the world, than many of the older people. That's why I want them to vote—not because they are old enough to fight, but because they are smart enough to vote.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that the proposed constitutional amendment could be effective for the 1972 elections. One principal reason for this hope is the laborious and expensive burden placed on election registrars, judges, and clerks throughout the Nation who are required, under present law, to maintain a separate system of registration for 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds. In order to assure a more expeditious ratification of the proposed constitutional amendment, I am recommending that this proposal should be ratified by State conventions as authorized in article V of the Federal Constitution. I should add that the State convention method was utilized in connection with the repeal of the 18th amendment, and the speed with which the ratification took place is an indication of the expeditious action that can occur when this mode of constitutional ratification is applied.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House Judiciary Committee will act promptly on this measure and that the House and the other body will pass this measure with the necessary two-thirds majorities in order that the people in State conventions can act promptly and wisely in ratifying this fundamental change in our law.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is a matter of the utmost urgency, and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House today and to join those other Members who are seeking a like result.

AMENDMENT TO THE SPORTS-TV BROADCAST LAW

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

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, along with my colleagues, Messrs. MEEDS, METCALFE, DORN, DUNCAN, NICHOLS, PICKLE, SISK, ADAMS, and KAZEN, to deal with the televising of professional football games on Friday nights and Saturdays in areas in which competing high school or college games are being played.

In July 1961, a U.S. District Court in Pennsylvania ruled that the Sherman Antitrust Act prohibited the member clubs of the NFL and AFL from entering into a "joint agreement" to pool their

television rights and sell them as a package to a TV network.

To meet this situation, Congress enacted an antitrust exemption for the televising of organized professional sports contests, Public Law 87-331, 15 U.S.C. 1291. However, the statute provided that the antitrust exemption shall not apply to a joint agreement which permits the telecast of a professional football game on any Friday after 6:00 p.m., or on any Saturday from the second Friday in September to the second Saturday in December from any television station within 75 miles of any college football game. This protection was extended to high schools in 1966, Public Law 89-900, when Congress amended the statute to permit the merger of the NFL and AFL.

During the 1966 hearings it was argued that telecasts arranged between individual professional football teams were not covered by the 1961 law. The Senate Judiciary Committee's report commented on these separately arranged telecasts as follows:

The committee views the practice of telecasting professional football games at those times traditionally used for the playing of high school and college games as a serious threat to scholastic athletic programs. The Committee intends to maintain a close scrutiny on this practice with a view of determining at a later date whether further legislation is necessary to circumscribe such a practice.

Whether the conflicting telecasts are arranged by the individual professional football teams independent of the leagues or under league auspices, the injury to high school and college athletic programs is real and substantial. Though many cases could be cited to document the damage caused by this competition, the following serve as examples.

On Saturday, October 8, 1966, the Pittsburgh-Cleveland game was televised in Pittsburgh. Athletic directors of colleges playing games on the same day in the area estimated the telecasts resulted in attendance losses ranging from 15 to 50 percent. More recently, on Friday, September 11, 1970, 18 high schools having games at the same time the Denver-Boston game was telecast in the Salt Lake City area reported attendance losses on an evening of perfect weather conditions.

In addition, it is felt the increased emphasis on the professional games will lessen the interest in high school and college football not only among the fans but also among the players and student bodies. In my view, amateur football cannot withstand this kind of competition.

Contrary to Professional Football Commissioner Mr. Pete Rozelle's verbal assurances to the Senate Judiciary Committee, there have been an increasing number of separately arranged conflicting regional telecasts.

During the 1970 season the following regional telecasts were in conflict with either or both high school and college games:

Day and date	Game	City, TV	Day and date	Game	City, TV
Friday, Sept. 11	Denver vs. Boston at Salt Lake City (many school games, including a home game at Boulder High School).	Denver (KOA-TV).		Atlanta at Miami (South Carolina at Georgia Tech.)	Atlanta (WAGA-TV).
	Minnesota at Chicago (several games played, including Bloomington-Lincoln at Edina).	Minneapolis (KSTP-TV).		Pittsburgh at Oakland	No telecast.
Saturday, Sept. 12	Kansas City at St. Louis (Washington State at Kansas).	Kansas City (KMPC-TV).	Friday, Sept. 18	San Francisco at Los Angeles (Santa Clara vs. St. Mary's at San Francisco).	San Francisco (KPIX-TV).
	Cleveland at New York Giants (4 high school games, including Parma Normandy at Lorain Southview).	Cleveland (WEWS-TV).		St. Louis at Los Angeles (Berkeley High School at Riverview High High School).	St. Louis (KMOX-TV).
	Washington at Baltimore (Villanova at Maryland).	Washington (WTOP-TV).	Saturday, Sept. 19	Chicago at New York Giants (Notre Dame at Northwestern).	Chicago (WBBM-TV).
	Detroit at Cincinnati (East Carolina at Toledo, Ohio).	Detroit (WJBK-TV).	Saturday, Oct. 3	Oakland at Miami (Purdue at Stanford).	San Francisco (KRON-TV).
				Pittsburgh at Cleveland (Kent State at Pittsburgh).	Pittsburgh (WIIC-TV).
			Saturday, Oct. 10	Miami at New York Jets (Jackson High School vs. Coral Park at Orange Bowl).	Miami (WCKT-TV).

These 13 telecasts represent over a 600-percent increase in the number of offending telecasts in the 1968 professional football season, and it seems to me that Congress should move to close the loophole in the existing statute. The proposed bill would do so.

LET US BUILD A STATUE OF KENNETH CRAWFORD

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington has, as you know, more statues per square foot than any other city in the world. But, I hope we can find one more niche somewhere in this city for a statue of Kenneth Crawford. He is entitled to it by virtue of a single column on the editorial page of the Washington Post of February 23.

He has written a frank and professional admission that the Nation's liberal press systematically deceives the reading public and gleefully trumpets every scrap of bad news about the war in Vietnam. I, personally, would ascribe a more hostile motive to these writers than does Mr. Crawford, but for the moment, I will be content that a writer of his stature has, at least, taken the first step to indict his companions in journalism.

Mr. Crawford's column is as follows:

HO CHI MINH AS HERO ON PRESS COVERAGE OF THE VIETNAM WAR

(By Kenneth Crawford)

How would the modern media have reported George Washington's crossing of the Delaware at McKonkey's Ferry on Christmas, 1776? J. Russell Wiggins, former editor of the Washington Post, asked this important question—and answered it—in a speech to the Washington Association of New Jersey on Washington's arbitrary new birthday, February 15.

Television camera men would have focused their zoom lenses on the rag-wrapped feet of Washington's troopers. When it was over, microphones would have been thrust under the noses of strapping recruits to catch their answers to the question: "How do you feel about some your buddies being lost in this sneaky operation?" The writing war correspondents would have salted their dispatches with suggestions that the whole bloody venture was ill-conceived by an incompetent

commander, ill-excused by a badly trained and equipped army and predestined to fail.

New York editorial writers would have followed up with lamentations about the plight of Trenton's civilian population, driven from its snug houses into the cold on a sacred holiday, caught in the crossfire between Hessian defenders and attacking colonials, and forced into a fight against its will over a questionable cause: something about taxation without representation. Washington, instead of attacking, should have been negotiating. His occupation of Trenton and quick withdrawal showed that he was still engaged in search-and-destroy operations—"following the will-o-the-wisp of military victory," as Wiggins thought the editorial writers would have put it.

Wiggins fantasy was, of course, a wry comment on the way the media of the 60s and the start of the 70s have dealt with the war in Vietnam. This war is the first in which American media, measured by weight of viewership, readership and influence, have been kinder to the nation's enemies than to its friends. This has been partly inadvertent, partly not. In any case, Ho Chi Minh has come off as this war's greatest hero, the Vietcong as its most admired fighters, American and South Vietnamese leaders as its most mistrusted participants, American GIs as its least appreciated warriors, especially since My Lai, which has been made the basis for unjust generalization, and South Vietnamese soldiers as invariably unreliable, also unjust.

All this is something new for Americans. They have always before tended to be home-team rooters. In British pubs Rommel may have been the favorite hero of the second world war but Americans stood by their own even when correspondents on the scene in North Africa intimated, insofar as intimation could be slipped through the censorship, that the "Darlan deal" and mistreatment of De Gaulle were compromising the morality of the allied war effort.

Wars have never been pretty but their ugliness has never before been conveyed to American households in living color, as it has this time, and always from our side because the other side is out of reach of cameras and correspondents. But it is more than that. War correspondents have often been instant experts and critics and they seem even more so this time. They have to be youthful to stand the physical rigors and brave to take the chances they must run in Vietnam. More than 30 of them have been killed. They are admirable in action but sometimes wrong in their strategic and tactical judgments and simplistic in their politics.

Prize committees, Pulitzer included, have rewarded the most captious. The self-styled "cowboys" who constituted themselves a sort of get-rid-of-Diem committee in the early days of the war made a point of being on

hand for every bonze immolation and of representing the Saigon disorders as a sort of holy war between the ruling Catholics and the subject Buddhists. Reputations were forged in the bronze fires.

Here in Washington, too, there has been a lively journalistic contest to be first with the worst. One of its high points was The New York Times revelation in the aftermath of the Tet attacks that the military was asking for 206,000 more troops to take advantage of the enemy's overextension. Coming, as it did, two days before the New Hampshire primary, the Times report had enormous political impact. It almost certainly contributed to the big McCarthy vote and, in turn, to President Johnson's subsequential decision not to run again.

The genesis of the expose, if that is what it was, has just been publicly revealed for the first time by Philip Potter, Washington Bureau Chief of the Baltimore Sun. It was leaked to the Times by Townsend Hoopes, then a Pentagon official of dovish persuasion. Actually, the plan Hoopes made available to the Times was one of the alternatives under consideration and one which had little chance for Presidential approval in the Washington atmosphere of post-Tet distress. Hoopes had to violate a specific presidential order of secrecy pending decision to spring the leak.

Things haven't changed much, as the suspicious reporting of the South Vietnamese effort to cut the Ho Chi Minh trails in Laos demonstrates. By part of the press it is treated as a cunning scheme to inject Americans into an expanded war rather than what it is, a bold attempt to prepare for continued evacuation of American forces. Reporters and editors keep telling themselves and others that they have been more perceptive about this war than have military and political leaders. They may be right. But they have enjoyed the advantage of ultimate irresponsibility. In President Nixon's place, they would probably be doing about what he is doing. And history may be more approving of him than of them.

LET FREEDOM WORK

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 3, 1970, the Boulder Daily Camera carried an editorial entitled "Let Freedom Work." On February 15, 1971, the editorial was selected by Freedoms Foundation for the Distinguished Service Award.

As I told Mr. James D. Corriell, the editor of the Daily Camera's editorial

page, the article shows the importance of history and our heritage in relation to many of the ills currently besetting us and in relation to our future. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the award winning editorial in the RECORD so that all Members of the House may have the opportunity to read it.

LET FREEDOM WORK

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Following is the Daily Camera editorial, published July 3, 1970, which was selected by Freedoms Foundation for the Distinguished Service Award and a \$100 check for James D. Corriell, editor of the editorial page. The awards were announced officially at Valley Forge, Pa., today.)

Among many sophisticates today it is considered smart to downgrade America and scoff at those who are unashamed to show their patriotism. The more radical ones condemn that ambiguous thing they call the "Establishment" and retreat to their own imaginary little world of "1984," where peace is rioting, destruction is revolution, freedom is license.

They quote the nations' Founders to justify their twisted views and their anti-social actions.

In the face of this assault on the foundations of our country, it is well for us to take stock of the facts.

The Founders were indeed radicals—in the classical sense. And in that sense, the radical does not tear everything up by the roots but rather gets at the root of problems, where causes may be found and corrected.

The trouble in the colonies was rooted in tyranny exercised by a government too far across the Atlantic to sense the rights and aspirations of the people in America.

The leaders did not try to destroy the "system"—with no alternative to offer. They tried first to gain conciliation with the mother country, and they tolled at the effort diligently for years.

When the power structure across the sea refused to listen, the natural course for the colonial freedom was to declare their independence. Tomorrow the nation celebrates the anniversary of that declaration.

The colonial leaders believed that "men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." And later the Founders wrote that concept into the Constitution for the new nation, the rulership of which was based on consent of the governed.

The Founders had no visions of Utopia, as some of our modern "revolutionaries" entertain. The framers of the American concept of freedom merely opened the way to the pursuit of happiness, possible only where life and freedom are recognized and protected as fundamental rights.

They didn't map the course of the nation. They did draw up a set of natural principles and demonstrated truths under which the people in each generation could map their own course—under freedom.

The Founders had no notion of dictating the details of citizens' lives, but expressed the faith that an informed, free people, assuming the responsibilities of freedom, would be intelligent enough to rule themselves and find their own way.

In fact, the framers of our government made sure that no elite class, no privileged caste, not even the government itself, could arbitrarily dictate or intrude. A Bill of Rights was appended to the Constitution to spell out the basic rights of free speech, press and religion; the right of peaceful assembly and appeal for the redress of grievances; the right of equal justice under law that binds government as well as citizens; the right of privacy and freedom from unwarranted official interference in personal affairs.

And other rights were implied: the right

to protection by government and to the service of government as a referee in disputes; the right to own, use and enjoy property and the right to expect reasonable award for one's labor; the right of free choice—in the voting booth, marketplace, farm and workshop; the right to trade goods and services by bargaining; the right to think, dream, invent, build.

On this foundation of freedom America grew to greatness materially and morally. The dynamic power of millions of individual free men, working for themselves and for their combined interests, brought national progress unmatched in history. And because each person was free to develop to the limits of his aspirations and abilities, the character of the people took on a unique strength.

As this heritage was passed down from generation to generation it blossomed and bore even better fruit.

But when people tended to take their blessings for granted and neglected to replant after the harvest, the weeds of cynicism began to choke the freedom ethic. The troubles of today are largely the product of neglect—neglecting to keep the sinews of freedom strong by exercise and neglecting the vital job of handing down intact and complete our heritage to each new generation.

Like muscle, freedom is powerful when rightly exercised, flabby when misused or untrained.

The Founders' Declaration of Independence was a declaration of responsibility and integrity.

Do we not need today a new declaration of integrity and responsibility in the same spirit? Without them freedom falters. With them there is no greater force for human good.

Without those qualities faith sickens and cynicism devours hope. The system looks wrong.

Our problem is not in the system but in ourselves.

Built into the American concept of freedom, teamed with responsibility, is the means for orderly correction of its own faults—thereby preserving the good that has grown out of the past and embracing the good yet to be created.

Re-declare our responsibility and our faith, and watch freedom work!

LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT MAILING OF UNSOLICITED SAMPLES OF CIGARETTES

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited samples of cigarettes. The 91st Congress acted to ban the use of radio and television time by cigarette advertisers.

The Government has stated that cigarette smoking is harmful to health. The Surgeon General's warning that cigarette smoking is dangerous is on every pack of cigarettes.

Yet, the U.S. Post Office continues to be used as an agent for the cigarette industry. It is an unhealthy and unsound practice.

It is ludicrous that while the Congress and the Surgeon General have taken actions based on the conclusion that cigarette smoking is dangerous, and have prohibited advertising cigarettes on radio and television, the U.S. Post Office continues to assist that industry in obtaining greater sales.

My bill is not at all complicated. It has a single and simple purpose. I hope that we can have expeditious hearings on it and halt the use of our mails for sending of unsolicited cigarette samples.

THE EMERGENCY COMMUTER RELIEF ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Emergency Commuter Relief Act of 1971, a bill which would provide subsidies on a short-term basis to State and local governments to assure adequate urban mass transportation. Emergency grants for the purpose of assisting mass transit systems in paying interest charges and other annual obligations which have been incurred in order to provide essential services would also be provided by my legislation.

Although the Urban Mass Transportation Act, which was signed into law October 15, 1970—Public Law 91-453—will provide many long-range answers to our Nation's urban transit crisis, it does not provide any of the immediate relief which is so desperately needed now in our urban areas.

This legislation, which has been introduced in the Senate (S. 870) by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey and Senator PERCY of Illinois, would enable existing commuter services to stay in service until the large sums of money authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act begin to reach State and local mass transportation agencies. If funds are not provided during this interim period, some of our bankrupt railroads may stop moving entirely because they cannot earn sufficient moneys to meet their payroll. Mr. Speaker, this is not a case where, because of our urgent needs in Chicago, we come to the Federal Government, because the local communities are not doing their part. For, up until now, the burden of maintaining these essential commuter services, has fallen entirely upon the State and local government and their inadequate tax sources. The cities, already pressed to financial limits, cannot afford to carry the burden alone. I believe, they now are doing more than their fair share.

The situation has become critical. The Penn Central is bankrupt. The State of New York now owns the Long Island Railroad and Massachusetts has taken over the operation of the commuter lines formally serviced by the Boston and Maine. In my own city, the Chicago Transit Authority has been forced to raise its fares twice within the past year, to a level of 45 cents. At the same time, the CTA faces indebtedness of more than \$20 million annually, primarily as a result of its having to pay interest on equipment bonds and to lay funds aside to retire the principal on such obligations. Moreover, it must contribute to a depreciation account to meet future needs.

This legislation would prevent these crises from occurring. Under the Emergency Commuter Relief Act, \$75 million a year for operating subsidies would be

made available on a 5-year emergency basis to all forms of mass transportation. They would be channeled to State and other public bodies.

Before approving the grant which would be made on a two-thirds Federal, one-third local matching formula, the Secretary of Transportation would have to determine that the services were essential to the community. In addition, the State or public body applying for the grant along with the transit company involved must first submit a plan to the Secretary setting forth a program of capital improvements to be undertaken for the purpose of providing more efficient and economic service and for placing the commuter operations of the systems on a sound financial basis. These safeguards would guard against windfall profits by private promoters and would provide adequate insurance that the operating subsidy will not pay for existing inefficiency and poor service.

Transportation systems are too vital a part of the continued healthy growth of urban centers for their future operations to be governed solely by their ability to show a profit. Return on investment cannot and must not outweigh the social dividends which all of our citizens receive from good public transportation. Therefore, this legislation also contains provisions which allow the Secretary to make emergency grants to pay interest charges and other annual obligations which have been incurred by transit systems in order to provide essential services. The legislation would provide \$75 million a year for 5 years for these grants.

Such grants would be made only when the debt burden threatens the curtailment of needed commuter services or would increase fares to such a degree that low-income groups who use the service are unfairly penalized.

An increase in transit fares or a curtailment of transit services works undue hardships on citizens earning less than \$4,000 a year. As industry and business move to the suburbs, the tragic isolation of the inner city ghetto increases. Here is the most pressing need for low cost, efficient mass transit systems to take people to the jobs they so desperately demand. An increase in transit fares or a curtailment of service works undue hardships on these citizens.

The debt servicing provisions of this legislation would allow transit lines to continue to provide their essential services without the fare increases which all too frequently penalize the inner city dweller.

If existing commuter lines are allowed to collapse from financial weakness, severe hardships will result. The thousands of commuters who depend on these services to get them to and from work will be left stranded. And, in addition, these commuter lines will be far more costly to rebuild in the future than to preserve today.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the administration might consider this patchwork legislation, and, in a sense it is. I, too, would like to see a comprehensive approach to the whole question of urban mass transit and look forward, with great anticipation, to viewing the administra-

tion plans in this area. But, I must stress that help is needed now.

This bill can provide the necessary short-term Federal assistance to ease the financial burden of maintaining adequate public transportation which presently weighs heavily on the cities of this Nation.

A full text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Commuter Emergency Relief Act."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds—

- (1) that over 70 per centum of the Nation's population lives in urban areas;
- (2) that transportation is the lifeblood of an urbanized society and the health and welfare of that society depends upon the provision of efficient, economical, and convenient transportation within and between its urban areas;
- (3) that for many years the mass transportation industry satisfied the transportation needs of the urban areas of the country capably and profitably;
- (4) that in recent years the maintenance of even minimal mass transportation service in urban areas has become so financially burdensome as to threaten the continuation of this essential public service;
- (5) that the termination of such service or the continued increase in its cost to the user is undesirable, and may have a particularly serious adverse effect upon the welfare of a substantial number of lower income persons;
- (6) that some urban areas are now engaged in developing preliminary plans for, or are actually carrying out, comprehensive projects to revitalize their mass transportation operations; and
- (7) that immediate substantial Federal assistance is needed on an interim basis to enable many mass transportation systems to continue to provide vital service during the period required to overhaul and revitalize mass transportation operations and to place such operations on a sound financial basis.

