

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 2, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The heavens declare the glory of God: and the firmament showeth His handiworks.—Psalms 19:1.

Almighty and eternal God, who hast created this expanding universe and who dost keep the planets in their courses, yet art mindful of the faint whispers of our human minds, before Thee we bow in reverence contemplating the glory of Thy being, the greatness of Thy work, and the goodness of Thy spirit. Thou hast blessed us in many ways and led us in many paths. For all these blessings we are truly grateful.

Particularly are we thankful for those who labor so diligently in our space program and for the success of our astronauts in reaching the moon and returning safely. May Thy blessing rest upon all who work in this area and may success continue to attend their efforts. As our knowledge of the world increases so may our faith in Thee increase that we may use our knowledge wisely and for the good of all.

We pray in the spirit of the Pioneer of Life, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE APOLLO 14 ASTRONAUTS INTO THE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort our distinguished visitors into the Chamber the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. O'NEILL, the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON, and the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. WYMAN.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes, p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE APOLLO 14 ASTRONAUTS

The SPEAKER of the House presided. At 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper (Hon. William M. Miller) announced the Apollo 14 astronauts.

Capt. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy; Capt. Edgar Dean Mitchell, U.S. Navy; and Lt. Col. Stuart Allen Roosa, U.S. Air Force; accompanied by the Committee of Escort, entered the Chamber and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. My colleagues of the House of Representatives, I have the very high honor of welcoming on behalf of the House of Representatives to this Chamber those heroic astronauts of Apollo 14 who have accomplished on behalf of mankind and the Nation the most difficult, most sophisticated feat in the history of modern technology.

I have the further honor of presenting to you the distinguished and veteran commander of that flight, Capt. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Captain SHEPARD. Thank you so much.

Since I am the commander of the mission, I have the prerogative of designating how the tasks will be accomplished.

My first designation this morning will be to designate my two buddies over here permission of saying a few words to you—just a few little mementos of what went on during the flight of Apollo 14.

I would like to introduce first Capt. Ed Mitchell.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Captain MITCHELL. Thank you, Alan.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, I am hard pressed to tell you about Apollo 14 in the next 2 minutes, but I thought you might be interested to know what we feel we accomplished in 9 hours and 17 minutes on the lunar surface. That is slightly more than a normal working day, but let me see if I can reiterate for you—enumerate for you some of those items.

We set up a nuclear generating station. We set up a telemetry control station which was powered by the generating station. We set up six very complicated experiments that were controlled from the ground. We conducted or set up—performed five additional experiments on the lunar surface. We evaluated a new wheeled vehicle. We collected about 45 different samples totaling 95 pounds, the largest of which was 21 pounds. We drove four core tubes into the lunar surface. We dug a trench so that the geologists could have an insight as to what the surface looked like just beneath what we could see. We traversed approximately 2 miles across the lunar surface making geological observations as we went. We erected a TV station and conducted a 9-hour "Today" show. We formed the first lunar "Olympics," which consisted of two holes of golf and one javelin throw.

That was a pretty good day's work. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Captain SHEPARD. I would, at this time, like to introduce the third member of the Apollo 14 crew. The poor fellow did not have the fun on the lunar surface as we did, because he had to stay up there and orbit around and listen to all the fun we were having. But nonetheless, he did a tremendous job by himself photographing the lunar surface, and returned with a collection of photographs that will help the cartographers, help the geologists, and enthuse those who are interested in looking at a strange planet.

Command module pilot Lt. Col. Stuart Roosa.

Lieutenant Colonel ROOSA. You know, of all the thrills of Apollo 14 I do not believe any of them can match the thrill that it is for me to stand in front of this body this morning.

I think every American, every citizen of the country, at some time tries his best to visit Washington, D.C. I know I did when I was in high school and passed through the galleries and watched the Congress in action, and was extremely thrilled.

It is very difficult for me to find the words to tell you gentlemen how much I appreciate the opportunity to be standing in this body on this day.

I also want to thank all of you who made it possible for Apollo 14 to be the success it was. I look upon Apollo 14 with a great deal of pride and humility—pride in being a crewmember on 14, pride in being associated with NASA, and pride in being a citizen of this great country. I also feel humble in association with a project which I like to think personifies the spirit of our forefathers, the spirit that took the American flag from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific coast and has three times planted it on the surface of the moon.

Thank you very much.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Captain SHEPARD. Thank you, Ed, and thank you, Stu.

I would like to add at this time a few of my own thoughts, and if you will allow me to think back to 1959 when we first started the manned space effort, when we first started this country's total space program, many of you here today were there then. Many of you have since suffered with us through the valleys, the low points of our space program, as well as through the high points.

I think you will agree with me, having shared this experience with us, that the mission of Kitty Hawk and Antares—that of Apollo 14—really is the payoff, the culmination of the years of effort and the long hours and days and weeks of work that we all have put into this program together.

We met with Chairman MILLER this morning, as perhaps most of you know, and gave him a really detailed report of the contributions that Apollo 14 has made. We talked about the scientific contributions and the immediate and in-

direct benefits which accrue. We talked about the geological contributions which will enable man to know more about the planet Moon and certainly more about the planet Earth as the result of these studies. We talked about the tremendous momentum that has been achieved as a result of this completely successful flight.

It is a memorable day for all three of us—a day that we will never forget. And, as Stu said earlier, it is the recognition of the contributions of flights such as Apollo 14, the overall benefits and prestige which this country enjoys from having that flag up there, and all the technical benefits which accrue, that is the thing that we rejoice in this morning.

Having suffered through the low points with you and having rejoiced with you in our joint successful efforts, I thank you very much for this opportunity. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Our distinguished visitors have agreed to present themselves in the well of the House in order that they may greet all the Members of this body. Will the Committee of Escort now accompany the distinguished visitors to the well of the House.

The distinguished visitors were escorted to the well of the House by the Committee of Escort.

The SPEAKER. Will Members please give attention to the Chair. The Chair would like, while the astronauts are greeting Members, to present those who have honored us just as much as their distinguished husbands, fathers, and sons.

The Chair would like to present the wife of Capt. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., Mrs. Louise Shepard.

The Chair also is pleased to present the children of Captain Shepard: Mrs. Laura Shepard Snyder, Julie Shepard, and Alice Shepard.

Now it is a particular pleasure to be able to present the parents of one of our most illustrious and successful astronauts, who have lived to see him perform great feats, Mr. and Mrs. Alan Shepard of East Derry, N.H.