EMERGENCY GRANTS TO PAY INDEBTEDNESS

SEC. 3. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended—

- (1) by redesignating sections 6 through 16 as sections 8 through 18, respectively; and
- (2) by inserting after section 5 a new section as follows:

"EMERGENCY GRANTS TO MAKE ANNUAL DEBT PAYMENTS

"SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof to assist in paying the yearly interest on and discharging annual obligations on securities, equipment trust certificates, or other similar instruments of indebtedness which have been incurred in the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, and leasing (exclusive of any charge for operation or maintenance) of facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas. A grant may not be made under this subsection unless the Secretary determines that it is essential to prevent (1) the termination of a significant part of the transportation service for a community, or (2) the occurrence of a serious adverse effect upon the welfare of a substantial number of lower income persons who are dependent upon the

transportation service of such community. The amount of any grant made by the Secretary under this subsection shall not exceed twice the amount provided by the grant applicant (from other sources than current revenues of a mass transportation system) for use in paying such interest or obligations during the year in which the grant is made.

"(b) To finance grants under subsection (a) of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$75,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, and 1976. Any amount appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, and any amount so authorized but not appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year."

INTERIM ASSISTANCE TO ASSURE ADEQUATE MASS TRANSPORTATION SERVICE IN URBAN AREAS

SEC. 4. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after section 6 (added by section 3 of this Act) a new section as follows:

"INTERIM ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 7. (a) For the purpose of providing interim assistance to assure adequate mass transportation service in urban areas, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State or local public body or agency thereof to enable it to assist any mass transportation system which maintains mass transportation service in an urban area within its jurisdiction to defray annual net operating deficits incurred as the result of providing such service to such areas. No grant shall be provided under this section unless (1) the Secretary determines that the mass transportation services provided by the system involved are needed for carrying out a program referred to in section 4(a), and (2) the applicant State, public body, or agency, and the operator (if a different entity) of such system, have jointly submitted to the Secretary a comprehensive mass transportation service improvement plan which is approved by him and which sets forth a program, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for capital or service improvements to be undertaken for the purpose of providing more efficient, economical, and convenient mass transportation service in an urban area, and for placing the mass transportation operations of such system on a sound financial basis.

"(b) The amount of any grant under this section to a State or local public body or agency thereof to defray the operating deficit of any mass transportation system shall not exceed twice the amount of financial assistance provided by such State, public body, or agency to such system to defray such deficit.

"(c) The Secretary shall issue such regulations as he deems necessary to administer this section in an equitable and efficient manner. Such regulations shall include appropriate definitions of (1) the items of cost and revenue to be used in determining annual net operating deficits, and (2) the sources or types of State or local financial assistance which may be considered in computing the maximum allowable Federal grant.

"(d) To finance grants under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$75,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, and 1976. Any amount so appropriated shall remain available until expended, and any amount so authorized but not appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year. The Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, to make advance or progress payments on account of any grant made pursuant to this section.

"(e) The Secretary shall conduct a study of the operation of the subsidy program authorized by this section comparing it with other operating subsidy programs including

those currently carried out by the Federal Government, with a view to determine the efficacy of such program in assuring adequate mass transportation service in urban areas. The Secretary shall submit an interim report of his findings not later than June 30, 1972, and a final report of such findings and recommendations not later than June 30, 1974.

"(f) No grants shall be made under this section after June 30, 1976, except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to such date."

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) The following sections of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) are amended as follows:

(1) Section 3(b) is amended by striking out "section 7" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 9".

(2) Section 4(c) is amended by striking out "7(b), and 9" and "section 12(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "9(b), and 11" and "section 14(d)", respectively.

(3) Section 14(c) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (4);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(C) by adding after clause (5) the following new clauses:

"(6) the term 'mass transportation system' means any private company or public authority or agency providing mass transportation service; and

"(7) the term 'annual net operating deficit' means that part of the annual operating costs of a mass transportation system which could reasonably have been avoided by the elimination of all or part of the mass transportation service in an urban area, less the annual revenues derived by such system from the provision of such service."

(4) Section 14(d) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "No funds appropriated pursuant to section 4(b) may be used for grants made pursuant to section 6 or 7. Grant assistance provided under any section of this Act shall be coordinated to the greatest extent practicable with any other financial assistance provided under this Act. With the specific exception of the prohibition contained in section 3(c), the extension of financial assistance to a State or local public body or agency thereof under any section of this Act shall not have the effect of prohibiting the extension of financial assistance to such entity pursuant to any other section of this Act."

(5) The first sentence of section 15(c) is amended by striking out "section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3, 6, 7, or 8".

(6) The part of the first sentence of section 17 which precedes the first semicolon is amended to read as follows: "Grants made under section 3 (before July 1, 1970) and grants made under section 6 or 7 of this Act (other than for relocation payments in accordance with section 9(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 12½ per centum of the aggregate amount of grant funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to sections 4(b), 6(b), and 7(c), respectively".

(7) Section 3(e) is amended by striking out "section 13(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 15(c)".

(b)(1) Section 10 of the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970 is amended by striking out "and 6" and inserting in lieu thereof "and 8".

(2) Section 11 of such Act is amended by striking out "6(a), 9, and 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "8(a), 11, and 13".

REFORMING GOVERNMENT OIL POLICY

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today two bills to reform Government oil policies and provide substantial relief to American consumers which I am proud to say are cosponsored by 83 of my colleagues from 21 States across the Nation. A list of cosponsors is included at the close of my remarks.

The first of these bills would eliminate oil import quotas which cost U.S. consumers more than \$5 billion annually. The second would put an end to Federal sanction of oil production controls in Texas and Louisiana which artificially hold down supply, and thus also serve to maintain unduly high prices.

In May of 1969, I introduced with 53 cosponsors the first bill to eliminate oil quotas gradually over a 10-year period. Since then, the President's own Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control has found the quotas unnecessary for national security, and urged their abolition in favor of a tariff system which would lower consumer prices. The bill introduced today with 31 new cosponsors would end the quotas outright by January 1, 1972, and permit the substitution of a tariff system.

I am gratified by this increased support for more immediate action. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced it is a good barometer of the growing demands to end unjustified special privileges for the oil industry and, more importantly, to combat inflation and relieve our hard-pressed consumers.

In view of the concern about the impact of the recent Persian Gulf oil price agreement, it should be noted that only 3 percent of the U.S. oil has come from the Middle East. And the oil task force has recommended a higher tariff for this oil to prevent undue reliance on this source. Such a step would be entirely consistent with my legislation.

My second bill, Mr. Speaker, would end State production controls, or prorationing, by repealing the so-called Connally "Hot Oil" Act. Without the Connally act, this prorationing would be unlawful as an unconstitutional interference with interstate commerce—a field left to the exclusive control of the Congress.

President Nixon has already spoken out against State prorationing in his speech before the National Association of Manufacturers on December 10, 1969. In announcing the end of limits on Federal off-shore oil production in voluntary compliance with state prorationing, the President said these controls "are not necessary for national security; moreover, they actually interfere with the freedom of our domestic market system."

Taken together these two bills will go a long way toward developing a sound Government oil policy which will at the same time provide needed consumer relief.

The list of cosponsors follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS OF CONTE BILLS ON GOVERNMENT OIL POLICIES

Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, and Mr. Carey.

Mr. Celler, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Clay, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Dow, and Mr. Drinan.

Mr. Dulski, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Fish, Mr. William D. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gaijmo, Mr. Gibbons, Mrs. Grasso, and Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hawkins, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, Mr. Horton, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jacobs, and Mr. Kastenmeier.

Mr. Keith, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Koch, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Minish, and Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nix, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Podell, Mr. Rees, Mr. Reid of New York, and Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Robison, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Roe, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roybal, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Smith of New York, Mr. Stafford, and Mr. Steele.

Mr. Stokes, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Vanik, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Wydler, Mr. Wyman, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Ryan, and Mr. Pike.

SUPPORT FOR ATLANTIC UNION GROWS

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Atlantic Union Resolution with 12 additional cosponsors. They are: BROCK ADAMS, Democrat, of Washington; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota; THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Democrat, of New York; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland; HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat, of Texas; CHARLES S. GUBSER, Republican, of California; CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR., Republican, of New Jersey; FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Democrat, of Kentucky; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey; and JOHN W. WYDLER, Republican, of New York.

This important resolution was first introduced in the 92d Congress on February 17, 1971, with 71 cosponsors. The additional Representatives who are today listed as cosponsors bring the total to 83.

Since Clarence Streit first published his book, "Union Now," over 30 years ago, much comment has been generated in the press about Atlantic Union. I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of many recent editorials endorsing this bold initiative, this one from the Cincinnati Enquirer. The editorial cites President Nixon's long and vocal support for Atlantic Union, support which dates back long before he entered the White House, first as Vice President, and now as President.

That support continues to this day.

Text of editorial follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Nov. 16, 1970]

THE ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

With the Nation settling down after the exertions of the hotly fought series of Congressional and gubernatorial elections, the sponsors of the Atlantic Union Resolution are seeking once more to muster nationwide support, including a reiteration of the endorsement Mr. Nixon sent to the House Foreign Affairs Committee four years ago.

The Atlantic Union Resolution calls upon Congress to elect delegates to an Atlantic Union convention, which would be composed of similar delegations from other nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The projected convention would explore the prospects of converting the North Atlantic alliance into a federal Union. Any plan devised by the convention would thereafter be submitted to Congress for action in accordance with constitutional procedures.

In the years since the first Atlantic Union Resolution was presented to Congress, it has won the endorsement of a wide range of U.S. political figures—President Eisenhower, former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Senator Barry M. Goldwater, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

But few of its supporters have been more outspoken than Mr. Nixon. In his 1966 statement of support, he declared: "It is fitting that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations.

"Although the accomplishment of the ultimate goal of the resolution may well be impossible to attain for many years, recent events of history and numerous scientific and technological advances of the past 20 years point the way in this direction. . . . The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us."

The Atlantic Union Resolution had its origins in the days before World War II when the failure of the Western powers to work together to stave off German and Italian aggression made a worldwide conflagration inevitable. Clarence K. Streit, who served at the time as a League of Nations correspondent, was struck by the parallels between the Western democracies in the 1930s and the free states of North America in the years between the end of the American Revolution and the eventual adoption of the Constitution.

The answer for the discordant and frequently feuding states was a federal union under the Constitution. Mr. Streit saw a similar answer for the Western democracies. His first book on the subject was *Union Now*, which proposed an immediate union of the Western states to forestall World War II.

The postwar era, as matters turned out, brought even stiffer challenges to the nations of the North Atlantic. One response was the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty, which bound the nations of the Atlantic community together in a mutual-defense arrangement.

The Atlantic Union Resolution is a proposal that the NATO nations now go a step farther to determine the feasibility of a closer concert.

The House sponsors of the Atlantic Union Resolution include representatives of both parties. The Ohio House delegation is represented among the sponsors by Reps. Donald (Buz) Lukens and J. William Stanton, both Republicans, and Reps. Thomas Ashley and Charles Vanik, Democrats.

The federal union idea is said to be America's most distinctive contribution to the realm of political philosophy. It is logical, we believe, that the nations of the Atlantic community should ask themselves whether it holds an answer for the world of the late 20th century.

THE RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased and honored today to reintroduce the Rural Job Development Act, a bill that has already been introduced in the Senate by my good friend and colleague, Senator JIM PEARSON, and 48 of his distinguished colleagues in the Senate.

I am most gratified to reintroduce this legislation with 40 cosponsors. Those Representatives who have joined in cosponsoring the Rural Job Development Act of 1971 are: Mr. JAMES S. ABOUZEK of South Dakota, Mr. BILL ALEXANDER of Arkansas, Mr. MARK ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BILL ARCHER of Texas, Mr. JOHN N. CAMP of Oklahoma, Mr. W. C. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON of Alabama, Mr. HAROLD D. DONOHUE of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHN J. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BILL FRENZEL of Minnesota, Mr. DON FUQUA of Florida, Mr. SEYMOUR HALPERN of New York, Mr. ORVAL HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MICHAEL HARRINGTON of Massachusetts, Mr. JAMES F. HASTINGS of New York, Mr. EDWARD HUTCHINSON of Michigan, Mr. ED JONES of Tennessee, Mr. PETER N. KYROS of Maine, Mr. ARTHUR A. LINK of North Dakota, Mr. MANUEL LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. JAMES R. MANN of South Carolina, Mr. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI of Kentucky, Mr. JAMES A. MCLURE of Idaho, Mr. JOHN MELCHER of Montana, Mr. CLARENCE E. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. WILMER MIZELL of North Carolina, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BILL NICHOLS of Alabama, Mr. WILLIAM R. ROY of Kansas, Mr. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE of Iowa, Mr. GARNER SHRIVER of Kansas, Mr. ROBERT L. SIKES of Florida, Mr. ROBERT H. STEELE of Connecticut, Mr. CHARLES THONE of Nebraska, Mr. AL ULLMAN of Oregon, Mr. VICTOR V. VESEY of California, Mr. RICHARD C. WHITE of Texas, Mr. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania, Mr. JIM WRIGHT of Texas, and Mr. JOHN M. ZWACH of Minnesota.

This legislation in essence would encourage job-creating industries in our rural areas. In brief, the bill would work as follows:

A series of tax incentives—a 7-percent tax credit on personal property, a 7-percent tax credit on real property, an accelerated depreciation allowance, and a 50-percent tax deduction on wages paid workers given on-the-job training—would be offered to industrial and commercial enterprises locating in counties designated as "rural job development areas." Rural job development areas are counties which have no city of over 50,000 population and where at least 15 percent of the families have incomes of less than \$3,000. Indian reservations are also included. To be eligible, the enterprise must hire at least 10 people and wherever possible must hire at least 50 percent of the work force from the local area. The bill contains a prohibition against "runaway" firms and recapture provisions for those firms which willfully violate the terms of the program.

I would like to stress one particular point regarding this legislation. The objectives of the Rural Job Development Act are truly in the best interests of our entire Nation. This bill should and can be an integral part of our growing commitment to deal with our Nation's urban crisis.

In introducing this bill, I take great pride in pointing out to my colleagues the dedication and tireless efforts of the senior Senator from Kansas to revitalize rural and small town America.

Senator PEARSON, in an earlier statement, has skillfully and succinctly discussed this legislation and its intent. I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of all who are vitally interested in helping to revitalize rural and smalltown America and help our Nation achieve a healthy and proper rural and urban balance:

S. 346—INTRODUCTION OF THE RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT ACT

The bill I introduce would encourage the development of new job-creating industries in rural areas, thus serving to expand the economic base and more fully and effectively utilize the human and natural resources of our rural communities. The resulting expansion of economic opportunity and thus help to reduce the population pressures of our overcrowded and overburdened metropolitan areas.

Providing a judicious blend of private initiative and public responsibility—the bill, in brief summary, would work as follows:

A series of tax incentives—a 7-percent tax credit on personal property, a 7-percent tax credit on real property, an accelerated depreciation allowance, and a 50-percent tax credit on real property, an accelerated depreciation allowance, and a 50-percent tax deduction on wages paid workers given on-the-job training—would be offered to industrial and commercial enterprises locating in counties designated as "rural job development areas." Rural job development areas are counties which have no city of over 50,000 population and where at least 15 percent of the families have incomes of less than \$3,000. Indian reservations are also included. To be eligible the enterprise must hire at least 10 people and wherever possible must hire at least 50 percent of the work force from the local area. The bill contains a prohibition against "runaway" firms and recapture provisions for those firms which willfully violate the terms of the program.

Mr. President, the bill introduced today is essentially the same as the Rural Job Development Act of 1969.

The principle of using tax incentives for the purpose of bringing new business and industry into our rural communities also has been endorsed by a wide variety of groups and individuals around the country.

Mr. President, the support for the Rural Job Development Act is but one manifestation of the great interest in the overall theme of rural development, which has also been variously referred to as rural revitalization, rural urban balance, balanced urbanization, and balanced national growth. But whatever label we use we are all talking about the urgent necessity of expanding economic and social opportunities in our smaller communities.

As we all know, major portions of rural America are economically underdeveloped and lacking in the full range of public services. Millions of people each year are forced to leave our smaller communities because of the lack of economic opportunities there. These conditions in and of themselves justify and, indeed, demand major new efforts to improve and expand economic and social opportunities available in rural communities.

But the objectives of the rural development movement are truly national, not sectional. For, in fact, the rural development movement represents a new and vital part of our growing effort to deal with the crisis of the cities.

We have finally been forced to recognize that many of the problems which constitute the crisis of the cities can be traced to the overcrowding of people and the excessive concentration of industry. Thus the rural development movement, which ultimately seeks to slow down the great rural-to-urban migration, if successful, will be of benefit not only to our rural communities but to our cities as well.

We are coming to realize that rural development is not simply a desirable objective but, indeed, a national necessity.

Mr. President, many of our old notions about urbanization and rural migration simply are no longer valid.

Into the cities have come the unskilled rural poor attracted by the lure of economic advancement. Many gain, but a tragically high number do not. Instead of economic salvation too many of the rural poor, both white and black, find tenements, unemployment, welfare, and the depersonalized, demoralized environment of the slum-ghetto.

Into the cities also come the young, the educated, and the talented. They often do much better materially, but for this economic gain they pay the social costs of the loneliness of the crowd, the frustrations of congested streets and crowded stores, the stultifying sameness of the bedroom suburbs and the loss of community identity.

Into the cities comes industry and for the most part it has prospered. But increasing numbers are now finding that the cost of doing business in the city is unprofitably high.

And as the urban resident breathes the fouled air of industrial smog, he comes to understand the hazards as well as the benefits of industrial concentration.

In short, too many of our rural communities are underdeveloped. Too many of our metropolitan areas are over crowded. This maldistribution of population and economic activity will surely worsen, unless we take strong, positive, action.

The task ahead is clear. We must expand the quantity and quality of economic and social opportunities in rural America so that those who choose to do so will have the freedom to remain where they are and not be forced to move to the already overcrowded and overburdened metropolitan areas.

This task will not be easily or quickly accomplished. And we do not yet fully know all the needs which must be met nor all the policy alternatives which must be considered. But I think it is clear to all that new jobs lie at the heart of the rural development effort. For unless we can create upwards of 1 million new and better jobs each year in our rural communities, nothing else we will do will have any meaningful or lasting effect.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today aims precisely at this goal of creating new jobs. It applies a proven principle to a particular need. The principle is that tax policy does in fact influence the course of business investment. The particular need is that special incentives are necessary to encourage a substantial increase of private investment in rural areas in order to overcome some of the factors which otherwise discourage business expansion into these areas. The tax incentives provided by this bill are as follows:

First, a 7-percent tax credit on personal-machinery and equipment—and real property—land and buildings. And if the rural job development area has a population density of less than 25 persons per square mile—the national average is 51—the credit is increased to 10 percent. This incentive recognizes that the normal factors which often

work against expanded rural investment are magnified in the more sparsely populated areas. These areas are often quite far removed from major industrial and commercial centers thus adding to transportation costs for example. Certainly we believe that these additional incentives are consistent with the objective of promoting the maximum feasible geographical distribution of new job-creating industries.

Second, an accelerated depreciation of two-thirds of normal, useful, or class life for machinery, equipment, and buildings;

Third, a tax deduction equal to 50 percent of the wages paid to workers for whom the enterprise must provide on-the-job training.

This special deduction, which would be in effect during the training period, is intended to encourage the enterprise to hire and train local people who lack the required labor skills. The U.S. Employment Service would certify the length of the training period.

Fourth, all credits and deductions can be carried backward 3 years or forward for a maximum of 10 years, or if the business is a corporate subsidiary, utilized against other outside income of the parent corporation.