The Chair would next like to present the wife of Capt. Edgar D. Mitchell, U.S. Navy, Mrs. Louise Mitchell. And the children: Karlyn Mitchell and Elizabeth Mitchell.

The Chair would like to present the distinguished mother, not only because of who her son is, but also because of where she is from, Mrs. Ernest Wagoner of Tahlequah, Okla.

The Chair would like to present the wife of Lt. Col. Stuart Allen Roosa, U.S. Air Force, Mrs. Joan Roosa. And the children: Christopher, John, Stuart, Jr., and Rosemary. The Roosas are going to be flying for a long time.

I also have the honor of presenting the parents of Colonel Roosa, Mr. and Mrs. Dewey Roosa, of Tucson.

May I tell you a few things about these distinguished visitors which you probably do not know.

Capt. Alan Shepard, I am sure you do know, is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, and he is the first flying astronaut in the history of our country. He also has a master of arts degree from Dartmouth College.

Captain Mitchell obtained a B.S. degree in industrial management from Carnegie Institute, a B.S. in aeronautical engineering from the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School, and a doctor of science in astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He entered the Navy in 1952 and was commissioned ensign in May 1953.

This is indicative of the quality and the caliber and the ability of the kind of men who participate in this wonderful program.

May I add that Captain Roosa completed high school at Claremore, Okla., went to Oklahoma State University, the University of Arizona, graduated with a B.S. degree in aeronautical engineering from the University of Colorado.

I am very happy Captain Roosa is from Oklahoma. I wish he had been from my district instead of from Ed EDMONDSON'S.

I welcome one and all.
[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that the House will continue in recess until 1:30 p.m. The bells will be rung 15 minutes before the time for reconvening.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings had during the recess of the House will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

THE LATE IRA KAPENSTEIN

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, services are being held today in Washington for an outstanding young American, Ira Kapenstein, a native of Milwaukee, who had risen to one of the highest posts in the National Democratic Party as principal aide to our national chairman, Lawrence O'Brien.

Ira Kapenstein was one of the most brilliant and dedicated young men I have ever known. He was a young man with great self-possession, tremendous understanding of the forces and the pressures of politics in today's complex society, and a true sense of dedication to making this country of ours a better place in which to live.

He was the recipient in 1968 of the Postmaster General's Benjamin Franklin Award for outstanding service.

He was a young man who will be very much missed today. Men of his caliber and his dedication are sorely needed on the national political scene.

My wife joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his lovely wife, to his three sons, and to the remainder of the Kapenstein family.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Ira Kapenstein, deputy chairman of the Demo-

cratic National Committee, died yesterday at George Washington University Hospital here.

A brilliant young man whose career was nothing short of meteoric, Mr. Kapenstein rose from a Milwaukee newspaper reporter to one of the highest posts in his party within a decade.

He was just 35 years old yesterday when cancer took his life.

Since 1965, he served as a principal aide and trusted confidante to Lawrence F. O'Brien, now chairman of the Democratic National Committee and former Postmaster General.

Mr. O'Brien said yesterday that the country and the Democratic Party "have lost a dedicated leader."

I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Cool and clearheaded no matter how pressed by his burdensome assignments in government and politics, Mr. Kapenstein could master problems others considered beyond solution.

His early work on plans for a Government postal corporation, for example, played a major role in the eventual establishment of the new Postal Service.

He earned the Postmaster General's Benjamin Franklin Award in 1968 for outstanding service.

Just 7 years ago, in 1963, Mr. Kapenstein left his job as Washington reporter for the Milwaukee Journal to join the staff of Postmaster General John Gronouski.

He stayed on when O'Brien succeeded Gronouski, becoming the new Postmaster General's special assistant for public information and what most people would describe as his right-hand man.

It marked the beginning of a close friendship between the two men.

The Democratic Party—indeed, the Nation itself—has lost one of its most promising young leaders.

I extend my deepest sympathies to Mr. Kapenstein's lovely wife, Betty, his three sons and the rest of his family.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

SENIOR CITIZEN TRAVEL BILL

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which has as its purpose, the establishment of reduced standby air fares for our senior citizens.

For years now, this country's major air carriers have offered reduced standby passenger rates for service personnel and students. Under this provision, if there are empty seats on a plane, the standbys are permitted aboard after full-fare passengers have been seated. The

reduced standby rates permit a vast number of students and servicemen to fly who might not otherwise be in a position to do so.

In spite of the fact that the standby system has worked well, most of our major air carriers are still feeling a financial squeeze due to a lack of passengers. For anyone who flies commercially on a regular basis, as many of us in this body do, the sight of vacant seats is quite common even with the present standby system in full swing.

Why, then, has there been a marked decline in air passenger travel in recent years? Quite frankly, I believe that a major contributing factor is simply that many people can no longer afford to fly and this is particularly true for those trying to make ends meet on a fixed or retirement income, and those in the so-called lower and middle income categories.

With this being the case, it should be obvious that the solution—both for the airlines and those who cannot afford to fly—does not lie in raising air fares or cutting back flight schedule or passenger service.

Many elderly people today would like to fly—to visit their children and relatives, or to take a much deserved vacation trip abroad. But they do not fly due to the high cost. Yet, summer after summer, students avail themselves of the opportunity to see the world at cut-rate air fares while their parents and grandparents, in many cases, have never set foot out of the State—much less out of the country.

SECURITY AT THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the bombing at the U.S. Capitol Building early yesterday morning, it is obvious that security measures must be stiffened. A number of Members have asked me what has happened to a proposal sponsored by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) and myself to install a plexiglass type of transparent protective covering over the galleries, which would also enable the visitors to hear more clearly and to allow a commentary on the bill being debated, the procedure utilized, who is speaking, and the major issues at stake.

As a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which reported in 1966, I included the following in my statement of Separate Views:

The galleries should be enclosed with soundproofed, transparent covering, with the floor debates piped into the galleries. The floor proceedings would then be clearly audible to visitors, and gallery noises would not disturb floor proceedings.

It will be noted that my arguments in 1966 were not based on security, but the present situation demands that the security aspects of such a proposal should not be overlooked. The job of the Capitol Police, I am assured, will be much simpler when these steps are taken, and hence-

forth it will be much easier to protect both the Members and the Capitol itself.

I am pleased that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 contained a provision for a "Special Commission on Modernization of House Gallery Facilities," a five-member commission appointed by the Speaker. Section 499 of Public Law 91-510 empowers the Commission to study and report on necessary measures for modernizing the House galleries, and indicates that any such program formulated and developed by the Commission shall provide for the enclosure of the galleries with soundproof and transparent coverage in such manner as to preserve the visibility from the galleries of proceedings on the House floor and eliminate the audibility on the House floor of noise in the galleries.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that early work may be carried forward to enable action to implement this provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY; MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

MARCH 2, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, pursuant to section 712(a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (title 50, Appendix, United States Code, section 2162(a)(2)), it is the duty of the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to suggest five members of the Committee to be members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

The members selected to serve on this Committee for the 92nd Congress in pursuance of this law are as follows: Wright Patman, William A. Barrett, Leonor K. Sullivan, William B. Widnall, and Gary Brown of Michigan.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

REVENUE SHARING — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-56)

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 the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Many of our State and local governments today are in serious financial difficulty. This has not diminished the growing demands on their financial resources, however: their needs continue, their populations increase and their social problems multiply. All these circumstances point to the need for outside as-

sistance, and the Federal Government has tried to provide such assistance. But in doing so, it has frequently added to, rather than reduced, State burdens.

In the past decade, the Federal Government has turned increasingly to a complex system of grants for providing financial assistance to State and local governments. Today Federal aid programs account for one-fifth of State and local revenues. In theory this income should reduce the pressure on State and local budgets and it should free financial resources at those levels for use at those levels. In practice the reverse is commonly the case.

To qualify for Federal grants, States and local government units are frequently required to match Federal funding, often seriously restricting flexibility in the use of State and local resources. Recipients are placed in the position of having to accept Federal money with its concomitant restrictions on State funds, or receive no Federal money at all. Thus, we may find States and local governing units pursuing projects which may be of low priority to them simply because money for these projects is available, but the matching requirements for such grants may have to be met at the expense of programs of higher priority to the community.

In other cases, State and local agencies are required to maintain their financial commitment to a project in order to qualify for Federal grants to that project. The result, again, is diminished flexibility in the use of financial resources at the State and local levels.

Equally burdensome are project-by-project requirements for prior Federal approval of grants. These requirements often delay the availability of much needed funds, generate Federal, as well as State and local, bureaucratic delay, and inject needless confusion into the Federal, State and local relationship. Rigidity in adhering to exact requirements is rewarded, and new or imaginative ideas are frequently lost because they fail to fit exact bureaucratic guidelines.

Finally, Federal grants have proliferated to such a degree that simply discovering their availability is a bureaucratic chore all in itself. The processes of application frequently contribute to the difficulty, and delay the process, of obtaining grants to a degree which further aggravates the problem the money is designed to assuage. And, because the Federal Government, with all the best intentions, cannot really know the needs of the States and local governing units as well as the people who govern at those levels, these grants frequently cannot be aimed with real precision at the needs which exist at those levels.

Certain of these difficulties are most prevalent in the narrowly defined "categorical grants," and therefore I have long supported the concept of block grants which permit State and local governing units to receive financial assistance on the basis of what they know is necessary. This eliminates many of the problems of the categorical grants. The block grant does, however, retain other shortcomings: requirements for match-

ing funds, maintenance of effort, and prior approval by the Federal Government. I believe the time has come to further reform our system of providing financial assistance, and to streamline, where we can, the system of grant aid by adopting a system of Special Revenue Sharing which provides the benefits of Federal assistance without the burdens of assistance built into the present grant programs.

The purposes of 130 of our narrowly based categorical grant programs now in existence can be reduced to six broad areas of national concern. In a series of special messages, of which this is the first, I will propose that funds be made available to States and localities to assist them in meeting their problems in the areas of law enforcement, manpower training, urban development, transportation, rural development and education, by converting these grants to Special Revenue Sharing. Funds for assistance in these areas, as I proposed in my State of the Union message, will include more than \$10 billion of the money allocated for the narrow-purpose grants plus \$1 billion of new funds. Special Revenue Sharing would require no matching funds, no maintenance of effort, no prior project approval and, within the six broad areas, recipients would have the authority to spend these funds on programs which are of the highest priority to them.

I am proposing today legislation for the first of these six Special Revenue Sharing programs. This legislation is directed to matters of primary concern in our national life: the control of crime and the improvement of this nation's system of criminal justice. Much has been accomplished in combatting these problems, but much remains to be accomplished.

Part of the market progress of the past two years can be attributed to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The LEAA was created by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to aid State and local law enforcement agencies in funding programs for police, courts, corrections, control of organized crime, civil disorders, and other related crime problems. This is a national problem—but the basic responsibilities for solving this problem rest at the State and local level and the LEAA provides for Federal assistance to these levels of government.

This program is based on the assumption that those who bear responsibility at the State and local level are best qualified to identify their enforcement problems, and to set the priorities and develop the means to solve these problems. It is designed particularly to encourage and provide for experimentation and innovation in the search for more effective solutions to the crime problem. With LEAA assistance each State has developed, in partnership with local governments, a comprehensive statewide approach to improving law enforcement and reducing crime. Each State is receiving funds under this program, and is moving to execute its plans.

The program is effective. In the District of Columbia, LEAA assistance has played a role in achieving encouraging

reductions in various categories of crime. With LEAA assistance, Oakland, California, has launched a unique effort against street crime using citizen-police cooperation. A feature of this effort has been more than thirty bilingual "citizen forums" in high-crime areas.

LEAA has launched the first major Federal research and development program in criminal justice. It has initiated the first nationwide computerized information system—Project Search, which will help provide instant interstate information on offenders. It has funded the first national survey of crime victims, and the first national jail survey. In the six New England States a joint program is under way to collect and analyze intelligence information and plan a coordinated effort against organized crime in that area. This was funded by LEAA. LEAA assistance to the States for corrections has increased from \$3 million in fiscal 1969 to over \$68 million in fiscal 1970. This final year the total exceeds \$100 million. In another area LEAA has initiated the first major Federal program to enable law enforcement and criminal justice personnel to continue their educations. More than nine hundred colleges are involved in this program.

I think it is clear that LEAA has assumed a vital and effective role in this area of Federal, State and local concern. But, I believe it can and must be made more effective. Therefore, I am proposing amendments to the Law Enforcement Assistance legislation which I believe would strengthen and increase its effectiveness in the war on crime by increasing both the resources of State and local enforcement and judicial agencies, as well as their freedom to use the resources at their disposal.