Business enterprises would receive these tax benefits under the following conditions:

First, the enterprise must be located in a "rural job development area" designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and defined as follows: A county, no part of which contains a standard metropolitan statistical area and which has no city with a population in excess of 50,000, and where at least 15 percent of the families have incomes under \$3,000 or where employment has declined at a rate of more than 5 percent during the previous 5-year period; or where the closing or curtailing of operations of an installation of the Department of Defense is likely to cause a substantial migration of persons residing in the area. The Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with the Secretary of the Interior may also certify Indian reservations.

Second, to receive an eligibility certificate, the enterprise must demonstrate that it has not discontinued a comparable enterprise in any other area and will not reduce the employment in any other area.

Third, the enterprise must create at least 10 new jobs at the beginning of the operation.

Fourth, to assure benefits to a local community, at least 50 percent of the original working force must be residents of the rural job development area. However, the Secretary can waive this requirement if the labor requirements of the enterprise exceed the local labor supply, and if the Secretary determines that the establishment of the enterprise in the area will promote economic benefits consistent with the purposes of this act.

Fifth, to continue to qualify, the enterprise must maintain the same working force unless circumstances beyond its control prevent it from doing so. The bill also provides an effective recapture provision in those areas where a firm willfully violates the eligibility requirements.

Sixth, before the enterprise is given an eligibility certificate, the Secretary must have written notice from the local governmental unit responsible for zoning requirements to the effect that the proposed enterprise meets the existing regulations and that there are no immediate plans for altering those regulations. This will assure that the local community is aware that the enterprise anticipates locating there, thus giving the community a chance to prevent the move should it choose to do so.

Seventh, the enterprise must be engaged in industrial or commercial production—manufacturing, producing, processing, assembling, wholesale operations, or the construction of buildings and facilities in the authorized area. This precludes benefits to

retail and service enterprises which might be competitive with local establishments. Recreational enterprises may be certified provided they would not be competitive with existing enterprises in the area.

Mr. President, in addition to the tax incentives the bill would authorize \$500,000 for the Department of Agriculture so that the Secretary may collect and disseminate relevant economic data and to serve as an information clearing house for local communities and businesses considering establishing job-creating enterprises in job development areas.

Mr. President, as indicated, this bill would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. It may well be that this provision should be changed. Quite possibly it would be better to vest this authority elsewhere, possibly in the Secretary of Commerce. This is one of the points that certainly should be discussed in committee. The administration's view on this would be particularly important.

There are also other parts of the bill which are subject to debate. For my own part, I am not wedded to each and every provision. I fully recognize that adjustments may be necessary in several areas. However, I do believe very strongly in the basic principles of this bill.

Mr. President, the tax incentive approach is based on the proposition that the new economic activity which will thereby be generated will bring broad economic gains to the whole rural community.

This is not a reversion to the old dogma that whatever is good for business necessarily has to be good for the country. Rather it is a pragmatic recognition, on the one hand, that government cannot do everything and, on the other hand, an acceptance of the fact that through a more judicious stimulus and control of the private sector we can see many of our economic and social problems.

Mr. President, it is also important to note that most rural areas, not just the poverty-stricken ones, would be covered under the area eligibility definitions of the bill.

This follows from the fact that the purpose of this bill is to encourage rural development in general. Thus we wanted to make sure that it would be broadly applied to all rural areas and not be limited to reach poverty stricken regions. Although we believe it will complement existing rural poverty programs, this is not a rural poverty bill as such. Of equal or greater importance, it will help prevent the further spread of poverty and eventually generate new heights of prosperity throughout much of rural America.

Some have suggested that the bill should be more precisely tailored to potential rural growth centers. I am aware, of course, that not all rural areas have the potential for growth. But the problem is that of reliably identifying those which have the potential for growth and those which do not.

The birth of new types of industry, the continued improvements in transportation and communication, and the changing tastes of the American consumer make it extremely difficult to predict with any certainty the economic potential of any given area. Moreover it is important to keep in mind that the unpredictable equality and spirit of local leadership and the pure coincidence of other noneconomic factors often have a major effect on whether a given community will grow, hold its own, or decline. By making the incentives in this bill broadly available, all the factors which effect economic growth, many of which we do not know with precision will be allowed to operate freely.

Mr. President, the enactment of this bill would result in an initial drain on the Treasury to the extent that businessmen take advantage of tax incentives. But at the same time, the new economic activity thus stimulated would generate an increased flow of revenue to the Treasury. Precise predictions are impossible, but I believe that over the

intermediate and long run the benefits will more than offset the losses; that the total tax revenue flow will be expanded, rather than decreased.

But beyond the tax losses and gains directly attributable to this program one must also consider its indirect influence. I believe that a more extensive geographical distribution of our industrial and commercial capacities will strengthen the overall national economy. I believe that strengthening of rural communities will result in substantial social benefits. I believe that the slowing of the flow of rural people to the urban slums will reduce the public costs of unemployment and welfare payments and also ultimately, the costs for other public services in those areas such as those for law enforcement.

Mr. President, the passage of the Rural Job Development Act will not solve all the problems of rural America. Its adoption would, I believe, do a great deal to create the type of new job opportunities which rural America so urgently needs. And because of this its enactment constitutes, I believe, the necessary first step toward the attainment of a more reasonable and healthy rural-urban balance.

ESTATE TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILY BUSINESS

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, today one very important group within our society has not shared in our Nation's prosperity. I am speaking of the family-owned enterprise, whether it be a farm, ranch, or small main street business. The family farmer and the small businessman, while getting much lip service, are now being discriminated against by our tax laws.

Specifically, I am talking about the Federal estate tax or what some refer to as the "death tax." Too often today, the "death tax" has meant the death of the family business; a death caused by tax discrimination.

On one hand, we express alarm about the disappearance of the family farm, ranch or community business and the stability and proven worth of this kind of life. On the other hand, we place a discriminatory tax based on unrealistic, inflated land values and thereby make it virtually impossible for young people of today to carry on the family operation.

For over 200 years, the family farm has contributed strong and stable young men and women who formed the very backbone of our society. The family farm has given us plentiful production of food available at an ever-decreasing share of our take-home pay. Today, the rest of the world looks to the success of the American farmer with envy, admiration, and hope. If these families are continually forced from rural America, where they lead productive and happy lives, we not only hasten the death of the traditional American farm, but also speed up the mass migration to the cities where desperate conditions there already need our urgent attention.

The small family-owned business has played an equally important role in building America. They provide the goods and services which we all expect and demand into our neighborhood homes, areas where the big corporations cannot serve because "it doesn't pay." The small businessman not only serves America, but in the eyes of many, he is America.

Yet with all of this lip service and

praise, there is continued discrimination against the family-owned enterprise.

I am today offering legislation to strike at one area of discrimination against the family-owned enterprise.

The prime problem centers on the requirement in the Federal estate tax regulations that the estate tax be imposed on the "fair market value" of the assets at the time of the owner's death. In the case of real estate, the fair market value is usually established by comparing land in the estate with prices recently paid for other land in the area.

More often than not, these prices are vastly inflated and are in no way comparable to the value of the decedent's ranch, farm, or business based on its ability to earn. The economic fact today is that ranch and farm land being sold is based on these inflated property values to speculators who may intend the land for purposes other than to produce food and fiber.

Unfortunately, even in light of this economic fact, no consideration is given to the earning capacity of the property in calculating estate taxes. Yet, these taxes must be paid out of the earnings of the ranch, farm, or business unless the family has substantial outside interests or cash.

When shares of corporate stock in an estate are taxed, the earning power of the shares is generally considered the most important factor in determining value. It then becomes proper to argue that earning power should be considered in the valuation of a farm or ranch for estate tax purposes.

Let us take a case in point: Farmer Jones dies, leaving his 10,000-acre cattle ranch to his son. Assume the ranch is valued at \$30 per acre, is paid for and the cattle and supplies would sell at an auction for \$150,000. Farmer Jones has no prior debts.

This ranch is now valued for estate tax purposes at \$300,000. The personality is valued at \$150,000, bringing the total estate to \$450,000. After the \$60,000 exemption, Farmer Jones' taxable estate comes to \$390,000. The estate would have to pay an astounding \$110,500 in Federal estate taxes.

On the other hand, computing Farmer Jones' tax based upon the property's earning power is quite a different story. Jones had an average annual income of \$7,500, a profit that is slightly above the average 1.5 percent value of his total earnings earned by most cattlemen. Taking a capitalization factor of 4½ percent increased value per year, Farmer Jones' capitalized earning value comes to \$165,000. With the \$60,000 exemption, the taxable estate is now \$105,000 and the estate tax would be a much more reasonable \$22,200.

This same problem applies to the small businessman, who finds that high estate taxes make it impossible for the family business to be carried on from one generation to the next. The business is purchased by those who can pay the price and what used to be a traditional and proud community service becomes a speculative investment for those who can afford it.

Mr. Speaker, we must change these tax

regulations that discriminate so blatantly against the family-owned enterprise. Up to now, ranchers, farmers, and small businessmen could only seek relief through lifetime planning and making sure they had enough liquid assets in case of emergency. These stopgap remedies do not offer and real guarantee and are available only to those who can afford to hire expensive tax consultant advice.

I believe this bill can bring some relief to the estate of small businessmen, ranchers, and farmers caught in the stranglehold of the estate or "death tax." The bill, simply put, would allow the estate's representatives to have the option of having the decedent's interest in the business valued at either its market value—the present system—or the higher of, first, the decedent's cost basis, or second, value based on the reasonable earning power of the business.

The bill additionally provides the decedent must have been in the business 10 years prior to his death and that his heirs would have to continue the business for at least 5 years after his death.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this proposal represents a fair solution to the problem.

THE FARMWORKERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill for a farmworkers' bill of rights.

Over most of this century, Mr. Speaker, the general thrust of the development of labor legislation, at both the State and Federal level, has been progressive. For the most part the legislation this Congress and the State legislatures have enacted has contributed to increasing the real wages working men and women earn, to improve the working conditions under which they earn those wages, and to assure their ability to bargain collectively with their employers.

The greatest amount of this progress has been the direct result of the efforts of working men and women themselves, through their own organizations. But legislation has helped.

However, the legislation has tended, with a consistency as remarkable as it is disheartening, to leave one segment of the working force outside of the areas secured for other working people. I refer, of course, to the farmworkers. The farmworker was left explicitly outside of the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act, and remains so to this day. He was left outside of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and although that act has been liberalized, and its protections extended to the farmworker, even there he is protected at a lower minimum wage than are other workers.

The farmworker has only limited workmen's compensation coverage under a few State laws, and although the migratory nature of much farm labor makes it uniquely an interstate matter, there is no Federal workmen's compensation coverage like that accorded, for example, to longshoremen and harbor

workers, to compensate for the lack of State coverage.

Existing manpower legislation, although available to farmworkers, has not been directed to their special problems—including the rapidly changing technology of the industry.

And not least of all, Mr. Speaker, most State unemployment compensation statutes fail to cover farmworkers, even though the incidence of unemployment among them is very high. In the last Congress, indeed, there was an effort made to extend unemployment insurance to these workers.

I have painted this picture with broad strokes, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is time to seek, with an equally broad brush, to paint a different picture. It is time for the Congress to consider legislation which will remove the inequities under which farmworkers labor, to the extent that legislation can do that. It is time that legislation was actively considered which will give to farmworkers a legislatively protected equality of bargaining power with their employers—and not the kind of "equality" that forbids the farmworker from using the economic weapon which is most useful to him—the boycott.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, to strike all the invidious distinctions against the farmworker which remain in the Fair Labor Standards Act, in spite of the substantial liberalization that act has undergone in recent years.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, to consider extending workmen's compensation to farmworkers, and with particular emphasis on the hazard which confronts these workers in particular—the danger from economic poisons which destroy pests and endanger the health of field workers with fine impartiality.

I think it is time, and past time, to strike those sections of the law which leave farmworkers without unemployment compensation.

I think it is time to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act to provide specific programs for farmworkers.

And I think it is time that farmworkers were given an organized, formalized, recognized voice in the highest councils of their National Government.

The bill I introduce today—the "Farmworkers' Bill of Rights" is an attempt to do each of these things. I do not offer it as a panacea, or as a product which cannot be improved upon. I do offer it as a starting place for a concentrated legislative effort to bring the equal protection of the laws to men and women too long neglected.

DISREGARD OF PASSENGERS BY THE PENN CENTRAL RAILWAY

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I would like to state for the record my extreme disquiet about the manner in which the Penn Central Railway chose to react to the recent decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission permitting the

reduction of eight passenger trains on the Boston-Providence, Rhode Island run. The railway acted in a manner which constituted a complete disregard of the convenience of the passengers it is supposed to be serving. Within minutes after the word of the Commission's decision was reached by the railway, hastily put together, hand-scribbled announcements appeared in the railway stations concerned advising the waiting public that their trains had been removed from service. The resulting confusion and discomfort was well documented in recent press stories appearing in the major dailies of both cities. One would have thought that in this interim period between the advent of railpax and the demonstrated intent of the majority of Congress to preserve the future of rail passenger service that the Penn Central Railway would have got the message and decided to abandon its public-be-damned attitude. These are the same people that come to Congress hat-in-hand asking us to bail them out of financial difficulties brought about by years of benign neglect of the rail passenger in favor of the wildest kind of investment adventures completely unrelated to rail travel. There was no need for this abrupt action. A few days notice of their action was the least the public had to expect. As one of the Congressmen whose district is served by these trains, I feel that my office should have received some notification of the cancellations. To some extent, what is done is done, and I know no one is supposed to cry over spilled milk, but I want the Penn Central to know their action did not go unnoticed and they can ill afford to lose what little good will they might have.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN REVOLUTION

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, February 18, all Americans of Armenian descent joined with Armenians throughout the world in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Armenian revolution against the Soviet Union.

It was a grim observance, however, for the revolution was futile. The brave Armenians, unable to overthrow the force of the Red army, remain today in bondage, denied the blessings of freedom.

The Armenians, Christians since the year 301, have throughout history been denied their right to self-determination. They have been subjected to the rule of Arabs, Egyptians, Mongols, Persians, Russians, and Turks. During World War I, Turkey adopted a policy of extermination and over a million Armenians lost their lives. Today, their land is divided between the Soviet Union and Turkey.

The freedom of all persons is a proper goal of Congress. Let us today renew our pledge to work for the day when all people, now held behind the Iron Curtain, can take their rightful places as free nations.

ADOLF A. BERLE, JR.

(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, on Wednesday, February 17, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., passed away. Author, diplomat, Presidential adviser, lawyer, law school professor, and Liberal Party leader, Adolf A. Berle possessed one of the most innovative and perceptive minds of our century. His contributions to his profession and to his country were manifold.

I think the New York Times editorial of February 20 very aptly summed up the mark of this man:

History is sure to evaluate highly the quality of advice Mr. Berle gave and the services he rendered over the years, from his days on the delegation staff at the Versailles Peace Conference to his drafting efforts for the infant United Nations and his work for the Alliance for Progress. Here was that rare resource—a fine mind devoting its great talent to the city, to the nation and to humanity.

Adolf A. Berle was a "rare resource." Few have contributed so much and so brilliantly. I was privileged to study under Professor Berle at Columbia Law School, where his intellect and his teaching ability inspired many law students and continued to guide them during their professional careers. I valued his friendship and extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

I should like to include at this point the February 20 editorial from the New York Times, entitled "Adolf A. Berle, Jr.," and an article by Albin Krebs from the February 19 edition of the New York Times discussing Mr. Berle and his career:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1971]

ADOLF A. BERLE JR.

Adolf A. Berle Jr., adviser to Presidents of both parties since Woodrow Wilson, knew almost everything that was happening in government circles—and made more of it happen than most. Brilliant, articulate and aware of his own impressive attributes, he could have played the role of *eminence grise*, but his was too shimmering a character to be thought of as any shade of gray.

The many-sidedness of the man is reflected in the varied titles he held—professor, Treasurer of the City of New York, Assistant Secretary of State, Ambassador, and chairman of both the Liberal party and the Twentieth Century Fund—a roster which leaves out of account his authorship of such major works as "The Modern Corporation and Private Property," a classic in its own right.

History is sure to evaluate highly the quality of the advice Mr. Berle gave and the services he rendered over the years, from his days on the delegation staff at the Versailles Peace Conference to his drafting efforts for the infant United Nations and his work for the Alliance for Progress. Here was that rare resource—a fine mind devoting its great talent to the city, to the nation and to humanity.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1971]

ADOLF A. BERLE JR., DIES AT AGE OF 76—LAWYER, ECONOMIST, LIBERAL LEADER AIDED PRESIDENTS

(By Albin Krebs)

Adolf A. Berle Jr., the lawyer, economist, law professor, diplomat and Liberal party leader, who first came to prominence as one of the original members of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Brains Trust," died

Wednesday at his home, 142 East 19th Street. Mr. Berle, who was 76 years old, had been ill for two years. The immediate cause of his death was a massive stroke.

As counsel to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the New Deal, Mr. Berle had much to do with shaping legislation to reform banking, the stock market and railroading. At one point he was an Assistant Secretary of State, a position in which he became a leading authority on Latin-American affairs.

The multifaceted Mr. Berle (pronounced burly) also served as chamberlain of New York City in the administration of Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia, as a founder and chairman of the Liberal party and as a Latin-American affairs troubleshooter for President John F. Kennedy.

All the while, he managed to juggle his several public careers with maintaining a law office and serving, from 1927 to 1964, as a professor of corporation law at Columbia University.

A short, intense, small-boned man with the energy of a dynamo, Mr. Berle had a brilliant mind and, according to some New Dealers whom he rubbed the wrong way, he knew it.

He came by his iconoclasm naturally. His mother, the former Augusta Wright, irked her well-to-do New England family by going out West while still in her teens to work as a missionary to the Sioux Indians.

Mr. Berle was born in Boston on Jan. 29, 1895. His father, the Rev. Dr. Adolf Augustus Berle, a Congregationalist minister, was one of the most controversial and forward-looking clergymen of his day, a benign autocrat who believed that there was "an appalling waste in elementary school education."

He himself looked after the early schooling of the young Adolf and the other Berle children, Rudolf, Miriam and Lina.

TAUGHT SEVERAL LANGUAGES

He taught them several languages and insisted that they memorize long passages from Virgil, Goethe, Homer and Dante even before they could read. Young Adolf was graduated from high school at age 12 and easily passed the entrance examinations for Harvard, although he was not allowed to begin his studies there until he was 14.

Harvard was a breeze. He received a bachelor's degree in 1913, when he was 18, and a master's degree the following year, and in 1916 he was graduated cum laude from the Harvard Law School.

After practicing law in Boston with Louis Brandeis's firm for a year, Mr. Berle joined the Army as a private. His non-combatant service was brief, and then, as a first lieutenant, he was a member of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace with Germany at Versailles.

"I didn't approve of the Treaty of Versailles that was finally signed, and resigned from the commission in disillusionment in 1919," Mr. Berle said in an interview for this article in 1970. "But I didn't lose my idealism and join the Lost Generation—the equivalent of today's young dropouts, I went to work."

With his brother, Rudolf, Mr. Berle set up law practice here in 1919. He remained active in the firm, Berle & Berle, at 70 Pine Street, until his death. For several years he was associated with the Henry Street Settlement, a pioneer organization formed to promote social justice. In 1927, the year he joined the Columbia law faculty, he married Beatrice Bend Bishop.

WORKED ON TREATISE

In collaboration with Gardiner E. Means, a Columbia colleague, Mr. Berle wrote "The Modern Corporation and Private Property," one of the most influential economic treatises of its time. Based on a massive study of American corporations in the nineteenth-twenties, the book concluded that the mod-

ern corporation had become almost independent of its stockholders and that its managers could compete, in terms of power, with the modern state. The authors suggested a wide range of controls on corporations.

The work, published in 1932, brought Mr. Berle to the attention of Raymond Moley, who had been asked by the then Governor Roosevelt to gather a group of experts to advise him in his Presidential campaign on means of dealing with the issue of the nation's growing economic crisis. Mr. Moley recruited Rexford G. Tugwell, a professor of political science at Columbia, and Mr. Berle who, together with former State Supreme Court Justice Samuel Rosenman and Basil O'Connor, Mr. Roosevelt's law partner, formed the original "Brains Trust."

"I felt caught up in a great moment in history," Mr. Berle recalled in the interview last year. "Roosevelt was an inspiring, vital man for whom I burned to do service."

From the first, Mr. Berle's often abrasive manner won him enemies in the Roosevelt inner circle. "He was capable, if necessary, of diplomacy," wrote Arthur Schlesinger Jr., "but, with his edgy manner and his intolerance of fools, he sometimes exploded in sarcasm and disgust."

(In 1970, it was revealed, in long-secret papers declassified by the British Foreign Office, that Mr. Berle also rubbed some foreigners the wrong way. Sir Ronald Lindsay, British Ambassador to Washington in 1939, characterized Mr. Berle as "100 per cent intellectual." But, Sir Ronald added in qualification, Mr. Berle was "a specialist in too many subjects to be quite convincing in any of them," and, further, he "had an academic career at Harvard of such distinction that he has never quite recovered from it.")

Early on, he got into a dispute with Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, a Roosevelt confidant who believed, in general, that big business would have to be broken up into small units. Mr. Berle took the view that big business was here to stay and could be dealt with by strong government regulation, and he told Justice Frankfurter so in blistering terms. Roosevelt aides smoothed things over with the Justice by asking Mr. Berle to leave the train.

After the Roosevelt landslide, Mr. Berle turned down any major role in the Administration, but became counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the agency charged by the President with helping the nation's banks, railroads and insurance companies recover from the Depression.

For his part, Mr. Berle sought to give the New Deal the reasonable and moderate tone he believed Mr. Roosevelt wanted for it. "It is just possible," he said, "that all the social inventiveness of the world was not exploded between the two poles of Adam Smith and Karl Marx."

Mr. Berle helped draft Section 77B of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, designed to liberalize receiverships, and, as an adviser to the President, he suggested methods, later adopted, by which the Securities and Exchange Commission controls stock transactions. He also served as a Roosevelt speech writer.

He remained a frequent consultant to the President from 1934 to 1938, a period in which he served Mayor La Guardia as city chamberlain. Part of his responsibility was municipal planning, but Mr. Berle came to look upon the chamberlain's job as obsolete and recommended that it be abolished. It was, later, with the chamberlain's office being absorbed into the office of City Controller.

PREPARED POSITION PAPERS

In 1938 Mr. Roosevelt appointed Mr. Berle Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs; Mr. Berle prepared the President's position papers on dealing with Latin America during World War II and served as his delegate to several Pan American con-

ferences. In 1945 he became Ambassador to Brazil, but left the State Department the following year after a quarrel with Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius.

During the next 15 years Mr. Berle devoted himself full time to his law practice and to teaching at the Columbia Law School, which made him professor emeritus in 1964. From 1952 to 1955 he served as chairman of the Liberal party, which he had helped to found.

In 1960 President Kennedy asked Mr. Berle to be chairman of a six-member task force to advise him on Latin-American affairs. In that capacity, Mr. Berle advocated creation of the Alliance for Progress. He also was among those who recommended to Mr. Kennedy United States support of the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba by Cuban exiles opposed to Premier Fidel Castro in 1961.

Mr. Berle considered himself "an old revolutionary" from the New Deal era, he said last year, but he maintained he had "not a damn bit of use for the New Leftists of today, who haven't the brains or patience to develop a program to substitute for the one they despise so."

He complained bitterly that the New Left has embarked on a calculated campaign to discredit F.D.R. and downgrade his accomplishments—and those of us who worked with him.

"The New Left claims that Roosevelt didn't go far enough" he said, "but what they are incapable of seeing is that Roosevelt went as far as possible. The people didn't want full revolution; they wanted jobs and they wanted the government that they had to get to work which it did."

Mr. Berle was particularly proud of his association since 1932 with the Twentieth Century Fund, a foundation that does research in economic and social questions. He was the fund's board chairman from 1951 until his death.

Among Mr. Berle's books were "New Directions in the New World" (1940), "The 20th Century Capitalist Revolution" (1954), "The American Economic Republic" (1963) and "Power" (1969) in which he summed up his views formed over a lifetime.

PREDICTION ON ECONOMY

"The United States does not prosper if only the rich grow richer" he wrote. "It can thrive only as poverty is progressively abolished . . . To contemporary American corporations, underpaid and starved labor means a shortage of customers to buy motor-cars television sets . . . not to mention the necessities of life . . ."

For more than 40 years, Mr. Berle maintained his home on East 19th Street, as well as a farmhouse at Great Barrington, Mass., where he liked to garden and fish for trout in Berkshire mountain streams.

Mr. Berle is survived by his widow, a physician who has been a pioneer in community medicine and recently has been active in the methadone maintenance program for the treatment of heroin addicts at Bronx State Hospital.

He also leaves a son, Peter A. A. Berle, who was elected to the State Assembly in 1968 as a Democrat-Liberal; two daughters, Mrs. Clan Crawford of Ann Arbor, Mich., and Mrs. Dean W. Meyerson of Washington; his two sisters, Lina W. Berle and Mrs. Miriam Clay; his brother, Rudolf, and 10 grandchildren.

A private family service will be held tomorrow in Great Barrington, and there will be a memorial service at 3 P.M. Monday in St. Paul's Chapel at Columbia University.

RED POWER

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a good friend of mine who is a keen judge of human nature and current events as well as a skilled journalist recently wrote for his local newspaper an article which bears repeating.

Entitled "Red Power," it points out that our American Indians, particularly the Tonawanda Tribe in New York, who trace their ancestry back to North Carolina's Tuscaroras, are not sitting back waiting for others to solve their problems, economic and otherwise; that they are not rioting, burning, and looting. Instead, they are working to revive and strengthen their pride in their race and their heritage. They are emphasizing time-honored Indian crafts and skills and stressing those things the Indians can and should do better and more skillfully than the typical white, black, or member of some other race.

This is of particular interest to me because I have seen increasing evidence of this same attitude among the Indians of my own district. Rallying behind able local leadership which bears striking resemblance to their traditional tribal chiefs, they are sponsoring "National Indian Days" which emphasize traditional Indian crafts and skills.

I took pride in the fact that last year, young Daucey Franklin Brewington, a nominee of mine, became the first Indian graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The Indians are pointing the way for all of us. Red power, black power, white power, or any other kind of power can and should most effectively be exercised in a positive, constructive manner and not in a negative, destructive manner. In recent years, both white and black racially oriented groups have engaged in conduct and in practices of which none of us can be proud.

Let us follow the lead of those first Americans, our Indian citizens and let red power lead us to a better future.

Wade Lucas' article follows:

YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

(By Wade Lucas)

RED POWER

It's good to get a clipping from The Tonawanda (N.Y.) News Frontier about what many of our Tuscarora Indian friends are doing on the 5,749-acre Tuscarora Indian reservation near Sanborn, N.Y.

We are an adopted member of the Tuscarora tribe and proud of it. We visited with the Tuscaroras on their reservation in May, 1963, with our good friend, Col. Frank C. Bellinger of Tonawanda, when he was instrumental in having us invited to Tonawanda to make the Memorial Day address on May 30, 1963, honoring Union dead and the lone Confederate soldier buried in the beautiful cemetery there.

We became acquainted with Frank Bellinger during the Civil War Centennial, 1961-65, when the 100th anniversary of that unnecessary war between the states was fought. We met him in a number of re-enactments and never did he try to plunge his sword into our innards. Nor did we try to puncture any Yankee.

We won't go any further into that re-enactment period because we want to comment about our old friends, Chief Elton Greene, who headed the Tuscaroras in 1963 and for many years before and after that, and Chief Arnold Hewitt, the present headman of this proud tribe. It was Chief Hewitt, who in-

ducted us into his tribe along with two other veterans of the so-called "Second Civil War" on the battlefield at Gettysburg, Pa. on July 3, 1965.

WHAT IT MEANS

You will note he headed the start of this piece "Red Power" and we purloined it from another good Indian friend, Mel Patterson, who is a reporter on The Tonawanda News Frontier.

Patterson is a good reporter. He is a good fellow. We like him.

In the clipping Col. Bellinger sent us, Patterson has a feature story telling how "red power" is being developed by many of the Tuscarora Indians as they seek to improve their standard of living.

Patterson emphasizes they are not demonstrating, looting, burning, and resorting to other acts of lawlessness so common today in this troubled land of ours.

Instead, they are stepping up their handicraft work. They are making their farms pay. They are proud they are Indians. Could more be said?

"I believe the Indian of tomorrow will seek new ways and means to help cure and bridge the gap that now exists between the Federal Government and the Indian," Chief Hewitt wrote as he insists the Indians must be allowed to help solve their own problems. We agree.

YESTERDAYS

Why, then, do we select the Tuscaroras to write about? Simply because of their North Carolina origin.

Before and shortly after the 1700's, the Tuscaroras were a powerful tribe in then Colonial North Carolina. Records showed they owned just about all the land east of present day Raleigh to the coast.

We recall in July, 1963, when we had Chief Green and about half a dozen other Tuscaroras down to Morehead City for the North Carolina Crab Derby we promoted then for the State Department of Conservation and Development what he said to Mack Lupton, then Mayor of New Bern.

Standing by and listening after we introduced the statuesque chief to the mayor, we heard the chief say:

"Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for taking such good care of our land."

If you know your North Carolina history and you should, you will recall what happened in 1711 around New Bern when the Tuscaroras, victimized and swindled to a great extent by whites for taking their lands, rebelled, massacred many whites for taking their lands by force, went to war with the whites. Many whites were killed in what historians call the "Tuscarora War".

The result was that the Tuscaroras were forced to leave colonial North Carolina and the lands they loved so much. They finally stopped their traveling in upstate New York, where they are now a part of the Six Nations of Indians.

THEIR ANSWER

We are not afraid to go on record as saying the American Indian has been discriminated against as much if not more than other ethnic group. Some Indians brought much of this upon themselves and their descendants by the wars they waged against the whites in the 1700's and 1800's.

"Violence is not the answer," Patterson wrote in his article headed "Red Power" in The Tonawanda News Frontier.

One paragraph from Patterson's story is quoted here:

"Right here in Niagara county (the reservation is not too far from fabled Niagara Falls—editorial note). Tuscarora chiefs quietly but firmly rejected vigilante type black power offers to help the Indians in a recent trailer camp controversy. Bad as the Indians' image in the county may have become during those tension-packed weeks, it is to the credit of worried and harried Tus-

carora leaders that major violence did not take place."

It's heartening to note, as Chief Hewitt and Patterson wrote, that "red power" as interpreted today by the progressive Tuscaroras simply means their desire to carry out the old Biblical injunction that "The Lord helps those who help themselves."

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE ELIMINATION OF THE OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM AND THE REPEAL OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, not even pouring oil helps to calm the waters of our troubled times. On the contrary, the oil I am referring to—petroleum and its industry—has contributed in good measure to some of the more serious problems we face as a nation. Nothing could be clearer than this in the wake of the historic price settlement reported from Teheran in mid-February of this year between the major Persian Gulf oil-producing nations and all the major international oil companies.

An entirely new dimension has been introduced in the equation of the global oil situation and the United States, whether we like or not, is an integral and significant part of that equation. To this end I wish to speak today.

I am cosponsoring two bills, H.R. 638, a bill to terminate the oil import control program, and H.R. 3548, a bill to repeal the Connally Hot Oil Act. The Congress can no longer accept the notion that the United States as a total economy can remain isolated from the commercial-political interaction of the rest of the world, if we are to pursue the best interest of our national welfare and our national security.

In 1956, the American consumers—private and public, industrial and commercial—were able to satisfy their need for petroleum from domestic or foreign sources substantially at the level of world prices. But last year some oil sold in America at twice the world price. The current energy crisis in general and petroleum crisis in particular that we face, still leaves the American consumers footing the bill for petroleum products at significantly higher prices than the users of other industrial nations are paying. This crisis has in no small measure been precipitated by the oil import controls supported by the oil industry for over a decade, when the industry enjoyed special privileges open to no one else at the expense of the entire American economy, from homeowners to drivers, from American industries to the Government itself.

Last fall, one major American oil company decided to raise the price of crude oil in the United States by 25 cents a barrel. Other companies soon aligned their prices with the new higher level. The administration reacted with an unprecedented blast of public disapproval and took some countermeasures. It instituted in short order an investigation into the crude price hike, it increased allowable oil imports from Canada; and

it removed from State control oil production from the Federal offshore leases.

Almost 3 months after the fact these measures clearly seem to have been too little and too late to be of any significant impact for the intended purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the original recommendation for the import controls in 1959 proposed to invigorate the domestic oil industry, to induce more exploration at home, and to build increasing reserves for the purpose of coping with possible crises. Instead, the industry itself tells us now that it is economically in trouble and the Nation has been experiencing a decline in domestic oil exploration, and in drilling and employment; further the role of the independent producers has been diminishing.

Almost every heading of a recent statement by the Independent Petroleum Association of America submitted to the Office of Emergency Preparedness spells out the failure of the program and the bankruptcy of the system which curbed oil imports for the last 13 years—this program, this system that was sold by the industry to the Eisenhower administration under circumstances that have never been logically and intelligently validated by known facts.

In full support and necessary for the practical implementation of the oil import quota program we also have the Connally Hot Oil Act which was originally framed for the specific purpose of protecting the activities of those States that limit oil production on grounds of conservation. Last year a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers significantly asked if there was justification for oil prorationing beyond the needs of sensible conservation, which can hardly be envisioned when a third or more of the productive capacity is withheld. Suspension of the Connally Act would permit interstate transit of oil produced in excess of State prorationing laws. The President has now the power to do so, but he failed to utilize this tool in his attempt of forcing a rollback of the economically unwarranted price increase of crude oil last fall.

Additionally, while the President was speaking out against the price increase he finally recognized publicly some of the findings of his task force report of a year ago, stating that controls are not necessary for national security and that in fact they interfere with the freedom of our domestic market system.

Mr. Speaker, under the current circumstances and on the basis of past performance and the most recent developments affecting the world price of oil, I believe that Congress has a unique opportunity not only to remedy some old wrongs, but truly to aid the Nation in an economic adjustment that is going to be painful regardless what avenue of redress we may end in choosing.

We must now recognize that the oil import quota system has failed. It has fallen short in several respects, but primarily as a solution to the national security issue. It becomes then clear that the current oil import controls should be viewed as an intricate web of special privileges and tax treatment carefully assembled and built over years into a

deliberate network of considerable controls to fix prices. The defense of the system consists in the strategy of treating an attack on the program as an attack on the national security. In the eyes of some oil industry supporters questioning their logic or performance is regarded as unpatriotic.

In view of the foregoing total situation, it becomes also clear that our Nation now has the best opportunity it has had in a long time to remove oil quota restrictions on the basis of the following considerations:

First. The gap between world and U.S. price levels is narrowing.

Second. American industry can take the opportunity to improve its relative productivity costs by virtue of relatively lower domestic energy costs.

Third. Higher exports would offset, if not become a positive factor in, the expenditures needed to gradually import more cheaper oil without the giveaway quota tickets.

Fourth. Inefficiencies eliminated from the oil industry would force a better utilization of resources in all energy fields to the total benefit of the Nation.

Fifth. The Government would have not only an opportunity, but a mandate to proceed with the formulation of a national energy policy giving equitable but not exclusive rights to all producers and consumers.

Since the President of the United States has the power both to alter the oil import control program and suspend the Connally Hot Oil Act when not in the national interest, and having not done so after asserting that controls are not necessary for national security, it then becomes the duty of Congress to take more decisive action to compensate for the inaction of the White House.

The two bills which I cosponsor—H.R. 638 and H.R. 3548—would only remove the economic strictures of the current inequitable, expensive, and unworkable program without handicapping the President who would retain the power to institute tariffs as recommended by his task force to achieve the goal of national security and assuring an improved national welfare.

THE FUTURE OF OUR CITIES FROM A BLACK PERSPECTIVE

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this week I was privileged to attend a conference sponsored by the National Urban Coalition at Airlie House where a wide range of elected officials from the Federal, State, and local levels met with other interested citizens to discuss the problems of State and local governments.

One of the highlights was an address by Hon. Richard G. Hatcher, mayor of Gary, Ind.

Mayor Hatcher is one of the most distinguished leaders in Indiana and, indeed, our Nation. As one of the first black mayors of a major city in the United States, he has proved to be an outstand-

ing leader for all of the people of Gary. Mayor Hatcher's address offered some important insight into the problems and the hopes of our cities.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are hearing much about the plight of local governments, I believe Mayor Hatcher's remarks are especially noteworthy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mayor Hatcher's address be printed in the Record.

The text of the address follows:

ADDRESS OF MAYOR RICHARD GORDON HATCHER

Good evening. I want to discuss the current and future fate of the cities from a black perspective, not simply because I am a black mayor, but because their growing numbers in the cities mean that the destiny of blacks and other minorities is increasingly tied up in the fortunes of our urban centers.

And I also want to discuss the need for a way out of the historic conflict between the Federal, State, and local levels of government. This Nation is agonizingly torn with conflicts which include:

- The young and the old;
- The poor and the non-poor;
- Working people and the corporation;
- Blacks and whites;
- Browns and angios;
- The silent majority and the vocal minority;
- Women's liberation and male chauvinism;
- Cities and suburbs;
- The old order and the new vision; and
- Spiro Agnew's golf balls and spectators' heads.

Although the President has expressed a recognition of the need to "bring us together" and to "lower our voices", new divisions within the society have arisen.

The "southern and western" strategy has set those regions of our nation against the east and the "eastern liberal establishment". Shrill cries of "effete intellectual snobs" have created a schism between the intellectuals and the working class. Angry reference to students have set the non-students against them. The list of conflicts could go on and on—and the wounds in the soul of America multiply, fester and worsen.

We are rapidly becoming a society of feudal interest groups ever poised on the brink of conflict. Our new and complex feudal society is not only divided along geographic lines with the cities confronting the suburbs and one region of the country pitted against another, but we are divided along the lines of class, race, ethnic origin, age, philosophy and now even by sex.

The cities, the States and the Federal Government have each sought to "be", prior to belonging; each one has said in effect that "I am who I am" precedes and supercedes "we are who we are." Existence has always come before co-existence.

WE ARE A NATION IN SPIRITUAL AGONY

At home, we are a nation in spiritual agony. Other member nations in the world community see us as being in a state of national insanity which is so severe that our ability to function as a world leader is being seriously questioned—even by our friends—and in spite of the fact that we are the richest and the most powerful nation in the world.

They see us at war at home and at war in Southeast Asia and they wonder about our ability to survive—and I wonder if we can blame them.

The citizens of the nation are weary of confrontation, conflict, and the rhetoric of conflict.

Our friends, our neighbors and our constituents would rather go home at night and rest, feeling secure that our major conflicts are being resolved and knowing that our wounds are being healed. The soul of our na-

tion cries out for healing—and our citizens silently plead for a healer.

THE BATTLEGROUND: THE CITIES

The battleground for many of the conflicts are cities. It is the cities which cry out to the suburbs and to various elements of government for relief to assist in solving some of their problems. We hear the cries for wage taxes and commuter taxes and we hear the rebuffs and we see the resistance. It is in the cities where the poor, the blacks and the latins are crowded into hovels, go unemployed, attend overcrowded and underfinanced schools, are denied access to more liveable suburban environments, confront every available institution for redress and relief and ultimately grow to hate those institutions because no relief is forthcoming.

It is the cities which house many of our colleges and universities which teach our youth the American ideals of hope and equality and bring them face to face with the realities of urban hopelessness and inequality.

It is our cities where the demonstrations and confrontations against the institutions take place. The students, the poor, blacks, and Latins confront and demonstrate against the institutions which are not solving their problems.

Those who have been taught to love those institutions feel threatened by those demonstrations and they in turn demonstrate against the demonstrators and the demonstrations.

The cities are at the core of the emotional sickness and the wounded soul of America.