MATCHING FUNDS

I propose that the requirement for matching funds be eliminated from LEAA grants being converted to Special Revenue Sharing.

MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

I propose that requirements for maintenance of effort be eliminated as a condition for receiving Special Revenue Sharing payments.

PRIOR PROJECT APPROVAL

I am recommending that State planning agencies continue to prepare comprehensive statewide law enforcement plans. These will continue to be submitted to LEAA for review and evaluation, to assist LEAA in its role of counseling State and local government agencies. I am proposing, however, that requirements for prior approval of these plans by LEAA be eliminated. Prior approval would not be required to receive Special Revenue Sharing funds.

COVERAGE

Special Revenue Sharing would replace the present LEAA action grants and their payment would be automatic. Special Revenue Sharing for law enforcement for the first full year would be \$500 million. Fifteen percent of this would be in grants which can be awarded at the discretion of LEAA, and the remainder in grants awarded automatically on the basis of population.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I urge that the protection from discrimination now provided minorities under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 be expressly extended to special Revenue Sharing.

CONCLUSION

The changes provided in the LEAA legislation are not extensive. But I believe they will have a profound effect. They are designed to improve a good program which already has many of the elements we seek to obtain in other programs. Special Revenue Sharing will permit the needed improvements. And by further freeing State and local governments, both from the restrictions of onerous Federal control, and from the administrative and fiscal restrictions which accompany or result from much of our Federal assistance, we can release the creative capacities of each level of government in these areas of national concern.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1971.

APPOINTMENT AS PUBLIC MEMBER OF COMMISSION ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) (1) (B), Public Law 91-377, the Chair appoints as a public member of the Commission on Railroad Retirement the following person from private life: Mr. George E. Leighty, of Maryland.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a), Public Law 91-129, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Government Procurement the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HOLIFIELD, of California, and Mr. HORTON, of New York, and the following member from outside the Federal Government: Hon. Joseph W. Barr, of Maryland.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMISSION ON THE COINAGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 301, Public Law 89-81, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Commission on the Coinage the following members on the part of the House: Mr. JACOBS, of Indiana; Mr. MAZZOLI, of Kentucky; Mr. CONTE, of Massachusetts; and Mr. McCLURE, of Idaho.

THE WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL CONCERNING THE BOMBING OF THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning's editorial in the Washington Post concerning the bombing of the Capitol indicates what is wrong with the Post—

and, more importantly, what is wrong with a certain segment of our society.

The Post concedes that the bombing "is a bad piece of business," but the thrust of its editorial is that, after all, we have had bombings before, and that the "new level of outrage" felt in this instance is because the explosion took place, as the Post says, in a "Senate washroom."

This misses the point.

America's sense of outrage is not because this explosion occurred in a building used by Senators and Representatives. It is because the Capitol is a symbol of our Republic; a monument to our past; a beacon for our future.

The bomber, I am sure, in his own warped way, fully understood and appreciated this point; that the Post does not is an indication of what is wrong with the Post and with that part of our society which shares its general approach and attitude.

The poet asks the question: "Breathes there a man with soul so dead?"

The answer—unfortunately—is "Yes."

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—TO AUTHORIZE THE PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION, AND THE TESTIMONY OR DEPOSITIONS OF HOUSE EMPLOYEES

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of a privilege of the House, and I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 264) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 264

Whereas, Civil Actions No. 65 C 800 and No. 65 C 2050 had been instituted respectively on May 24, 1965, and December 6, 1965, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, by Jeremiah Stamlar, Yolanda Hall, plaintiffs, and Milton M. Cohen, intervening plaintiff, against members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for matters arising out of the performance by defendants of their legislative duties as Members of the United States House of Representatives;

And whereas, the aforesaid actions were subsequently dismissed against the said members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the basis of their assertion of the privilege of Speech and Debate as assured by Article I, Section 6, of the United States Constitution, but that the actions nevertheless continue against persons thereafter joined as defendants in the actions, to wit: John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States; William J. Bauer, United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois; and Donald G. Sanders, Alfred M. Nittle, and Anniel Cunningham, employees of the United States House of Representatives, serving respectively as chief counsel, legislative counsel, and chief, files and reference section, of the House Committee on Internal Security;

And whereas on December 7, 1970, in the course of said proceedings certain discovery has been ordered on behalf of plaintiffs requiring defendants to produce certain documents in the possession of the United States House of Representatives, to respond to certain written interrogatories to which response may be made on the basis of documents and information in the control of this House, and requiring the depositions upon oral examina-

tion of Donald G. Sanders, Alfred M. Nittle, and Anniel Cunningham, employees of the House as aforesaid, and the depositions upon oral examination of Francis J. McNamara, Neil E. Wetterman, and Donald I. Sweany, former employees of this House, which may require the disclosure of information and matters acquired by them in the course of, and by reason of, their employment by this House;

And whereas, by the privileges of the House no documents and no evidence of a documentary character under the control, and in the possession of the House of Representatives can by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission;

And whereas, by the privileges of the House no staff employee or former staff employee of this House is authorized to appear and testify, except by order of the House, concerning any matter requiring the disclosure of information or material in the files or possession of the United States House of Representatives, or of its committees, or acquired in an official capacity by reason of his employment in the said House, the disclosure of which has not been authorized or is not a matter of public record.

And whereas, when it appears by the order of the court or of any judge thereof or pursuant to the rules of said court, documents or documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House, or the testimony of an employee or former employee of the House respecting information and knowledge acquired by said employees by reason of their employment in said House, is needful for use in any court of justice, or for the promotion of justice, the House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the House:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That—

(1) With respect to plaintiffs' motion for production of documents in the possession of the U.S. House of Representatives the chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security (or his designee) is authorized to make available for response to plaintiffs' motion, documents to the extent and in the manner following: There shall be made available to plaintiffs for inspection and copying at the offices of the Committee on Internal Security in Washington, D.C., during business hours the printed transcripts of all public hearings held by the Committee on Un-American Activities since January 1, 1957, together with the unedited stenographer's transcripts of the 1965 Chicago public hearings; all published and printed reports, including all annual reports, and all press releases issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities for said period; all newspaper, periodical, or magazine clippings in the custody of the Committee on Internal Security relating to the plaintiffs' subpoenas or appearances before the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and a copy of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

(2) With respect to plaintiffs' interrogatories, the chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security (or his designee) shall be authorized to supply the following information and documents for response to said interrogatories:

(a) As to interrogatory No. 1, there shall be made available to plaintiffs for inspection and copying at the offices of the Committee on Internal Security during business hours all printed reports of public hearings held by the Committee on Un-American Activities since January 1, 1957, together with the stenographer's transcripts of the 1965 Chicago public hearings held by the Committee on Un-American Activities; all press release files of the Committee on Un-American Activities for said period, together with such news clippings as are in the custody of the

Committee on Internal Security relating to plaintiffs' subpoenas or appearances at the 1965 Chicago hearings; and copies of the Congressional Directory for said period.