We might ask next: "What about the physical conditions of America?" Again, the cities are the core of our physical ills. We can illustrate the intensity of this physical illness with but one example: Urban housing conditions. As long ago as 1960 the Bureau of the Census reported that 49.1% of all housing units occupied by non-whites in Pittsburgh were classified as deteriorating or dilapidated. The figures for New York were 33.8%; for St. Louis 40.3%; for Dallas 41.3%. When I took office in Gary in 1968 47% of all housing was classified as substandard. The picture is just as bleak for our cities and particularly for the urban poor when we look at employment... or education... or transportation... or health—and the list could go on. But there is no need here to recite the same old tired statistics. You have heard these frustrating problems time and time again—so often now that there is a tendency to tune them out when you are confronted with them once again.

There is the suspicion that these problems would have already been tuned out had we as a nation not been confronted with the spectacle of 110 cities burning in April of 1968—and if we did not still have the burned out corridors staring us in the face.

NEW CONCERNS

We now have new concerns: the spectacle of air pollution, water pollution and ecological imbalances which threaten all of mankind. I need not remind you of course, that again the central cities are at ground zero of this environmental devastation. If you don't hear the voices of the central city residents joining with students and the middle class in strident chants of woe about pollution and ecology, it is only because they are more concerned. When that is taken care of they will concern themselves, like the more fortunate of us, with tomorrow's existence.

In some respects, the form of our government is like the garment of our society. When we examine that garment closely we begin to see the crazy-quilt patchwork of government overlays which citizens must negotiate in order to obtain governmental services.

A citizen of Gary, Indiana in the simple

pursuit of basic services is confronted with no less than seven separate governmental units, each of which has numerous divisions, subdivision ad infinitum.

I am not going to take you verbally through that maze—because it exists in one form or another in virtually every American Community.

A GREATER VOICE

The complexity of governmental systems has created a demand on the part of many of our citizens for a greater voice in the delivery of governmental services—a demand for services which are more responsive to the needs and desires of the recipients. This demand is at least in part why the Federal Government has begun to deal directly with the cities and with citizen groups within the cities. Where sincere relationships have been established, services have become much more responsive to the people. The Federal agencies that have worked with the cities have become increasingly sensitive to city problems and needs. The old inefficient process of funding separate detached programs unrelated to each other is more and more giving away to unified multiple program commitments. Just last year, the city of Gary and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) worked out a comprehensive program arrangement which in effect, committed both HUD and the Municipal Government to comprehensive actions in urban renewal, code enforcement, housing, beautification, community renewal, public works, neighborhood facilities, code changes, model cities and improved central relocation services. This "arrangement" committed the resources of both HUD and the local governmental agencies for this program year. The intention is to develop a similar comprehensive programming arrangement in each succeeding year.

This agreement, the first of its type in the nation, will allow us for the first time to make a unified attack on the city's problems. It enables both the city and HUD to measure the impact of our efforts on a year-to-year basis.

The Secretary of HUD has said that he fully intends to make similar comprehensive arrangements in other cities. What is happening here is that the separate categorical programs are now being comprehensively packaged and delivered. Gary made a similar agreement with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) through its center for community planning last year—though it was somewhat less inclusive.

I am raising all of this only to point out that under the current capability, it has taken years to develop more efficient methods of operating the programs locally and allocating the resources federally.

If other federal agencies expand this mode of operation service delivery will become much more unified.

GARY, INDIANA AND THE "NEW FEDERALISM"

The current administration introduced the concept of "new federalism" with the rationale that placing the state governments at the focal point of federal resource allocation would make service delivery more efficient and more responsive since the state government is closer to the problem than is the federal government. Let me share with you what has happened in the city of Gary under "the new federalism".

The "safe streets act" was passed and funds appropriated ostensibly to fight crime in the streets. Indiana's funds were allocated to the state criminal justice planning committee for distribution. Almost none of that money reached the streets of Gary. The little money we did receive from the "safe streets act" came mostly from the discretionary funds which were distributed directly from Washington.

Gary has a concentrated employment pro-

gram (CEP) which provides manpower training for the "hard core" unemployed and underemployed. It requires a state sign-off for program approval. The state employment service would not join on a badly needed pre-apprenticeship training program because it concluded there were no jobs—notwithstanding that nearly one hundred million dollars in new housing and other construction money had been committed to Gary since 1968.

A third example of state obstruction relates to education. The city's school system entered into a contract with a private corporation which, in effect, offered a money-back guarantee that the children in one of our inner city schools would be brought educationally at least to the national norms. But the state superintendent of public instruction had the accreditation of the school revoked because the experimental program didn't adhere to traditional educational standards—which have not served the needs of inner city students.

Those, ladies and gentlemen, are three instances in which the city of Gary dealt directly and of necessity with the State government in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Beyond the particulars I have experienced in Gary, I think that the State structures nationally are dominated by interests which ignore urban responsibilities.

The new federalism has not increased governmental accountability, although that is how it is being ballyhooed. Rather, it has further complicated the procedures by which the resources get to the people who need them most.

We do not need to have more people in high places handling the money as it goes through the pipe. We really need to find ways to get the money to the target as directly as we can.

We need simplified, straight-line systems of delivering goods, resources and services to where they are most needed. Those of us in the cities are far from blameless in the current crisis, however. In some instances we have made a major impact on local communities with Federal monies—but more frequently that has not occurred.

Sometimes we have been able to develop the mechanisms whereby citizens really participate in programs—but in many more cases that has not been true.

In many communities we have streamlined the delivery of services ourselves, but in the overwhelming majority of instances where this has occurred, it has come about only as a result of direct Federal prodding.

It is clear, however, that only a fraction of the funds that go into public programs come out in real change for their avowed beneficiaries.

THE CRUCIAL QUESTION

The crucial question, against which all others pale, is how much revenue are we talking about sharing. First of all, how much do we need?

To answer this question, we need only go back to the recent past and recall the discussions concerning the "peace dividend", the "freedom budget" and Governor Rockefeller's proposal for \$15 billion in additional urban funds, the lowest figure mentioned. All of this discussion held out some hope that real help was on the way.

We have yet to discuss our needs in their worst dimensions. We speak, for example, only of fire, police and water expenditures as quote "basic municipal services." These are the emergencies, we say. I submit we need to be talking also of health, food, housing, and education in the very same emergency terms—and that furthermore, when we do, we will begin to develop the groundswell of political support for basic revision of our national priorities. The scope of spending for such an expanded inventory of basic services makes \$5 billion—and probably \$50 bil-

lion—pale, but I believe we must address these national needs as honestly as we can. We have not been willing to be so honest before. Now, we have no alternative.

Let me put it another way. Throughout the 1960's, the size of the so-called "poverty" group has been, conveniently, viewed as just about exactly the size of the black population. Consciously or otherwise, we have been able in public administration to write off the poor as black and therefore forgettable. But we now know—and the recent blue-collar, ethnic outcry only confirms it—that even high-salaried workers are, in terms of emergency personal expenses, completely exposed. This applies to my suburban friends as well as it does to my inner-city friends. Neither of them have the basic economic wherewithal to take care of their needs. A man in the suburbs making \$15-20 thousand a year, isn't a whole lot better off, with all his home-owning responsibilities, than is the city resident, when his wife needs a major operation. He is medically indigent as far as the disastrous effect such an emergency will have on his family's economy. Similarly, educational starvation created when a school has to be kept shut two days extra at Christmas to save on the heating bill, is going to cost the children of the affluent the same as the financially less fortunate. I suggest it is long past time to be thinking of "the other America" as constituting possibly half or even more of the people of this nation.

WHAT ABOUT REVENUE SHARING?

When we examine that portion of administration's proposal for revenue sharing which contains the "new money", we find that only \$5 billion is proposed. As I understand this proposal, at least one half of these revenues would be siphoned off at the state level and the rest would be distributed among the localities on the basis of population and the level of local taxing effort.

If this money were to be distributed only to the cities—which is not the case—it would mean that less than one-sixth of the minimum required revenues would actually reach the urban centers. If that is the effect of revenue sharing, and I sincerely hope it is not, then it would wind up just like most of the other great rhetorical promises we have heard before: Another promise without payoff.

This brings us to the next question. Distinguished from new revenue, what existing revenues are to be shared? Most of them appear to come from programs which are currently concentrated in the cities. It seems that the existing funds, which are admittedly having only a meager impact on overall urban problems, are to be distributed 52% to the states and 48% to the local communities. So it is conceivable that the central cities would receive less of this "special revenue" than they are currently receiving.

And what about our model cities funds; our concentrated employment funds; our urban renewal funds; our rehabilitation and code enforcement funds; our neighborhood facilities funds; our sewer construction funds; our special education funds; and our poverty program funds? All of these, I fear, will be placed into a giant pool with the state taking half of them and the rest being returned to the localities on a formula basis. Theoretically, at least, it would appear to be possible for a rich suburban community to receive proportionately more funding than the more needy central city.

My real fear is that those of us in the city will be worse off in this redistribution process and that the gains we have made in the previously mentioned "HUD arrangement" will be largely lost.

THE BLACK VIEW OF REVENUE SHARING

Let me speak briefly—but as clearly as I can—about the black view of revenue sharing.

Within this context, the revenue sharing proposal is viewed as the economic ingredient of the "new federalism". I noted earlier that the "new federalism" shifted the political locus-in-quo from the cities to the States. The way I read the situation this revenue sharing proposal completes the circle by transferring the coffers of the Federal Treasury from the banks of the Potomac to the State capitols where, more often than not, the terrain is less familiar and the climate less salutary.

The increasing concentration of the black population in urban America will inevitably result in the ascension of black political power in many of our major cities. It is not unlikely that in the decade of the seventies some 33 major American cities will have black mayors.

Would it be surprising then that the black population might view "new federalism" and the administration's revenue sharing plan with, at the very least, some suspicion? Or, more possibly, as an attempt to insure that when blacks capture city halls they will find them empty?

The Shibboleth of the current Federal programs is that the poor, the blacks and the Latins must participate in the economic and political decision making processes which affect their very existence. In operation, however, we have learned through painful experience that this seeming transferral of power from those who rule to those who are ruled has been more myth than fact. The "new federalism" and the proposed revenue sharing plan could even eliminate what little facts there is unless we are careful.

Many of the Federal programs may well have been designed to alter the contours of the existence of blacks in particular. But the funding of those programs was so paltry, so miserly in the existential context of what was actually required that many of them accomplished little more than "cooling it" in some of the hot summer days on some of the hot summer streets, in some of the hot, teeming ghettos of our Nation.

There is nothing laudable about "cooling it" for its own sake. No it's deceptive and morally reprehensible. It produces no renaisance; it provides no permanent relief from pain. It is only a mild and transient sedative to dull the edge of anger and despair.

But the revenue sharing plan if undertaken, may result in the demise of what little that still exists which trickles down to the poor.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, REVENUE SHARING AND THE MAYORS

One final note in this regard: as far as Governor Rockefeller's statement is concerned, does he really think that I am prepared to accept the blame for not getting a revenue-sharing plan implemented just because I am unwilling to go along with his version of it? What I really hear him saying is that if mayors won't play the game his way, then there won't be any game.

As far as I am concerned, the current administration's proposal does not end the debate on revenue-sharing.

It has just opened that debate. Sol Linowitz, the Chairman of the National Urban Coalition, testified before the Proxmire subcommittee some weeks ago that the gap between State and local expenditure needs on the one hand and expected revenues on the other hand would be as high as \$100 billion by 1975.

I don't know what Gary's deficit is going to be in that regard. I don't know what the

deficit for the State of Indiana is going to be. But I do know that Gary isn't going to go away and its problems aren't going to go away either without some massive financial assistance.

The problems we are discussing are too severe and I am, quite honestly, too frightened at the prospect of them worsening, to suggest that there's some easy way out of all this.

NEEDED: A CEASE-FIRE BETWEEN THE STATES AND CITIES

But I do know one absolute requirement, if we are going to find a way out: a cease-fire between the various levels of government, particularly the States and the cities.

I desperately want an end to the traditional governmental play-off of their various constituencies.

The city of Gary doesn't have time for this anymore—for the 51%—majority games.

We simply must have government locally and state-wide and nationally which uses its potential as an advocate on behalf of public need.

There does have to be some recognition on the part of the States that the cities are here and that old patterns of response won't do anymore.

Those patterns won't do anymore, because the water we are in is too deep.

Everybody balls—or we go down together. We've got to have a new alliance—one which consists of city halls, State capitols, and Washington as proponents of change.

That calls for domestic diplomacy, a statesmanship of survival.

We all need to remind ourselves of that in the days and weeks ahead in what I hope will be a thorough-going discussion not just of revenue sharing but of how we can get our resources to the places where they are most needed: our central cities.

WE MUST BECOME A NEW PEOPLE

We must return power in this country to the people, whether it be through some form of revenue-sharing or a redistribution of wealth. People power must be the antidote to this sick Nation.

We must become a new people.

Our doctors must be concerned with public health administration, not personal wealth accumulation.

We must become a new people.

Our lawyers must become public dispensers of justice, not merely personal seekers of judgeships.

We must become a new people.

Our teachers must teach children about life and not merely for a livelihood.

We must become a new people.

Our clergy must strive to become prophets instead of profiteers.

We must become a new people.

Our men of war must become men of peace.

We must become a new people.

Most of all, our politicians, whether they are in Washington, Indianapolis, or Gary, must campaign for an end to poverty and racism, instead of merely another term in office.

We must become a new people.

LET THIS BE THE MOMENT

If this happens, those cities that are now seen as colonies of fear and desperation will become havens of hope and aspiration. The devastation will leave and a whole people will be saved. A people on the brink of dying as enemies will finally learn to live like brothers.

If this Airlie House Conference is remembered for nothing else, let it be remembered by you who are here as the touchstone for a time when we recognized and committed ourselves to a vision of men surmounting

the terrible things that beset them. This is the central message to the State conferences you will be organizing after this meeting.

Let this be the moment when we announced our resolve that the people whom we serve shall be free in their souls and that we will not rest, any of us, until that mission is accomplished.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR WIDENING VOTING RIGHTS FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, all Americans who are 18 years of age now enjoy the right to vote in Federal elections.

Congress originated this action in recognition of the maturity and responsibility shown by the vast majority of our young citizens, and it has been ratified by a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

But existing laws still prohibit this large group of Americans from participating in State and local elections in most States.

Mr. Speaker, I support the current moves in Congress for a constitutional amendment necessary to enfranchise these young people and to avoid confusion for voting registrars confronted with the task of keeping two sets of voting rolls.

I am pleased to see wide support for taking the steps which are necessary to extend full voting rights to this group of young citizens. An example is a cogent editorial on this subject presented on January 22, 1971, by television station WSJV, and radio stations WTRC and WFIM, which serve the South Bend-Elkhart area in Indiana's Third Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed below in the RECORD:

EDITORIAL

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that 18-21 year olds have the right to vote in all Federal elections. But the Court has left it up to the individual States to determine whether or not these young people should be allowed to vote in State and local elections.

We believe that 18-21 year olds should be able to vote in all elections, for several reasons: If our young people are capable of deciding who will make decisions that affect the future of the entire country, and the world, by participating in national elections, it follows that they should be able to vote for mayor, county clerk, judges and other State and local offices.

We believe that today's young people, by virtue of the educational system we have provided for them, are better equipped to accept the responsibility of voting in both national and local elections. We also believe that allowing our young voters to participate in only part of the electoral process relegates them to a type of "second class" citizenship . . . and lessens the importance of the electoral process for them.

Finally, it should be pointed out that having two types of voters will almost undoubtedly cost more and create confusion at election time. County clerks would need to keep separate voting rolls, have separate forms and perhaps use separate voting machines.

For these reasons, we support the efforts

of those who have introduced legislation allowing 18-21 year olds to vote in all Indiana elections. At the same time we support the move for an amendment to the Indiana constitution granting voting rights to this group, in the event that the aforementioned legislation should be declared unconstitutional.

A DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM TO HELP STATES AND CITIES NOW

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that many State and local governments—for differing reasons—face a crisis because of a shortage of funds to operate needed services for their citizens.

It is obvious that steps should be taken to aid these hard-pressed governments.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is also obvious that many Members of Congress feel that President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposal is not the answer to this urgent problem.

A number of options are available to Congress as we consider ways to relieve this crisis, and a thoughtful commentary on this subject has been prepared by Lawrence F. O'Brien, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, former Postmaster General, and special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum on this issue prepared by Mr. O'Brien for members of the Democratic Policy Council be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM

Subject: A Democratic Program to Help States and Cities Now, Not Next Year, and to Begin Simultaneously the Evolution of a More Effective Federal System.

INTRODUCTION

President Nixon has talked, characteristically, of creating a "New American Revolution . . . a system of government which will provide the means for America to reach heights of achievement undreamed of before." Overblown rhetoric of the State of the Union message notwithstanding, the few details of Mr. Nixon's "New American Revolution" contained in the federal budget for fiscal year 1972 suggest that the Nixon administration has in mind something considerably less earthshaking. Indeed, there is every reason to question whether the states and localities can expect any improvement whatever in their present circumstances given the highly illusory nature of the help offered by the Nixon administration. In these circumstances, the Democratic Party should come forward with specific alternatives. The following memorandum sketches the outline of such a program.

The following factors should be taken into account in developing an effective Democratic alternative to the revenue-sharing and institutional reform proposals of the Nixon administration:

(1) Some states and local governments are in financial trouble; some type of immediate federal assistance is needed.

(2) The Nixon administration's general revenue-sharing proposal is unlikely to offer much immediate assistance to state and local governments for several reasons: Congressional opposition to the basic concept is extensive; the amount proposed by Mr. Nixon (\$3.75 billion in fiscal year 1972) is far below the demonstrated need; and some state and

local governments are ill-prepared to spend such revenues effectively. More than this, given the national commitments already established by the Congress, it is doubtful—in this period of substantial budget deficits—that federal revenues are sufficient to meet established priorities, plus a new program of general revenue sharing. From this perspective, then, primary reliance upon a program of general revenue sharing to meet the immediate financial crises of state and local governments would appear to be both illusory and unwise.

(3) The existing patterns of categorical grant-in-aid programs, in many cases, imposes difficult administrative burdens upon states and localities, as well as the federal establishment. The conventional wisdom about the need to improve delivery systems contains a large measure of truth, even though many categorical programs have brought—and will continue to bring—considerable help to states and cities.

(4) There is little reason to believe—Republican rhetoric notwithstanding—that states and localities can effectively modernize their own administrative systems in the absence of some general national incentives and guidelines for such modernization. To the contrary, the massive influx of general shared revenue from the federal government is likely to perpetuate many of the inequities and inefficiencies that have contributed to the present crisis of federalism.

In summary: an effective Democratic alternative should be one that (a) provides immediate financial help to states and localities, (b) sets in motion a fundamental overhauling of the process by which states and localities receive federal assistance, (c) encourages a similar process of administrative modernization on the state and local level, and finally, (d) assures that federal tax revenues will be used to meet national priority goals established by the Congress.

The Nixon program offers the promise of some financial help (if one is willing to ignore the considerable congressional opposition to general revenue sharing) and the reform of federal procedures (if one is willing to ignore the congressional opposition to his plan to consolidate federal departments). To date, it offers little, if anything, to achieve reform at the state and local levels, or to assure that national priorities will be preserved in the spending of \$3.75 billion of general shared revenues or in the \$11 billion portion earmarked for special revenue sharing (bloc grants).

The combination of legislative obstacles and gaps in the Nixon program itself creates the conditions for alternative action in the 92nd Congress . . . action that more effectively alleviates the immediate financial concerns of states and local governments while simultaneously initiating longer-term reforms.

ELEMENTS OF A DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE

I. Immediate financial assistance to States and localities

(A) From a variety of sources has come the proposal that the federal government assume full financial responsibility for the welfare program administered by the states and localities. Not only is this approach advocated by such diverse groups as the Committee for Economic Development (CED) and the AFL-CIO, but there is growing evidence from academic economists that such a program, on its merits, is the most equitable and efficient means to improve the fiscal structure of federalism. Federal tax funds would be channeled to meet a well-established national priority; distribution of federal funds would be more equitable in that areas of greater need would receive more money; and, given the growing support in Congress, it is an alternative that could be realized this year. With the multi-million dollar welfare burden lifted from the states

and localities, it would then be possible for existing state and local revenues, as supplemented by other federal aid, to support other public services more adequately.

(B) It is likely, however, that the implementation of full federal assumption of welfare payments would extend over a number of years. Other immediate supplements to state and local revenue should then be considered:

(1) *Public Service Employment.* Already passed in the 91st Congress and vetoed by Mr. Nixon, this legislation has been reintroduced by Senator Nelson and Rep. O'Hara. Early and favorable action is likely: Whether the act is again vetoed by the President will depend, in some measure, upon whether its provision for channeling federal money to cities and states for public service employment can be viewed as part of a comprehensive alternative to general income sharing. In other words, whereas it was seen earlier as primarily a source of jobs for the unemployed, it should now also be looked upon as a source of revenue for states and cities. Its prompt passage by the 92nd Congress is a priority objective.

(2) *Concentrated Selective Employment.* Areas such as Seattle which rely almost exclusively on a sole employer (of highly skilled personnel) should have immediate and concentrated financial assistance available to channel these skills into other activity. Since the majority of these dislocations occur as a direct result of federal policy decisions, it is well within its realm of responsibility to provide alternative employment opportunities in these areas.

(3) *Expanded Educational Assistance.* As most state or municipal budgets will reveal, educational expenses have been soaring in much the same manner as welfare payments. Teachers' strikes have dramatized the problem for the general public. A new program of federal assistance to achieve minimum levels of primary and secondary education, in the form of *minimum per student grants*, would have great attractiveness for governors and mayors, not to mention the local property owner. In effect, such a program would represent bloc grants to the states and localities for educational purposes. As in the case of welfare, it would immediately free-up other state and local money.

For the time being, at least, this program of minimum per student grants should supplement, not replace, existing categorical programs. Many of these programs are designed specifically to meet problems arising out of severe economic disadvantage and racial discrimination. Until some firm understandings are worked out with non-public recipients of categorical aid programs, moreover, it would be irresponsible to eliminate those categorical programs. Such a decision would reopen at the state and local level the same church-state issue that the federal government finally resolved through passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(4) *Accelerated Environmental Protection Program.* In an earlier time, this program would have been called "accelerated public works." By whatever name, it offers states and localities immediate help in alleviating unemployment and in expanding capital resources of state and local governments—as well as accelerating badly-needed environmental protection programs. The emphasis should be on sewerage treatment plants, sewer lines, water lines, etc., rather than courthouses and other governmental buildings. Such a program would channel badly-needed federal resources into a program of high national priority.

(5) *Full-funding of Federal Programs.* In addition to the programs suggested above, it is mandatory that the Nixon administration ask Congress for full-funding of various categorical aid programs already on the books. If the present gap between authoriza-

tions and appropriations (estimated at approximately 35 percent) were reduced to the gap that existed in 1966 (estimated at 20 percent), \$6 billion more in federal revenue would go to states and localities—\$1 billion more than Nixon proposes in his general revenue sharing program (\$2.25 billion more in fiscal '72).

Despite President Nixon's promise "to strengthen and renew our state and local governments," his budget for fiscal year 1972 reveals a shocking insensitivity to the critical areas of state and local need. For example:

Model Cities.—The program is scheduled for total elimination by June 30, 1972. Prior to this, the Nixon administration will refuse to spend more than \$660 million of appropriated funds, even though 19 of 147 participating cities have been denied all first year action money. Recent reports that Mr. Nixon may now reverse himself on this decision cannot hide the fact of the administration's failure to make full use of this valuable program.

Urban Renewal.—Of the \$1.2 billion appropriated by Congress, the Nixon administration intends to obligate only \$1 billion, carrying over \$200 million to next year. And this despite a \$3 billion backlog on urban renewal applications from local governments.

Mass Transit.—The Nixon administration will have to double the rate of utilization of funds projected through fiscal year 1972 in order to achieve the \$3.1 billion authorized by Congress for the next five years.

Education.—Elementary and secondary school assistance will be reduced by \$50 million next year; vocational education cut by \$25 million; libraries and educational communications cut by \$35 million; no money for construction of public libraries.

Until proven alternatives exist, it would be foolhardy to abandon or drastically cut back federal programs designed to help states and localities deal with the most critical problems on our national agenda. But on the basis of the evidence available so far, one is tempted to conclude that the Nixon proposals for general and special revenue sharing have as their ultimate objective the destruction of the major domestic achievements of the past decade, or, at a minimum, their substantial reduction.

In summary: These proposals would assist state and localities in alleviating their immediate fiscal crises and in amounts far in excess of the \$5 billion (\$3.75 billion in fiscal '72) proposed by Mr. Nixon. More than this, however, federal funds would be dispersed more equitably among the states and localities, in accordance with previously established national priorities.

At the same time, it would appear desirable to consider such reforms as a *federal tax credit* for state income taxes, as the incentive most likely to encourage all states to enact, without further delay, a progressive system of income taxation. When this step has been taken, it would then be possible to begin the re-evaluation of regressive property and sales taxes, revenue-producing devices that place an unfair burden upon those least able to pay, and that stand in the way of proper development of land and property.

Senators and representatives already supporting revenue-sharing proposals could, quite consistently (a) agree that the implementation of general revenue sharing should await a federal budget surplus (the condition that pertained at the time of the original Heller-Peckman plan), and (b) agree that such a marked departure in fiscal federalism should be taken only when the federal structure itself had been overhauled at the federal, state and local levels.

Revenue sharing is simply one step toward readjusting the proportion of public tax dollars that should be spent at each level of government. It, however, does not address itself to the serious question of the need for

stronger organization for central program management as a tool for better executive direction at local, state and federal levels, and for more effective cooperative management links among the three levels of government. This latter consideration leads directly to the second half of the Democratic alternative: a program of national regional development.

II. Administrative reform

Given the growing public awareness of the inadequacies of the present federal system, it would be shortsighted indeed simply to propose a series of spending programs to rescue the states and localities from their present financial crisis. These "quick-start" federal efforts make sense primarily if they are coupled with fundamental structural reform of the federal system itself. Indeed, these "quick-start" programs can provide the leverage and incentive to achieve this fundamental reform, a fact overlooked in the present Nixon proposals.

In this regard, the most serious attention should be given to the proposal for establishing a *National Regional Program*, an approach based on the highly successful administrative model developed by the Appalachian Regional Commission. A national regional system, through its multi-county local development districts, would enable local officials, both public and private, to focus attention on regional problems instead of the fragmentation that usually results from the individual efforts by local and county communities. It is a systematic institutional arrangement which allows the multiple agencies of each level of government to work more closely together which, in turn, allows the three levels of government to mobilize their efforts more effectively.

Senator Montoya has initiated nationwide hearings directed at these problems: How can the resources of the state and the metropolitan regions be mobilized most effectively? How can we set in motion the evolution of a federal system truly attuned to the contemporary needs of both urban and rural America? How can federal resources be channeled most effectively to meet these needs?

(A) What Are the Arguments in Support of a National Regional Approach?

(1) A national regional program would establish an administrative system that would identify elected public officials—governors and mayors—as primarily responsible for deciding how federal money would be expended in their regions, in addition to providing for the spending of this money in a more coordinated and efficient manner. It would also provide strong incentives to states and localities to attack the bewildering problem of overlapping local jurisdictions.

(2) It would encourage comprehensive reform of the highly complicated maze of categorical grant programs where state and local officials must deal with countless layers of federal bureaucracy in no consistent pattern. This reform would look toward the gradual consolidation of many existing categorical grant programs, as well as the development of bloc grants in certain areas . . . but in the context of state and local administrative reform, the essential pre-requisite to judicious expenditure of these federal revenues.

(3) Once the governors and mayors within a region had decided on their priorities (through head-to-head bargaining), and assuming these priorities were in accord with basic national guidelines laid down by Congress, the federal assistance could flow to the region according to the plan that had been developed. Regional diversity would be possible without sacrificing national objectives.

(4) Metropolitan areas would clearly benefit from such a national regional system because it would compel the states, not to mention the suburbs, to face up directly to

urban needs and resources. No longer could states and suburbs attempt to ignore the cities; all jurisdictions would be compelled to hammer out, in concert, the total needs of the region prior to submission of the regional plan to the federal government. By the same token, rural needs would also receive direct consideration—in balance with the better publicized needs of metropolitan areas. Additional federal safeguards could be established to guarantee that no geographical area would receive less federal assistance than under existing arrangements.

(5) A national regional program would compel the states to use their unique powers in meeting urban and rural needs; their powers to develop needed social and economic programs, their powers to tax and spend, their powers to encourage inter-jurisdictional planning and cooperation, their powers to create metropolitan and rural jurisdictions capable of dealing with the overlapping social and economic problems that comprise a list of national priority concerns.

(6) A system of State Representatives (one for each region)—appointed by and responsible to the governors and mayors—would establish a focal point for decision-making and action within the regions, as well as providing an identified point of contact between the federal government and the regions.

(7) A system of Federal Representatives (one for each region), attached to the Domestic Council, would create within the federal bureaucracy identified persons with intimate knowledge of the mix of programs within each region, not just housing, or health, or manpower, or environmental, but all programs. From the perspective of the chief executive, this reform would be highly useful in getting, at long last, a handle on the executive agencies.

(8) A national regional program would be the ideal instrument to carry forward an effective national growth policy, and to administer some form of general revenue sharing when—or if—it becomes feasible to begin such a program. Indeed, a national regional system, or its equivalent, would appear to be an absolute prerequisite to a responsible program of general revenue sharing.

(9) A national regional program would initiate considerable reorganization of the federal bureaucracy, but it would be directly linked to comparable reorganization on the state and local level. In other words, through the impetus of a national regional program the reorganization of the federal, state, and local bureaucracies could go forward in tandem. Even if the current federal reorganization proposal of the administration could win congressional approval, there is no guarantee that the end-product would mesh effectively with the administrative structures that might, or might not, emerge on the state and local level.

(B) The programs discussed earlier in this memorandum could provide the basis for beginning the process of building a national regional system. These funds would offer considerable incentive for state and localities to begin the admittedly long-term process of defining and activating such a truly revolutionary change in the American federal system. At a minimum, Congress could provide through these programs a sum equal to that proposed by the Nixon administration for general revenue sharing.

Once the process of developing a national regional system had begun, additional elements of federal assistance would be channeled through the regional system until it existed as the principal conduit for all federal assistance dealing with basic development programs. Categorical grant consolidation and the development of bloc grants in certain substantive areas would be essential elements of this evolutionary process.

SUMMARY

In summary: a national regional program would set in motion an overhauling of governmental structure on all levels—federal, state, and local—that would eventually produce a far more rational and effective federal system, one that not only used public resources more efficiently but also made it far easier for governmental officials at all levels to achieve their desired objectives.

It would provide a framework for reaching some long-term solutions to the present governmental crisis—financial and otherwise—that grips many state and city governments.

Finally, it would also preserve the federal government as an active participant in the process, thereby making it more likely to insure the achievement of national priorities laid down by the Congress.

RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today my distinguished colleague from Kansas, KERR SEBELIUS, in sponsoring the Rural Job Development Act of 1971—a measure similar to one I had introduced in the 91st Congress.

Because of the lack of economic opportunities, each year over 500,000 residents of rural America migrate to our big cities and compound the problems of congestion, compaction, and pollution characteristic of modern urban life. Today, nearly 70 percent of our population is jammed into 2 percent of our land. In the next 30 years, 100 million people will be added to our population. Unless present trends are substantially altered, 60 percent of our people will be concentrated into five small geographic strips of land by the year 2000. It is imperative, therefore, that we set about defining and developing a national growth policy which will not only provide the living space and employment to support this population increase, but one that will encourage diversion and dispersal.

An obvious answer to rural migration and increasing urban ills is a rural development program which will create more economic, social, and cultural opportunities and a better environment for rural and smalltown America.

Creating job opportunities is perhaps the most important key to rural development. Rural people are dedicated, independent, work-oriented people. They want jobs which will enable them to earn incomes sufficient to support a reasonable level of living for themselves and their families. New employment opportunities generate an invigorated community spirit as well as a larger tax base with which local government can set about providing the essential public services the people need and want.

In order to accomplish this goal it is necessary that the Government maintain and promote a climate conducive to capital investment in rural America. When new jobs and industries are located in our small communities in America's countryside, we can begin to alleviate our

urban problems and bring about population dispersal.

Private enterprise has the efficiency and capability to do this, and it should be encouraged and compensated for its efforts to develop new or expanded job opportunities in areas where many times public services and the labor force may not be as attractive as some urban areas. The Rural Job Development Act of 1971 will help achieve this goal to attract job-producing industries and commercial enterprises in urban areas.

Some of the important provisions of this bill include:

First. A 7-percent tax credit on real property—land and buildings—to these job-creating enterprises over a period of 10 years.

Second. A 7-percent tax credit on personal property—machinery and equipment.

Third. The tax credit on real and personal property is increased 10 percent if the job development area has a population density of less than 25 persons per square mile—about one-half of the national average.

Fourth. An accelerated depreciation allowance of two-thirds of normal, useful, or class life for machinery, equipment, and buildings.

Fifth. A tax deduction equal to 50 percent of the wages paid to workers for whom the enterprise must provide on-the-job training.

Sixth. The enterprise must be engaged in industrial production—manufacturing, producing, processing, assembling, wholesale operations, or the construction of buildings and facilities in authorized areas.

To qualify for the program, industrial and commercial enterprises must locate in counties designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as "rural job development areas." Rural job development areas are counties which have no city of more than 50,000 population and meet one of the two following requirements: First, have at least 15 percent of its families with incomes of less than \$3,000 annually; or, second, a declining employment rate of at least 5 percent per year during the previous 5 years. The enterprise must also employ at least 10 people and must employ at least 50 percent of the labor force from the local population at least 50 percent of the labor force from the local population whenever possible.

I believe this is good legislation—important legislation to rural and urban America alike. It should be a vital and integral part of a national commitment to develop our countryside and revitalize our small towns. We must recognize that the ills of urban America are inextricably related to the problems of rural America.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's

great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. During the period from 1963 to 1969 private philanthropy in the United States was placed at \$96,598,000,000. Over three-fourths of this amount came from individuals.

SUSPENSION OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT IS NOT SUBSTANTIAL ANTI-INFLATION MOVE

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's suspension of the Davis-Bacon Act, though an encouraging sign that he is approaching a more positive "incomes" policy to restore stability to the economy, is dilatory, and constitutes discrimination against a single industry.

In August 1970, the Congress provided the President with discretionary authority to freeze and thereby stabilize prices, rents, and wages. Until recently he has refused to consider the use of such authority. Meanwhile, first-year pay increases in major construction contracts last year averaged 18 percent. The rate for the last 6 months of the year was almost 22 percent. Whatever the long-range effect of the Davis-Bacon Act suspension, it amounts at present to an after-the-fact exercise in wage-price pressure. Two-thirds of the industry have already achieved increases in the present round and the balance are in process.

The President's action also singles out one sector of an inflationary economy while all areas are involved and should be treated equally. The proper approach to our economic recession does not lie in exerting wage-price influence on one industry as an example to others. It lies in a consistent, overall approach to all industries and to the economy as a whole.

On January 29, I introduced H.R. 2502 legislation which I believe will provide such an approach. My bill, the Emergency Guidance Board Act of 1971, would create a temporary wage-price guidance board, to be appointed by the President, which, after proper consultation with business, labor, and consumer leaders, would publish a basic set of wage-price guidelines for all major industries. While these guidelines would be nonmandatory, those industries and unions planning price and wage increases in excess of the published guidelines would be required to file an economic justification with the Guidance Board. The Board would then publicize those wage and price hikes in excess of the guidelines, and attempt to use the pressure of public opinion to prevent such hikes.

In suspending the Davis-Bacon Act, the administration has taken a small step in moving to control the inflationary spiral in the building trades. While this step does provide some indication that the President is abandoning his total hands-off policy regarding wage-price decisions, I feel he should apply such deterrent pressure equally to all industries. Just recently, Chairman of the Federal

Reserve Board, Arthur F. Burns, supported this view in reiterating his advocacy of a strong "incomes" policy to deal with wage and price behavior in the private economy. Specifically, Burns has recommended a new wage and price review board that would gradually establish a set of guidelines through the process of "case law."

The Emergency Guidance Board bill which I have introduced provides just such a program. This legislation, which could be termed "sophisticated jawboning," provides an approach which would deal firmly yet fairly with all inflationary industries. I urge the President to adopt this overall plan in place of the halting steps he has taken thus far.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY BEFORE THE PHILADELPHIA CHAPTER OF COPE

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, recently the junior Senator from California, the Honorable JOHN V. TUNNEY, addressed the Philadelphia chapter of the AFL-CIO Political Action Committee on the occasion of its 22d annual banquet and victory dinner.

Mr. Speaker, this young man, our former colleague, gave one of the most spell-binding speeches ever delivered by anyone in public life. This is not my opinion alone, but is the opinion of all those in attendance on that occasion. His speech merits the reading by everyone. Under unanimous consent I include the speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNEY

I am pleased to be here in Philadelphia tonight and am honored that you asked me to address your Victory celebration. I am probably one of the few members of the Senate who is not a candidate for the Presidency.

It's good to be in a State where you have a Governor and a Lieutenant Governor who recognize the enormous problems that our State Administrations are confronted with today. Unlike California, where we have an "Acting Governor", Pennsylvanians are indeed lucky to have men like Governor Shapp and Lieutenant Governor Kline in Office.

It's also good to see all of my colleagues from the House again. I want you to know that Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the country are ably represented by men like Bill Barrett, Jimmy Byrne, Bob Nix, Bill Green and Joshua Ellberg.

I have just returned from California where they have had a very bad earthquake. While I was out there, we also had another natural disaster. Vice President Agnew came out. When the Vice President was asked to comment on the situation I understand that he was supposed to have remarked . . . "when you've seen one earthquake, . . . you've seen them all."

Last Fall, this country was subjected to a campaign based on fear rather than reason; a campaign that relied on the politics of provocation rather than the politics of problem solving. We witnessed several members of the National Administration traveling the country trying to divide and arouse our people. They campaigned on what were termed "the social issues." These were the issues of race and crime. Issues guaranteed to polarize; issues that were a part of the

sectional and ethnic politics that the Nixon Administration played in 1970.

Well, as we know, they were not very successful. And one of the reasons for their lack of success; . . . one of the reasons why candidates like Governor Shapp, . . . candidates like the Congressmen here tonight, . . . and candidates like myself were able to succeed was the overwhelming support that we received from the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education. The causes and the candidates that COPE endorsed were those causes that stand for peace and progress in America. They are the causes that mean jobs and equality . . . and not fear and illogic. COPE's contributions go further than just the Democratic Party; . . . they go to the very essence of what this country is all about. They are based on what is good for the country . . . and not just the Democratic Party.

However, the efforts that you made last fall need to be continued. For America today is a country in need of new leadership. The plain facts are, that the present Administration in Washington has proved itself incapable of facing up to the real problems that confront our country. They have proved themselves incapable of recognizing them . . . of understanding them . . . and of solving them.

Tonight, as I speak to you, there are more than five million people in America who are unemployed; . . . and two and a half million more who are able to find only part time employment.

Tonight, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans who are overseas . . . fighting and dying . . . half a world away . . . in the jungles of Southeast Asia.

Tonight, many of our States and our cities, are on the verge of collapse because of the warped priorities that are espoused by the Nixon Administration.

We have people in America tonight who have never seen a doctor; . . . who seldom have a hot meal.

We have families whose personal savings can be wiped out when a major illness strikes. The skyrocketing cost of health care can drive a family into bankruptcy within a week's time.

We have thousands of Senior Citizens living in poverty. We have large corporations willfully polluting our air and our rivers.

What's wrong in America? Why is it that we can find the capacity to send men to the moon and bring them back and yet we cannot find the will to make our cities livable? Why is it that we have the capacity to split an atom and yet we cannot find the will to devise a cure for cancer? Why is it that we have the capacity to transmit live broadcasts from outer space and yet we cannot find the will to feed those hungry among us?