(b) As to interrogatories 2, 3, 4, and 5, requesting information relating to persons employed as investigators, counsel, experts, and consultants for the Committee on Un-American Activities since January 1, 1957, this information shall be compiled and furnished to plaintiffs.

(c) As to interrogatories 6 and 7, there shall be made available to plaintiffs for their inspection and copying at the offices of the House Committee on Internal Security during business hours the printed reports, hearings, and annual reports of the Committee on Un-American Activities since January 1, 1957, together with access to the Congressional Record and the United States Code. The plaintiffs may likewise be informed that all bills introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities or considered by it since January 1, 1957, have been introduced by individual Members of the House, including individual members of that committee, and that counsel and staff members have assisted, on request, in drafting some of said bills.

(d) As to interrogatory No. 8, requesting the names, employers, and last-known addresses of persons who served subpoenas upon the witnesses for the Chicago hearings, this information shall be furnished.

(3) Donald G. Sanders, Alfred M. Nittle, and Anniel Cunningham, employees of the United States House of Representatives, and members of the staff of the House Committee on Internal Security, shall be authorized to testify or depose in the aforementioned civil actions to any matters determined by the court to be material and relevant, but shall not testify to or otherwise disclose or produce any information or material in their possession or of which they have knowledge in their official capacity which has not been publicly released by the House Committee on Internal Security or by the former House Committee on Un-American Activities or which is not a matter of public record.

(4) Francis J. McNamara, Neil E. Wetterman, and Donald I. Sweany, former employees of the United States House of Representatives, who may testify or depose in the aforementioned civil actions, are hereby ordered to refrain from testifying to, disclosing, or producing in the said civil actions any information or material in their possession, or of which they have had knowledge in their official capacity because of their former employment by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or by the House Committee on Internal Security, which has not been publicly released by either of said committees or which is not a matter of public record.

(5) A copy of this resolution shall be certified by the Clerk of the House to the clerk of said court.

Mr. ICHORD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, this resolution was mailed to each and every Member of the House on February 25, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I understand the parliamentary situation I have as mover of the resolution been recognized for 1 hour. I would announce that it is my

intention to control the time. I will yield freely for debate only, but at the conclusion of debate I would announce that it is my intention to move the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution concerns itself with the testimony of former employees of the former Committee on Un-American Activities, one employee of the House Committee on Internal Security, as well as certain documents of the former House Committee on Un-American Activities which are in the physical possession of the House Committee on Internal Security.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is necessary as rule 27-C of the Rules of the House of Representatives reads as follows:

All committee hearings, records, data, charts and files shall be kept separate and distinct from Congressional office records of the Member serving as Chairman of the Committee, and such records shall be the property of the House.

Under the privileges of the House no document under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice be taken from such control or possession except by the permission of the House of Representatives, so this resolution is necessary. I as the chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security do not have the authority to release these documents. No Member of the House has the authority to release these documents without the permission of the House of Representatives.

Several interrogatories have been submitted to certain employees of the committee, and an order to produce certain documents has been served upon them, the compliance with which, would require the production of these House documents. They are a part of two cases, No. 65-C-800, and No. 65-C-2050 in the U.S. district court of the northern district of Illinois.

Let me briefly review the background of the whole matter for the edification of the Members of the House of Representatives:

This controversy has its source in hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities when one Milton Mitchell Cohen, Yolanda Hall, and Jeremiah Stamler were subpoenaed before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in May of 1965 at hearings concerning the committee's investigation of the Communist Party U.S.A., and the Illinois district of the Communist Party.

Each of the witnesses appeared. They answered preliminary questions but refused to testify further and departed the hearings without leave of the subcommittee.

In October of 1966 they were cited by this House for contempt.

Later on July 18, 1967, the Department of Justice sought an indictment and these defendants were indicted under the process of the court by a grand jury.

On May 24, 1965, however, the people I just mentioned who are the plaintiffs in the civil suits; namely, Cohen, Hall, and Stamler, filed their first civil suit.

This was the day before the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in Chicago were to convene. This suit sought to enjoin the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the ground that the proceedings were unconstitutional and that House rule XI which established the former House Committee on Un-American Activities was unconstitutional. That was before a one-judge district court. The petition of the plaintiffs in that civil action was dismissed.

After the close of the hearings in Chicago, a second action No. 65C2050 was instituted. That was on December 6, 1965, against the members of the committee, and containing substantially the same averments and requests for relief as in the first action, but including allegations of matters that occurred at the public hearing.

The plaintiffs—Hall, Cohen, and Stamler—also requested the convocation of a three-judge court to determine this action.

On April 22, 1966, the one-judge court dismissed that second proceeding.

Then there began a merry-go-round of appeals.

The courts in this case have developed a very novel concept of permitting defendants in a criminal action to file a civil suit enjoining the prosecution of the criminal action. As a matter of fact, the alleged contempt was committed in 1965. They were indicted by a grand jury in 1967. Here it is 1971 and we have never had a trial of the indictment in the criminal proceedings.

This matter has been up to the court of appeals twice. It has been up to the Supreme Court twice. It has been in the district court, I do not know how many times, and I will predict before this matter is finally concluded, it will again go to the Supreme Court of the United States for a third time.

After the one-judge court in Chicago dismissed the petition, the plaintiffs appealed both civil actions to the U.S. court of appeals. The court of appeals reversed the one-judge court on the ground that a three-judge court should have been convened. It then went back to the three-judge court. The three-judge court dismissed the action but did give leave to file supplemental complaints to add the Attorney General and the U.S. attorney as party defendants.

Subsequently the court entered a pre-trial order in the civil actions requiring the defendant committee members and members of the staff of the committee to answer interrogatories and to produce records.

The committee then moved to stay all proceedings and to dismiss the action against the defendant congressional Members. That motion was supported by a claim of privilege and exemption under the speech and debate clause of article I, section 6, clause 1. The court sustained the motion dismissing the action against the defendant.