We spend billions every year propping up governments around the world and spend only a fraction of that amount building houses, hospitals and schools here in our own land? We form alliances with hundreds of Nations throughout the Globe and yet we seem unable to communicate with the poor, the black, and the brown on the streetcorners of Philadelphia or Los Angeles.

We have an Attorney General who talks about respect for the Law and yet he works within an Administration that has knowingly violated the spirit of laws passed by Congress . . . in expanding the war into Laos.

Why is it that the Attorney General almost gleefully, arrests priests and nuns and yet does very little about the large drug companies that knowingly produce twice as many amphetamines and barbiturates as are needed for domestic consumption; pills that soon find their way into the streets of America and into the hands of our children?

Why is it that he would rather beef up the Justice Department's Division of Internal Security rather than put more lawyers to work in enforcing the provisions of our Occupational, Health and Safety Laws. While

the Attorney General talks tough about vague conspiracies—men are losing their lives in the mines; construction workers are being killed as half finished buildings collapse; workers are dying from toxic fumes in plants.

Something is wrong in America when you have respected government officials being spied on by Army Intelligence; . . . when you have people dismissed from the F.B.I. merely because they point out what they feel are flaws in that Agency, in the hope of improving both its effectiveness and its image. There's something wrong when the Secretary of Defense can call an invasion of another country . . . merely "a matter of semantics." This is the same Secretary of Defense who last Fall said that a little unemployment was a good thing for America.

The invasion of Laos isn't just a matter of semantics. It is the single most disruptive act, . . . to both world peace and domestic stability . . . that President Nixon could have allowed. Our actions in Southeast Asia over the last year have defied the lessons of history. The statements of this Administration with regard to these actions have taxed credibility and formed the basis for further protest and action across our country.

As a result of this Administration's failure to learn from the lessons of history, the lives of our children are now on the line in yet another country in that quagmire of death that is called Southeast Asia. Laos has now become a burial ground for both American soldiers and President Nixon's Vietnamization Plan. Laos has now become the touchstone for a new round of protests and demonstrations that will most probably result in furthering the violence, frustration, and alienation that have long surrounded our seemingly never ending commitment to the Military Governments of Indochina. I want to know when the President is going to act on his commitment to the people of America? When are we going to fight for America? When are we going to confront the problems that we face here at home? When are we going to allocate a little money for our cities and our States?

Why is it that we have committed ourselves so strongly to a government that would be toppled by its own people if it were not for the strength that they derive from American Arms? If the South Vietnamese Government is suddenly so brave; . . . if they want so badly to invade Cambodia and Laos and North Vietnam; . . . then I suggest that President Thieu and Vice President Ky lead the charge . . . and allow our men to return home.

Someone ought to tell President Nixon that the way out of Vietnam does not lead through Cambodia and Laos. I feel that we should withdraw every American Soldier from Southeast Asia no later than the end of this year.

All of us in this room tonight have an obligation to tell the President of the United States, clearly and unequivocally . . . no more Vietnams. That war numbers more than 45,000 young men among its casualties. It has also killed our economic system. It has caused the economic royalists surrounding the Administration to plan the unemployment of thousands of Americans in order to cut the rate of inflation.

In January of 1969, the unemployment rate in this country was 3.4%. Today it is 6%. In January of 1969, 5.5% of the construction force was unemployed. Today that figure is 11.2%. Here in Philadelphia, the unemployment rate was 2.6% in November of 1969. In December of 1970, that figure was up to 4.5%. Real income is down . . . and prices are up.

In my state of California, the unemployment rate is 7%. One out of eight persons in Los Angeles County is on welfare.

What this Administration apparently doesn't realize is that people have to have jobs. You can't live on "Alice in Wonderland" statements from Arthur Burns or George Shultz . . . you have to work.

When you deprive man of his job . . . when you force him out of work . . . when he loses the opportunity to provide for his family . . . to pay his bills . . . you deprive him of his dignity. And this Administration, in an attempt, to halt inflation has planned millions of Americans out of work. This must stop.

It's going to be up to organizations like COPE . . . and people in the Congress like we have here tonight . . . and people in the Statehouses across America who are like Governor Shapp . . . it's going to be up to people like this to speak out and fight for the kinds of programs that are based on the needs of our people and not on the Pentagon.

Making life more comfortable for the resident of one square block of Philadelphia is more important than all the SST's we could ever build. Making our air fit to breathe and our water fit to drink is more important than giving billions of dollars worth of arms to right wing dictatorships through the Food for Peace Plan. A new school, . . . a modern hospital, . . . a warm home, . . . these are the things that America should be building instead of wasting its efforts on a war that is draining our conscience and our treasury and turning our soldiers into drug addicts.

When you build a dam in California, . . . or a new housing development in Philadelphia . . . you get results. People go to work. They make money from their jobs, . . . They buy things. But what happens when you build a gun or a missile. What happens when you invest in war? Death . . . That's all. There is no further return on a very poor investment. For too long, we have allowed ourselves to engage in a deadly game of overkill. We do need a strong National Defense. I don't doubt that, in fact, I support these efforts. But how many times can you blow up the world? How many nuclear bombs and missiles do we need?

Right now, we need to build a few houses and create a few jobs here in America.

We need a replacement for our present welfare system; a system that is both demeaning to the recipients and bankrupting to the States that administer it. It ought to be replaced by some version of the Family Assistance Plan. . . . a welfare program for the working poor.

We need to have some sort of Revenue Sharing Program that will guarantee the States an adequate return for the tax dollars that they send to Washington. An excellent first step might well be the Federalization of our welfare program. If this were done, progressive States like Pennsylvania would not have to pay the price for those States like Alabama and Mississippi who want to force the poor to leave.

We need a National Health Care Program that will guarantee all Americans adequate and economical health care from birth to death.

We need more money allotted for Manpower Training Bills and Employment Opportunity Acts so that those who are displaced from their jobs can be retrained; so that those low income and chronically unemployed people can find jobs.

We need an extension of unemployment benefits.

We need stringently enforced antipollution laws so that those who willfully abuse our environment will be made to pay.

We need extensive reforms of our campaign spending laws so that the public office will be open to all who chose to run . . . to all who want to serve.

We need to have a President of the United States who can recognize and address himself to the problems that confront this country.

Two years ago we were told "to watch what they did and not what they said." Well I have watched what they have done. And I have seen them. . . . Invade Cambodia and invade Laos.

I have seen the President of the United States—

Veto an appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare;

Veto an appropriations bill for the Office of Education;

Veto an appropriations bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

Veto the Hospital Modernization Guarantee Loan Act;

Veto a bill aimed at enhancing the employment and training opportunities for low income and unemployed persons;

Veto a bill which would have given Federal Blue Collar Employees a pay raise; and

Veto a bill aimed at limiting the amount that could be spent on political broadcasting by candidates.

Well, this country can no longer afford to wait until election year to have our problems discussed. We can no longer afford to listen to the empty rhetoric of those who merely propose and promise . . . but never act. We can no longer afford to be governed by those who cannot understand the fact that people are tired of "politics as usual;" that people today want only to believe their government; that they want only to be given some sense of hope . . . some sense that, perhaps there is someone in Washington or Harrisburg, or Boston or Sacramento . . . that really cares about them; . . . that will really try.

All of us have an obligation to heed this call . . . to listen to what the people of this great land are saying. If we don't, then the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, and organizations like COPE . . . will soon prove to be meaningless because the people will turn elsewhere for support . . . and for assistance.

Certainly, it is within our grasp to change the directions and the priorities of America. It is merely a question of leadership: political leadership and moral leadership . . . we need to bring this country together over issues and not ideology. We need to develop leadership based on conscience and not merely consensus. America certainly has the capacity; . . . it has merely to be given the will.

An Italian philosopher once made the statement that "there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."

This is our task. For in the final analysis, we are all one people . . . one Nation . . . one World; all sharing the same small currents of time and energy. And it is up to each of us to make an effort toward confronting challenge . . . toward implementing change and progress; . . . to make this effort so that those who follow will find a true community of mankind.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to testify today to the success of a demonstration program by military and civilian elements of our Government, cooperating in a splendid service called the Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic, or MAST. The first of these tests was inaugurated last July at Fort Sam Houston, serving 10 counties around San Antonio, Tex. Seven of these counties are in my district, and I am pleased to report widespread Government, military, and civilian approval.

I propose three reports to the Congress

on this effort. As other Members know, similar tests are being conducted elsewhere, but I am most familiar with the work of the 507th Medical Company—air ambulance—at Fort Sam. Its success is now being evaluated by an interdepartmental team; I believe continuation of the service has great merit.

This is a mercy airlift service, supplementing other methods as needs arise, to speed injured, sick, and wounded persons to hospitals from outlying areas. I stress that this is done at no extra taxpayer expense, since the mean, money, and equipment operate with defense funds. Indeed, the service provides genuine training benefits to the helicopter pilots and medics who man the air ambulances.

Let me cite some examples:

Last July 15, inauguration of the new service was announced by Secretaries Volpe and Laird. Two days later, on July 17, came the first call to action. At 10:33 a.m., the request for emergency air lift reached the Project MAST office. Two minutes later, a helicopter was in the air, winging toward a hospital in Dilley, Tex., 85 miles away. A 17-year-old youth had been run over by a truck in a farm accident. At the Dilley hospital, determination was made that he needed more extensive medical facilities if he was to survive. At 12:05, the air medic crew delivered the youth, with his mother and brother, to Baptist Memorial Hospital in San Antonio. He had a broken shoulder blade, broken thigh, crushed chest and internal injuries, but prompt and proper care was provided for him.

Later in July, a Sacramento, Calif., man was mangled in a motor accident near Uvalde, Tex. After 36 hours, the general practitioner who treated him, Dr. Sterling Fry, knew greater medical care was needed. In this case, the MAST service picked up a chest specialist from the University of Texas Medical School, two inhalation specialists from the county hospital, and a respirator. The men and equipment kept the victim alive while he was flown 81 miles from Uvalde to Bexar County Hospital in San Antonio.

And even as that flight was in the air, another emergency call was being handled. A baby needing a blood transfusion was airlifted from Crystal City to the Santa Rosa Medical Center, a distance of 126 miles.

The next day, a 12-year-old girl suffered a major back injury in a fall from a tree near her home in Kerrville. She, too, was delivered to the Santa Rosa Children's hospital in San Antonio, 69 miles away, promptly and deftly.

The list of emergencies is long. There have been cases of hunting accidents, or major burns, of newborn babies needing transfusions, even a heart attack victim whose condition worsened in an ambulance so the driver called for the faster helicopter transport. Incidentally, ambulance service is still used on short-haul calls and continues to be important. The familiar ambulance vehicles are only being supplemented by the helicopters.

Secretary Laird, when this service was initiated, stressed the parallel to the airlift ambulances of Vietnam. He said that when he saw the soldiers being rushed to hospitals, he saw the possibility—indeed,

the need—for similar service to civilians. Many of us recall Mr. Laird's interest in health matters when he was a Member of this House, so we are not surprised at his understanding.

I propose to report next on how people in my district—the families of the civilians ferried to hospitals, the medical profession, and law enforcement officers—share high regard for these air ambulances.

WHY BUY CHROME FROM RUSSIA?

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the proposed release to industry of approximately 30 percent of the usable chromium now held in Government stockpiles encourages procrastination in dealing with the problem of Rhodesian sanctions. At a meeting called by the General Services Administration, it was stated, if this Nation continues to procrastinate in reestablishing our Rhodesian chrome ore sources, we may find ourselves permanently shut off from the world's largest reserve of high-grade chrome ore—reserves currently estimated to be at least 10 times greater than those of the Soviet Union.

Chromium is an essential ingredient in stainless and tool steels and is classified as a strategic material. The Office of Emergency Preparedness determines the amount of chromium maintained in Government stockpiles and is asking congressional approval for the release of some 1,300,000 tons of chromium ore equivalents. U.S. industry consumes approximately 1 million tons of chrome ore per year for metallurgical purposes.

Some observed that the proposed release would aid industry in the short term, and would generate cash for the Government, but—unfortunately—would probably result in decreased pressures on Government to drop economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

The sanctions, imposed by the U.N. in support of the British position that the present Ian Smith government in Rhodesia is an illegal regime, have been in effect since early 1967.

It was pointed out that, despite sanctions, Rhodesian chrome is being sold to countries which are among the signatories to the U.N. sanctions—probably under long-term contracts. It has now been demonstrated that Rhodesia does not need the United States as a customer.

There is intense international competition for critical raw materials and other nations in this world have aggressive programs supported by policies established by their governments. We in the United States do not share this advantage.

Whether the stockpile material which OEP wants to sell is truly excess is questionable and calls for an in-depth review of stockpile objectives.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. CONTE, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEBELIUS, today, for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. O'HARA, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, today, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PATMAN in three instances.

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

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. PETTIS in two instances.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBELL.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BAKER in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGL.

Mr. TALCOTT in three instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. MYERS.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota in two instances.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. GOLDWATER in five instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. McKEVITT in two instances.

Mr. WARE.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California in three instances.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.
 Mr. DRINAN in eight instances.
 Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.
 Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
 Mr. MOORHEAD in 10 instances.
 Mr. EILBERG in two instances.
 Mr. DIGGS in three instances.
 Mr. FRASER in four instances.
 Mr. REUSS in six instances.
 Mr. VANIK in three instances.
 Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
 Mr. STOKES in three instances.
 Mr. DORN in two instances.
 Mr. PATTEN in two instances.
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
 Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
 Mr. ST GERMAIN.
 Mr. ROONEY of New York.
 Mr. RANGEL.
 Mr. ICHORD in four instances.
 Mr. ADDABBO.
 Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
 Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.
 Mr. WOLFF.
 Mr. RODINO in four instances.
 Mr. RARICK in four instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
 Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
 Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in two instances.
 Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.
 Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.
 Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
 Mr. DULSKI in six instances.
 Mr. RYAN in three instances.
 Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.
 Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.
 Mr. STEPHENS in three instances.
 Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.
 Mr. MATHIS of Georgia in two instances.
 Mr. MELCHER in two instances.
 Mrs. ABZUG.
 Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.
 Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 1, 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:

315. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Clerk covering receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period of July 1 through December 31, 1970, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104 (a) (H. Doc. No. 92-54); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

316. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 94th quarterly report

on export control, covering the fourth quarter of 1970, pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

317. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 16-1311 of the District of Columbia Code relating to condemnation proceedings by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

318. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Bonneville Power Administration for fiscal year 1970, pursuant to Public Law 89-448; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

319. A letter from the National Secretary-Treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the organization's 88th annual encampment, together with an audit report covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1970, pursuant to Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

320. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 18. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 20. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 21. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 27. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct an investigation and study of the organization, management, operation, and administration of departments and agencies of the government of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 109. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the oversea operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 114. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of

the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-23). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 217. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-24). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-25). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 142. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-26). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 201. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-15). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ICHORD: Committee on Internal Security. Annual Report for the year 1970 (Rept. No. 92-14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 365. Joint resolution to extend the time for the proclamation of marketing quotas for burley tobacco for the 3 marketing years beginning October 1, 1971; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-16). 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. McFALL (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. COTTER, Mr. MONAGAN, and Mr. BEGICH):

H.R. 4900. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to make its benefits available to certain areas of extra high unemployment, to authorize additional funds for such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 4901. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABOUREZK:

H.R. 4902. A bill to provide that an impression of Mount Rushmore, S. Dak., shall appear on the back of all U.S. currency in the denomination of \$1; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4903. A bill to provide that an impression of Mount Rushmore, S. Dak., shall appear on the back of all U.S. currency in

the denomination of \$2; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4904. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with a \$100 minimum primary benefit, and to raise to \$2,400 a year the amount of outside earnings a beneficiary may have without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. HALPERN, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BRAY, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. QUINN, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MYERS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ROE, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 4905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education, to be cited as, "The Higher Education Gift Incentive Act of 1971"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 4906. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 4907. 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. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CULVER, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 4908. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to establish a commission to oversee and improve the capability of the National Guard to control civil disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RALLSBACK, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. REES, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 4909. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to establish a commission to oversee and improve the capability of the National Guard to control civil disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 4910. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for increases in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide health insurance benefits for the disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL (for himself, Mr. ABOUREEK, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THONE, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 4911. A bill to provide that State laws or regulations with respect to certain environmental matters shall not be preempted or nullified by Federal law until such time as regulations in lieu of such State laws or regulations are put into effect by or pursuant to Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4912. A bill to provide for the payment of losses incurred by growers, manufacturers, packers, and distributors as a result of the barring of the use of cyclamates in food after extensive inventories of foods containing such substances had been prepared or packed or packaging, labeling, and other materials had been prepared in good faith reliance on the confirmed official listing of cyclamates as generally recognized as safe for use in food under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. PRICE of Texas):

H.R. 4913. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4914. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization of reorganization expenditures of railroad corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 4915. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act by providing for the establishment of a family physician scholarship and fellowship program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADEMAM (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 4916. A bill to improve educational quality through effective utilization of educational technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 4917. A bill to provide for computation of pay for members of the armed services retired for permanent disability sustained in line of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRINKLEY (for himself, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. McDONALD of Michigan):

H.R. 4918. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 4919. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. CORDOVA, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 4920. A bill to prevent the assignment of draftees to active duty in combat areas without their consent; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. RIEGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. HARVEY):

H.R. 4921. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 4922. A bill to relieve citizens of the United States of liability to repay to the

United States amounts of money advanced to them to enable them to evacuate foreign zones of war or civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization of reorganization expenditures of railroad corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 4924. A bill to increase the authorization limitation on appropriations for land acquisition at the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4925. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1964, authorizing the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4926. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the hourly minimum wage rate to \$2.25 and to extend the coverage of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4927. 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. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act) to conserve and protect Atlantic salmon of North American origin; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4929. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that payment may be made under the hospital insurance program for emergency inpatient hospital services furnished in Canada or Mexico regardless of where the emergency occurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CAREY, of New York, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FASCELL and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 4930. A bill to repeal the Connally Hot Oil Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIAMMO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 4931. A bill to repeal the Connally Hot Oil Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 4932. A bill to repeal the Connally Hot Oil Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FASCELL and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 4933. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIALMO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS, of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 4934. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 4935. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 4936. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 4937. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4938. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa, and to redistribute said quota among certain developing African nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4939. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4940. A bill requiring that each Member of Congress be notified of the intended disposition of federally owned real property in the district he represents; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4942. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to promote the development of living historical farms in the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4943. A bill to amend section 1102 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to safeguard American citizens from racial and re-

ligious discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4944. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4945. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 4946. A bill to authorize appropriations for the establishment of a U.S. Coast Guard Air Station at North Bend, Oreg.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 4947. 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. DINGELL:

H.R. 4948. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administration to guarantee any bid, payment, or performance bond under an agreement entered into by a small business concern which is a construction contractor or subcontractor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 4949. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, to extend to mentally retarded or physically handicapped dependents of certain members and former members of the uniformed services the special care now provided to similarly affiliated dependents of members on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4950. A bill to provide for the payment of Veterans' Administration benefits where a child has been properly and legally adopted; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MANN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 4951. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 4952. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 4953. A bill to provide for Government guarantee of private loans to certain motor bus operators for purchase of modern motor buses and equipment, to foster the development and use of more modern and safer operating equipment by such carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide for equality of treatment for military personnel in the application of dependency criteria; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4955. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for equality of treatment with respect to married women Federal employees in connection with compensation for work injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4956. A bill to provide equality of treatment for married women employees of the Federal Government under the Foreign Service Act of 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4957. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide equality of treatment for married women Federal employees with respect to preference eligible employment benefits, cost-of-living allowances in foreign areas, and regulations concerning marital status generally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 4958. A bill to provide that the Allegheny Center Urban Renewal project in Pittsburgh, Pa., may include the donation of certain property for development and non-profit operation as a historical site or museum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4959. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WATTS, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LENNON, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KYL, Mr. BOW, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 4960. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. DORN, Mr. BARING, Mr. WYATT, Mr. MR. CAMP, Mr. BRAY, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. GIALMO, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. HALEY):

H.R. 4961. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. ZION, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. BYRON, Mr. PELLY, Mr. HULL, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. POWELL, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. O'KONSKI):