Deciding in favor of the committee member's claim of privilege and exemption, the three-judge court handed down a decision on June 26, 1968. Judge Hoffman also in that decision dismissed the

action against the Attorney General and the Department of Justice.

An appeal was then taken by the plaintiffs in the civil suit to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court first dismissed the appeal. In a per curiam decision on November 25, 1968, the Supreme Court granted a motion to dismiss, and the appeal was dismissed. However, on January 20, 1969, following a petition for rehearing, which was denied, the court vacated the judgment on November 25, 1968, and remanded the case to the district court to enter a fresh decree on the ground that the court of appeals made a mistake in convening a three-judge court.

Pursuant to this mandate, the three-judge court dissolved itself, and on January 31, 1969, a single district court judge entered a fresh decree dismissing the claims of Cohen, Stamler, and Hall, and it also dismissed the claims against the Attorney General and the U.S. attorney.

The plaintiffs appealed the dismissal of this action to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Southern Circuit. That court affirmed as to the congressional defendants but reversed as to the other defendants.

The case was sent back to the U.S. Supreme Court by certiorari. Certiorari was denied. So, after 6 years, we are back where we started from in the district courts in the court of Illinois before a one-judge court.

If I may briefly retrace the actions for the Members, it started out in a one-judge court. Then it went to the circuit court of appeals. Then it went from the circuit court of appeals back to a three-judge court. Then from the three-judge court it went to the U.S. Supreme Court. Then from the U.S. Supreme Court it went back to a one-judge court. Then from the one-judge court it went to the circuit court of appeals. Then from the circuit court of appeals, on certiorari, it went to the U.S. Supreme Court, where it was denied, and now we are back before Judge Hoffman in the Federal District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

This had led me to comment that any person who would ever be found guilty of contempt before any committee of Congress has to have an extremely poor lawyer or he has to espouse an extremely unpopular cause. I might state that in view of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, it looks like these whole proceedings will be reversed, because the Supreme Court has recently held that in the case of State proceedings, you cannot use civil proceedings to enjoin a criminal proceeding.

The plaintiffs in this action have filed interrogatories and a motion to produce certain documents.

In this resolution we have authorized the House Committee on Internal Security to release everything they want, except in two areas. Those areas relate to unedited stenographers' transcripts of public hearings since January 1, 1957, and press clippings since January 1, 1957, relating to hearings held by the committee and to persons subpoenaed by the committee.

The interrogatories and the motion to produce certain documents ask the House Committee on Internal Security to furnish unedited transcripts covering a 10-year period. It also asks for the committee to provide press clippings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities covering a 10-year period.

As to the unedited transcripts of public hearings, I submit that it would be unduly oppressive to require the staff of the House Committee on Internal Security to search for and collect and sort this documentation, which may comprise more than 600 transcripts over the 10-year period. These transcripts, it must be understood, have been edited, as is the custom of the House, similar to procedures in the preparation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It seems to me—and this is a matter for the House to pass upon—that the production of unedited transcripts, a matter which also seems irrelevant and immaterial to the plaintiffs' cause of action, would be a violation of the customs and privileges of the House and its Members.

With respect to the production of press clippings over a 10-year period, the former House Committee on Un-American Activities made no compilation of them and what we have were not systematically collected and are scattered through countless files. To accomplish this search would be unduly oppressive.

In view of the fact that press publications are not evidence and are as accessible to the plaintiff as they are to the defendant, to require the production under the circumstances would seem to be an impermissible imposition upon the House and in violation of its privileges. Nor can we permit the plaintiffs to make such a compilation from the files of the House Committee on Internal Security, for the clippings are contained in files which have confidential and executive material to which the plaintiffs should not have access.

Now I would point out again in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, by the terms of the resolution, we do give the plaintiffs in the civil proceedings all of the press clippings in respect to this particular case. We give them the unedited transcript in regard to this particular case. We give them all press releases and all published reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We do not give them the unedited transcript over a 10-year period. We do not give them the press clippings over a 10-year period.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have several questions.

First, it is clear from the statement of the gentleman in the well that the resolution does not comply completely with the discovery order of the Federal court. Has the committee or have the defendants in this litigation applied to the court for a modification of the discovery order?

Mr. ICHORD. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that I have already discussed the many times that this

has been up to the court of appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court.

Back in the first appeal to the circuit court of appeals, after it was remanded to the three-judge District court, the plaintiffs in that action filed discovery proceedings asking for the production of the unedited transcripts over a 30-year period. The Department of Justice did go into those proceedings and contested the motions. The three-judge court made an order limiting the discovery to a 10-year period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time yielded by the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes for the purpose of answering the gentleman from New York.

The three-judge court made an order limiting the discovery to a period of 10 years. However, that was later appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the U.S. Supreme Court voided the proceedings in the three-judge court. We are now back in the one-judge court.

Now, these are motions that were filed by the plaintiff in the one-judge civil court. There was no contest to my knowledge made by the Department of Justice as to these motions. I am informed that in the proceedings in court the court was very reluctant to pass upon the matter, because the court knew that this was a matter affecting the privileges of the House. The court did not know what the House of Representatives would do in this matter. And this is a matter for the House to decide. The House of Representatives cannot be compelled to give the court anything, so far as that is concerned; but I do think that we should take this action.

I think that we should give the plaintiffs all the unedited transcripts in regard to their case. I think they should have all the so-called press clippings. I do not know how that is material, because press clippings are not evidence. I also think they should have all the releases and all the reports that have been made public.

However, I do not believe under the privileges of this House that the House of Representatives should consent to a fishing expedition and require employees of this House to assemble these unedited transcripts that cover a 10-year period and probably consist of some 600 transcripts. I think this is an imposition upon the House. For that reason I have framed the resolution in this form.

Mr. RYAN. If the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me the gentleman is setting up an impasse between the judiciary and the Congress which is unnecessary. The defendants in this case could apply to the court for a modification of the order if it is felt it is unduly burdensome.

In addition, I understand—correct me if I am in error—that the matter was before the U.S. district court in Chicago yesterday, at which time Judge Hoffman himself commented upon the failure to apply for a modification of the order and at which time also the attorney for the defendants, among whom are staff members of the Internal Security Committee—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time yielded by the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. RYAN. That yesterday the attorney for the defendants advised compliance with the court order.

Mr. ICHORD. I did not hear the gentleman's last statement.

Mr. RYAN. I am informed that yesterday the attorney for the defendants in this matter advised that there be compliance by the Internal Security Committee with the order of the court.