H.R. 4962. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illnesses, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUTH, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. FREY, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. KING, Mr. THONE, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. CHAPPEL, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 4963. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4964. A bill to confer veteran preference and other benefits upon members of the Philippine Army who have become American citizens; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

H.R. 4965. A bill to amend Public Law 89-701, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1973, the expiration date of the act and the authorization of appropriations therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 4966. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to prohibit any involvement or participation of U.S. Armed Forces in an invasion of North Vietnam without prior and explicit congressional authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 4967. A bill to provide for the cooperation between the Federal Government and the States with respect to environmental regulations for mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 4968. A bill to establish annual import quotas on certain textile and footwear articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4969. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4970. A bill to establish nondiscriminatory school systems and to preserve the

rights of elementary and secondary students to attend their neighborhood schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4971. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4972. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKS of Washington:

H.R. 4973. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax on automobiles and parts and accessories tops designed and sold for use to provide sleeping quarters when mounted on an automobile truck body; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKS of Washington (for himself and Mr. MEEDS, Mr. DORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. SISK, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. KAZEN, and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 4974. A bill to amend the Telecasting of Sports Contests Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 732), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 4975. A bill to amend section 64 of the Bankruptcy Act to afford priority to pension fund contributions earned within 3 months of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 4976. A bill to promote the advancement of biological research in aging through a comprehensive and intensive 5-year program for the systematic study of the basic origins of the aging process in human beings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4977. 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. 4978. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee and court costs in case of successful prosecution or defense of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4979. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive program of health care for the 1970's by strengthening the organization and delivery of health care nationwide and by making comprehensive health care insurance available to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 4981. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4982. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. DOW, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REDD of

New York, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 4983. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. KARTH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STEELE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PELLY, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. DUPONT):

H.R. 4984. A bill making appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year 1972 to carry out the provisions of the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 4985. A bill to reduce pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter by banning such containers when they are sold in interstate commerce on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4986. A bill to make the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 in order to make members of the Reserve and National Guard ordered to active duty for training periods of 30 days or more eligible for quarters allowances and to make allotments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 4987. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4988. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to change the last day of daylight saving time to an earlier day; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4989. A bill: The Southeast Asia Disengagement Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4990. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require premarket clearance for all additives to food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4991. A bill to authorize the U.S. Postal Service to receive the fee of \$2 for execution of an application for a passport; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4992. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. PODELL, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 4993. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that members of the Armed Forces be assigned to duty stations near their homes after serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4994. A bill to regulate interstate commerce and to provide for the general welfare by requiring certain insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways in order to have an efficient system of motor vehicle insurance

which will be uniform among the States, which will guarantee the continued availability of such insurance, and the presentation of meaningful price information, and which will provide sufficient, fair, and prompt payment for rehabilitation and losses due to injury and death arising out of the operation and use of motor vehicles within the channels of interstate commerce, and otherwise affecting such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4995. A bill to promote the greater availability of motor vehicle insurance in interstate commerce under more efficient and beneficial marketing conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 4996. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to avoid interruptions of railway transportation that threaten national safety and health by reason of labor disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4997. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income contributions by employers to plans providing motor vehicle insurance coverage for employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4999. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 in order to promote competition among motor vehicle manufacturers in the design and production of safe motor vehicles having greater resistance to damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 5000. A bill to provide a more equitable distribution of the responsibility for service in the Armed Forces, to modernize the Selective Service System, to provide for the uniform application of Selective Service policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5001. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish standards of conduct for military officers dealing in an official capacity with defense contractors, to prohibit employment of retired officers by defense contractors unless such officers have been certified as not violating such standards during their service careers, to establish a board to make such certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5002. A bill to amend section 273 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the armed forces who are Members of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States shall be transferred to the inactive status of the Standby Reserve under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5003. A bill to provide for the disclosure of certain information relating to certain public opinion polls; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 5004. A bill to provide for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives. Members of the U.S. Senate, Justices and judges of the U.S. courts, and policymaking officials of the executive branch as designated by the Civil Service Commission, but including the President, Vice President, and Cabinet Members; and by candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency; and to give the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the Senate Select Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Director of the Administrative Office of the

U.S. Courts and the Attorney General of the United States appropriate jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5005. A bill to amend section 203 of title 18, United States Code, to forbid the solicitation or acceptance of payment in return for assisting individuals with regard to positions in any military component, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5006. A bill to assist State and local criminal justice systems in the rehabilitation of adult and youth criminal offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5007. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5008. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum monthly benefits thereunder at age 72 for all uninsured individuals, without regard to the time at which such age is attained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5009. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that women who are 62 years of age or over and are eligible for cash social security (or railroad retirement) benefits shall also be eligible for hospital insurance benefits (and supplementary medical insurance benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 5010. A bill to assure equal access for farmworkers to programs and procedures instituted for the protection of American working men and women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DRINAN, and Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5011. A bill to incorporate the Historic Naval Ships Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment to certain distributions pursuant to the Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COTTE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WIDNALL, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. JOHNSON, of Pennsylvania, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5013. A bill to authorize U.S. contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COTTE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WIDNALL, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. BROWN of Michigan):

H.R. 5014. A bill to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5015. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial

assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5016. 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. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 5017. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 5018. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEE, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LINK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 5019. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mrs. Mink, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REES, Mr. RED of New York, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 5020. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. ST

GERMAIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIEK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 5021. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 5022. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FREY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALEY, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 5023. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to engage in public works for the prevention and control of water pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FREY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HALEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 5024. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dredge the Miami River, Dade County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 5025. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LENT, and Mr. McCLORY):

H.R. 5026. A bill to amend the consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to increase the loan limitation on certain loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. McCLORE, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THONE, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 5027. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to increase the loan limitation on certain loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of

North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LENT, and Mr. McCLORY):

H.R. 5028. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide for insured operating loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. MANN, Mr. McCLORE, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THONE, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 5029. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide for insured operating loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 5030. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited samples of cigarettes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. OBEY, Mr. POFF, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 5032. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DORN, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H.R. 5033. A bill to provide for the mandatory civil commitment of certain narcotic addicts, to provide for more facilities for treating, supervising, and controlling narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. HUNT):

H.R. 5034. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to permit the mailing of lottery tickets and related matter, the broadcasting or televising of lottery information, and the transportation and advertising of lottery tickets in interstate commerce, but only where the lottery is conducted by a State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5035. A bill to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of government, by providing Federal cooperation and assistance in the establishment and strengthening of State and local offices of consumer protection; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5036. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in labeling and advertising of certain drugs sold by prescription the "es-

tablished name" of such drugs must appear each time the proprietary name is used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5037. A bill to provide minimum disclosure standards for written warranties and guaranties of consumer products against defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties and guaranties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5038. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to make sales promotion games unfair methods of competition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5039. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 5040. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for civil service retirement purposes service as an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5041. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the waiver of certain grounds for exclusion and deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 5042. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Brantley project, Pecos River Basin, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5043. A bill making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Noise Pollution and Abatement Act of 1970 (title IV of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, Public Law 91-604) for the year ending June 30, 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 5044. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5045. A bill to authorize financial assistance for opportunities industrialization centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5046. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of Federal employees group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance during periods of active duty and active duty for training with the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5047. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5048. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum monthly benefits thereunder at age 72 for all uninsured individuals, without regard to the time at which such age is attained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. KYL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr.

DERWINSKI, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5049. A bill to regulate the discharges of wastes in territorial and international waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SANDMAN (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FISH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. THONE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. STEELE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. BURKE of Florida):

H.R. 5050. A bill to regulate the discharge of wastes in territorial and international waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5051. A bill to preserve, stabilize, and reactivate the domestic gold mining industry on public, Indian, and other lands within the United States and to increase the domestic production of gold to provide the requirements of industry, national defense, and other nonmonetary uses of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5052. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize additional training or education for certain veterans who are no longer eligible for training, in order to restore employability lost due to technological changes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5053. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make the children of certain veterans having a service-connected disability rated at not less than 50 percent eligible for benefits under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5054. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide hospital and medical care thereunder with respect to any disability of any veteran of World War I or a period of war thereafter who was a prisoner of war for 180 or more consecutive days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5055. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any 5-year level premium term plan policy of national service life insurance shall be deemed paid when premiums paid in, less dividends, equal the amount of the policy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5056. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any 5-year level premium term plan policy of U.S. Government life insurance shall be deemed paid when premiums paid in, less dividends, equal the amount of the policy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5057. A bill to amend section 333 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans who serve 2 or more years in peacetime shall be entitled to a presumption that chronic diseases becoming manifest within 1 year from the date of separation from service are service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5058. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall provide complete medical services for any veteran totally disabled from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. BRADEMAs):

H.R. 5059. A bill relating to the construction of an oil pipeline system in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FREY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LENT, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PELLY, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. ROGERS):

H.R. 5060. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide a criminal penalty for shooting at certain birds, fish, and other animals from an aircraft; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 5061. A bill to establish a National Institute of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 5062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LINK, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. MELCHER):

H.R. 5063. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROY, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SIKES, Mr. STEELE, Mr. THONE, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 5064. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 5065. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 5066. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and succeeding fiscal years to carry out the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 5067. A bill to improve intergovernmental relationships, and the economy and efficiency of all levels of government, by providing Federal block grants for States and localities where there is a demonstration of State intention to modernize State and local government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself, Mr. HALEY, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 5068. A bill to authorize grants for the Navajo Community College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5069. A bill to provide for the Federal collection of certain State and local income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5070. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 5071. 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. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 5072. A bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of restrictions imposed on domestic commercial fishing by a State or the Federal Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5073. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the retirement of the public debt by setting aside the first 5 percent of the budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year for the sole purpose of retirement of obligations counted as part of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. ABZUG, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 5074. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' suits and class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. VANIK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. ROE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STEELE, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 5075. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' suits and class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RYAN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. PIKE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. FISH, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HAYS, Mr. REES, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 5076. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' suits and class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 5077. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5078. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 5079. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of the entire amount of carrying charges paid on installment purchases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 5080. A bill to establish a Commission on Security and Safety of Cargo; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 5081. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in small towns and rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYLIE (for himself, Mrs.

ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BARING, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FREY, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 5082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$3,000 of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYLIE (for himself, Mr. Mc-

KINNEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. ROE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 5083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$3,000 of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 5084. A bill to prohibit assaults on State law enforcement officers, firemen, and judicial officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deduction from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5086. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for

himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MANN, Mr. HANLEY, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 5087. A bill to set standards of ethics and financial disclosure in campaigns for election to Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for

himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. FISH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WYATT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DUNCAN,

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 5088. A bill to set standards of ethics and financial disclosure in campaigns for election to Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. ANDER-

son of Illinois, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. LINK, Mr. BELL, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. ROBISON, of New York, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 5089. A bill to set standards of ethics and financial disclosure in campaigns for election to Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for

himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MANN, and Mr. HANLEY):

H.R. 5090. A bill to provide certain amounts of television program time for candidates for Federal offices during general elections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for him-

self, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. FISH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WYATT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 5091. A bill to provide certain amounts of television program time for candidates for Federal offices during general elections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. AN-

DERSON of Illinois, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. LINK, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 5092. A bill to provide certain amounts of television program time for candidates for Federal offices during general elections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for

himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MANN, and Mr. HANLEY):

H.R. 5093. A bill to provide a reduced rate of postage for a certain amount of

campaign literature mailed by congressional candidates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for

himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. FISH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WYATT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 5094. A bill to provide a reduced rate of postage for a certain amount of campaign literature mailed by congressional candidates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. AN-

DERSON of Illinois, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. LINK, Mr. BELL, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 5095. A bill to provide a reduced rate of postage for a certain amount of campaign literature mailed by congressional candidates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for him-

self, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MANN, and Mr. HANLEY):

H.R. 5096. A bill; Tax credits for political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for

himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. FISH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WYATT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 5097. A bill; Tax credits for political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. AN-

DERSON of Illinois, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. LINK, Mr. BELL, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 5098. A bill; Tax credits for political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for

himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. DRINAN,

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. THONE, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.R. 5099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education, to be cited as, "The Higher Education Gift Incentive Act of 1971"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.J. Res. 381. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 383. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. McCORMACK):

H.J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROY, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STEED, Mr. STEPHENS, and Mr. STUCKEY):

H.J. Res. 386. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ZION):

H.J. Res. 387. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. MIZELL):

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 389. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 390. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year as "Fire Service Recognition Day", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 391. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.J. Res. 392. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 394. 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.

H.J. Res. 395. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 396. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 397. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to reduce the voting age to 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. BARING, and Mr. ICHORD):

H.J. Res. 399. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 400. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. POFF, and Mr. McCLORY):

H.J. Res. 401. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age; or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year as "Fire Service Recognition Day", and for other services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. CABELL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FREY, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ROE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WINN and Mr. McCORMACK):

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution designating the third week in July of each year as "National Man in Space Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNT,

Mr. MINISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey) (by request):

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New Jersey and New York for certain amendments to the Waterfront Commission Compact and for entering into the Airport Commission Compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.J. Res. 406. Joint resolution proposing designation of March 21, the Vernal Equinox, of each year as "Earth Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the production and distribution in interstate and foreign commerce of motion pictures and television programs which degrade or demean racial, religious, or ethnic groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WYDLER):

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution; that the Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mr. RUNNELS):

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution calling for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that aid to and trade with any country which extends any aid or assistance to North Vietnam shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. Brown of Michigan, and Mr. ROY):

H. Res. 249. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CULVER:

H. Res. 250. Resolution to amend rules X, XII and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 251. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. DELLUMS):

H. Res. 252. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the

Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 253. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. KARTH, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H. Res. 254. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 255. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 256. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H. Res. 257. Resolution designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

32. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the establishment of a nonvoting Delegate in the U.S. House of Representatives from Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

33. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the blasting of stumps in Lake Hartwell and Clark's Hill Reservoir, S.C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 5100. A bill for the relief of Edgardo Brian Walton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 5101. A bill to release the conditions in a deed with respect to certain property heretofore conveyed by the United States to the Columbia Military Academy and its successors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 5102. A bill for the relief of George Adom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5103. A bill for the relief of Aldo Amanini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5104. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Angeloti, also known as Giuseppina Angeloti Dall'Angul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5105. A bill for the relief of Nicola Augelletta, his wife, Ida Augelletta, and their children, Rosa Augelletta, Maria Carmela Augelletta, and Susanna Augelletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5106. A bill for the relief of Polberto Obias Baranuelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5107. A bill for the relief of Carlo Basanini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5108. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Bivona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5109. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cannata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5110. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carbone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5111. A bill for the relief of Maria Cardinal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5112. A bill for the relief of Perla Casuto (nee Eskanazi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5113. A bill for the relief of Nicola Cianci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5114. A bill for the relief of Maria D'Apruzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5115. A bill for the relief of Carmine D'Apruzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5116. A bill for the relief of Bonaventura Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5117. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ferraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5118. A bill for the relief of Brenda Gill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5118. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giustino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5120. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Inico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5121. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Ippolito, his wife, Ada Ippolito, and their children, Giuseppe and Nunzia Ippolito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5122. A bill for the relief of Dionisia C. Japco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5123. A bill for the relief of Sister Angelina Landolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5124. A bill for the relief of Benedetta Larca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5125. A bill for the relief of Anna Flumefreddo Lembo and Giovanni Lembo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5126. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lo Zito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5127. A bill for the relief of Ippolita Maffei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5128. A bill for the relief of Eduardo and Giovanna Malorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5129. A bill for the relief of Filippo Morici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5130. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Passalacqua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5131. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Pezzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5132. A bill for the relief of Antonio Regalbutto, his wife, Maria Regalbutto, and their son, Domenico Regalbutto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5133. A bill for the relief of Paolo Reparto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5134. A bill for the relief of Angela Antonio Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5135. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sereno and Orsola Mannino Sereno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5136. A bill for the relief of Stefano Squitieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5137. A bill for the relief of Catello, Grazia, and Adriana Striano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5138. A bill for the relief of Lidia Tagliaferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5139. A bill for the relief of Domenico Viscariello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 5140. A bill for the relief of Luciano Dimino, Antonina Scarpulla Dimino, and Maria Giuseppina Dimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 5141. A bill for the relief of Master Sergeant Robert M. Stachura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5142. A bill for the relief of Nello Giarelli, Rosa Cafagno Giarelli, Marcelo Giarelli,

and Isabel Giarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Patti, Maria Rita Repici Patti, and Francesco Patti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Concetta Fulco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5145. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe L. Anchetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Wei Tack Lick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 5147. A bill for the relief of Filipinas D. Framil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes S. Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 5149. A bill for the relief of Jose Posada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Lilia Romay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Lol Sing Yip, his wife, Szeto Pik Shun Yip, and their minor son, Koon Ying Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Filomeno De Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pietro DeSantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5154. A bill for the relief of Candida LoGatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Miss Milagros M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5156. A bill for the relief of Ronald K. Downie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 5157. A bill for the relief of Alexandria de Medeiros Cipriano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5158. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5159. A bill for the relief of Maria Ascencao Reis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 5160. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ardito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5161. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Baldwin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5162. A bill for the relief of John J. Hartin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5163. A bill for the relief of Charles A. McInnis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5164. A bill for the relief of the New York Toy Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5165. A bill for the relief of Dr. Garcia Quintana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 5166. A bill for the relief of Dinis De Almeida Tavares Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5167. A bill for the relief of Maria Beatriz Ribeiro De Compos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5168. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Falacano Di Pietro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 5169. A bill for the relief of Violetta Stylianou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5170. A bill for the relief of James Yunnan Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 5171. A bill for the relief of Gregorio E. Mamerto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 5172. A bill for the relief of Miss Emma Falco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5173. A bill for the relief of Andres Carrasco-Villapudua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 5174. A bill for the relief of Glover Packing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5175. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to present a gold medal to the widow of Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5176. A bill for the relief of Michael Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5177. A bill for the relief of Simeon Agapito Alejon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5178. A bill for the relief of Orlando D'Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5179. A bill for the relief of Soo Yong Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5180. A bill for the relief of Nguyen van My; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 5181. A bill for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

34. The Speaker presented petition of the Village Assembly, Tomigusuku, Okinawa, relative to granting jurisdiction to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands over criminal offenses committed by members and civilian employees of the U.S. Armed Forces, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE—Thursday, February 25, 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:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, help us to face this day and the distant future unafraid. Show us a vision of a world made new and the way by which it can come into being.

Forbid us to be satisfied with things as they are, or content with having our own way, when it is Thy way which we seek and Thy will which is to be done. Open our minds to the wisdom in others and our hearts to the loveliness men hide from us. We do not ask that Thou wilt keep us secure where we are, but that Thou wilt keep us loyal and true in service to our fellow man.

While we pray to make us worthy servants in this place, we ask Thy continued blessing upon the whole Nation, that it may be so committed to righteous purposes as to be a beacon of hope for our troubled world.

In the name of Him who gave His life for others. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 24, 1971, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TALMADGE ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, on

Monday next, immediately after the approval of the Journal, if there is no objection, and the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the able Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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.

REPORT ON PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In a democracy, policy is the public's business. I believe the President has an obligation to lay before the American people and its Congress the basic premises of his policy and to report fully on the issues, developments, and prospects confronting the Nation.

Shortly before my inauguration, I concluded that an annual Presidential report on foreign policy would serve these ends well. Each report would measure progress and outline what remains to be done.

I hereby transmit to the Congress the second annual Presidential review of United States foreign policy.

This year my message will be supplemented by two major documents: the Secretary of State's review—the first of its kind—and the annual Defense Report by the Secretary of Defense. Both of these will be comprehensive and detailed accounts, filling out the basic framework and philosophy set forth in this Presidential message.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1971.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 45 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

QUORUM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE WORLD

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, today the President of the United States sent to Congress a comprehensive message on the state of the world. The report, 180 typewritten pages in length, entitled "United States Foreign Policy for the 1970's—Building for Peace," is a comprehensive statement on U.S. foreign policy.

In addition, President Nixon today addressed the Nation on radio, and summarized many of the points made in his state of the world message.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's radio address to the Nation today be printed in the RECORD.