Mr. ICHORD. In answer to the question of the gentleman from New York let me advise the gentleman from New York I am not aware of, and have not been advised of, what went on in the U.S. district court yesterday. I scheduled this matter well over a week ago for today. The gentleman perhaps has been in contact with the attorneys for Stamler, Cohen, and Hall.

I have not had the privilege of that contact. I will state—

Mr. RYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. Not until I answer the question.

I will state that the Department of Justice has not advised the committee or any member or me in the position as the chairman of the committee as to what we should do with regard to production of these records.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Some of the lawyers of the Department of Justice have stated that this may have adverse effects upon their criminal proceedings against these individuals, but they have not advised the chairman nor have they advised the staff of the Committee on Internal Security that these documents should be submitted by the House of Representatives. It is not for the committee to decide. It is for the House to decide.

I will point out to the gentleman from New York that in view of the recent State decision I think this whole merry-go-round of appeals to the circuit court and to the Supreme Court will be negated by recent decisions of the Supreme Court, because in State cases the Supreme Court has recently ruled that civil proceedings cannot be used to enjoin criminal proceedings—a very novel concept.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman, Is it not correct in specific response to the question raised by the gentleman from New York regarding the compliance of our committee with the request of the plaintiffs, the gentleman from Missouri in his statement indicated that this is compliance. The majority of our committee believe that we are complying with the request of the plaintiffs,

and the gentleman from Missouri pointed out that the plaintiffs, as is often the case, make requests for matters that we do not even have and ask for clippings not in our possession and ask for many items which are equally accessible to them and which are not in the confines of any of our files. In specific response, is it not correct that this is compliance and is precisely what is before the House at this time?

Mr. ICHORD. There are only two instances where it could be considered as not being in compliance with the order. They did ask for the unedited transcripts over a 10-year period of time. They also asked for the press clippings over a 10-year period of time. It is possible that this may be construed as not being in compliance in that respect.

Again I point out that this is a matter for the House to decide. We are giving the plaintiffs in this action the unedited transcripts that apply in their case and all the press clippings in their case and also authorize the defendant employees of the committee to testify in the court proceedings except that we do not authorize them to testify as to any executive matter. Of course, this would have to be authorized by the House of Representatives.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman very precisely points out the areas of substantial compliance. I think we have responded to every reasonable request that can be made in the spirit of wanting to cooperate. I think it would be absolutely impossible to say that we have not made an effort to comply with this legitimate request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I point out to the gentleman from Ohio and the Members of the House that in the criminal proceedings under the indictment—there have been so many proceedings in this matter—we were asked to submit certain information, which we did. Mind you, we are here dealing with the civil proceedings. We gave the court everything they asked for in the criminal proceedings but in this resolution we are not giving them unedited transcripts over a 10-year period of time, that is, transcripts unedited by us over a 10-year period of time. This would be an imposition on the privileges of the House.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, before discussing the reasons why I think the Members of this House should reject the resolution proposed today by the House Internal Security Committee, I would like to present some background material relevant to this matter which was not fully explored in the memo sent by the chairman of this committee to all of the Members of Congress under date of February 25, 1971. The events on which this House is asked to vote upon today began on May 24, 1965, when these

three plaintiffs instituted an action against the chairman and the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee. This was 1 day before the plaintiffs were scheduled to appear by subpoena before a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee meeting in Chicago on May 25, 1965.

The plaintiffs instituted this unprecedented civil action against the House Un-American Activities Committee seeking a declaratory judgment that rule XI was unconstitutional and that consequently an injunction should be issued restraining the holding of the scheduled hearings.

On November 10, 1966, the Seventh Circuit Court of the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the plaintiffs and held that they had raised a "substantial constitutional question" in their charge that the conduct of the House Un-American Activities Committee "consisted of exposure of witnesses, including plaintiffs, to public scorn, obloquy and harassment, and intimidation of witnesses without any legislative purpose."

The Seventh Circuit Court held that the cases of *Barenblatt v. the U.S.*, 360 U.S. 109 (1959) and the decision in *Gojack v. U.S.* 384 U.S. 702 (1966), two opinions in which the Nation's highest tribunal adjudicated protests against the conduct of the House Un-American Activities Committee, did not rule out the standing to sue of the Chicago plaintiffs or the substantial merit of the constitutional question which they had raised in their complaint.

On August 5, 1969, the seventh circuit once again reversed the opinion of a single district court judge and ruled in vigorous terms against the Government which had contended that the plaintiffs should be restricted to litigating their constitutional claims in the criminal prosecution brought against them. The circuit court pointed out that the civil action initiated by the plaintiffs made available to them "more suitable discovery procedures and more liberal rules of evidence." The seventh circuit ruled in no uncertain terms that "plaintiffs should not be compelled to go through years of criminal litigation as in *Gojack*—where the defendant had to stand trial twice, was convicted twice, appealed unsuccessfully twice, obtained a new trial from the Supreme Court and finally the dismissal of charges against him in the Supreme Court." Despite the very clear decision and firm mandate of the seventh circuit court of appeals on August 5, 1969, the Committee on Internal Security asked the Attorney General to apply to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari. This petition was denied by the Supreme Court without comment on June 29, 1970. Since that date the plaintiffs in this case have sought to obtain from the remaining defendants in this case those items of information which the Federal court in Chicago has decreed may be obtained by these three plaintiffs.

I would like to outline the several reasons why the Members of this House, in my judgment, should grant to the three

plaintiffs in this crucially important case all of those rights of discovery granted to them by a Federal judge after extensive deliberations and negotiations between the plaintiffs and the counsel for the defendants:

First, The chairman of the House Internal Security Committee has stated in his February 25, 1971, memo to the Members of this House that the resolution now being debated makes it possible to have "compliance by defendants with the discovery requested with certain minor exceptions or limitations." It should be noted that these "exceptions or limitations" are by no means minor to the plaintiffs involved. In fact the very two items omitted from those things to be made available by this resolution to the plaintiffs are the very two items on which their whole case may rest.

It is not for the House Internal Security Committee nor is it for the Members of the House of Representatives to decide upon the relevancy or materiality of the evidence decreed by a Federal court to be the inherent right of plaintiffs in litigation in a civil action in a Federal court.

The plaintiffs in this case originally asked for press clippings and other materials which would have gone back to the first day of the reconvening of Congress in January 1945, when a deeply divided House of Representatives first authorized the House Un-American Activities Committee. The discovery authorized and indeed ordered by a Federal court in this case is made up of those basic documents which, in the judgment of a Federal tribunal, are essential to the plaintiffs in making out their case to the effect that the implementation of rule XI on the part of the House Committee on Un-American Activities inhibits and deters the exercise by citizens of the United States of the rights of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and privacy.

One can assume, for example, that the plaintiffs would plan to secure clippings from newspapers with regard to certain witnesses subpoenaed by the committee. If, as might well happen, it became clear that very adverse effects almost always came to those citizens subpoenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the plaintiffs could argue that the ultimate effect, if not indeed the purpose, was not the establishment of a unit to secure information on which to base legislation, but rather, in the words of the brief of the plaintiffs, the "creation of a governmental mechanism with the sole purpose and objective of forcing public disclosure of beliefs, opinions, expressions, and associations of private citizens which may be unorthodox or unpopular, resulting in public stigma, scorn, and obloquy all beyond any powers granted to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States."

The plaintiffs similarly seek unedited transcripts of hearings because, in the words of the plaintiffs, they "believe that the printed versions may be edited in ways that might conceal constitutional violations committed by the committee."

For the House Internal Security Committee or the Members of the House of Representatives to substitute their judg-

ment on the relevancy and materiality of what a Federal court has decreed should be available to these plaintiffs is clearly, in my judgment, a serious deprivation of basic justice to these individuals who have been told in the clearest possible language by a three-judge Federal court that they have a cause of action and a basic right to the evidence here in question which, in their judgment, in the judgment of their lawyers, and in the judgment of a Federal court is indispensable to them in carrying on the civil action designed to throw light on the serious constitutional questions which these plaintiffs have presented. This Federal court in *Stamler v. Willis* 415 F.2d 1365 (1969) categorically gave to these plaintiffs the right to have their case adjudicated "in this proceeding rather than in subsequent criminal proceedings."

If the House of Representatives today rejects and indeed defies a carefully balanced discovery decree of a Federal court, this House will in effect be denying the three plaintiffs in this 6-year-old case those fundamental documents which a Federal court has decreed as essential if they are to receive justice in these proceedings.

Second. The only reason asserted by the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives for withholding newspaper clippings and unedited transcripts from the three plaintiffs in this case is the convenience of the staff of the committee. Investigation, however, into even a few of the documents of the case of the three Chicago plaintiffs would indicate that the lawyers for these three persons have agreed to all types of reasonable procedures by which they would not in any way unduly burden the staff of the Committee on Internal Security, would not in any way violate the confidentiality of any file in the possession of the committee, and would in no wise intrude into the records of any executive session of any meeting of the House Committee on Internal Security.

The chairman of the Committee on Internal Security concedes in his memo to the Members of the House under date of February 25, 1971, that the committee's "resolution presents no novel questions, nor is the procedure unusual." There is, in other words, no challenge here to documents which the House may not authorize to be used in any civil or criminal proceeding in a Federal or State court. There is, therefore, no question, contrary to the letter of the chairman to the Members of the House, of anything that "would be in derogation of the privileges of the House."

The Committee on Internal Security is not telling the Members of the House of Representatives that the committee desires to withhold access to certain evidence because of any privilege which Members of this House might have but simply because compliance with a decree of discovery given by a Federal court to these three plaintiffs would allegedly create a hardship for the staff of the Committee on Internal Security.

It is axiomatic that the inconvenience or hardship of any person, including

Government officials, does not justify any citizen in refusing to a litigant that evidence which a court has solemnly decreed is the right of that citizen to possess.

In the past the House of Representatives has routinely produced copies of documents which have been determined by a court to be relevant and material. Such action is authorized by House Resolution 11, 90th Congress—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 1, page 35—where it is stated that when any "court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers or documents called for in the subpoena or other order—the Clerk of the House is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents that the court has found to be material and relevant." The rest of this resolution which refers to the minutes or transcripts of executive sessions is in no wise relevant to the question before this House today.

It is furthermore too late for the Internal Security Committee or this House to interpose the objection that the three plaintiffs in this case can obtain the requested information from other sources. That question was litigated and resolved on behalf of the plaintiffs. For the Committee on Internal Security to suggest, therefore, as the chairman's letter of February 25, 1971, does suggest, that the press clippings requested by the plaintiffs are "equally accessible to the plaintiffs from other sources" constitutes in the final analysis a rejection and indeed a defiance of the decree of a Federal court made after extensive arguments and protracted deliberations.

Third. A third and enormously persuasive argument for the House of Representatives to reject the resolution proposed here today derives from the consequences of this House accepting on this occasion the repudiation of a decree of a Federal court by the Committee on Internal Security totally in the name of inconvenience and alleged hardship. If this House ratifies what in my judgment is a profound mistake and a basic denial of justice by the House Internal Security Committee the plaintiffs in this case will almost certainly move for a dismissal of all of the charges against them. The plaintiffs will indeed be justified in this motion of dismissal because they have been denied by this House what a Federal judge has told them is useful and indeed essential to their case. If the House Internal Security Committee, in the name of inconvenience or alleged hardship, denies to these plaintiffs that evidence without which they cannot proceed in a civil case then the House Internal Security Committee should be prepared to accept the consequence. And that consequence is the possible and perhaps very probable dismissal of all of the charges made against these plaintiffs by the House Internal Security Committee.

In October 1966, these three plaintiffs were cited for contempt by this House. The Speaker of this House certified reports of this contempt to the U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois. Pursuant to those citations of contempt the three plaintiffs were in-

dicted by a grand jury on July 18, 1967.

The question before this House today comes to this: Will this House of Representatives which has cited these three individuals for contempt, a citation resulting in their indictment, now say to these defendants that this House will deny them that very evidence which a Federal court, after protracted litigation and extensive debate, has decreed is the essential right of these three individuals?

If this House of Representatives refuses to allow to these three people that this House has itself cited for contempt those things deemed by a Federal court indispensable for the defense of these individuals what else can these persons do but ask for a dismissal of the charges against them? And what else can a Federal tribunal do except dismiss charges when the very agency of Government which has brought those charges denies to those individuals against whom these charges are brought that essential right of discovery without which these persons cannot possibly have a valid case or a fair day in court?

The House Internal Security Committee is in my judgment asking this House today to join in another self-inflicted wound, agreed to by a majority of the members of the House Internal Security Committee.

It may be that if the House of Representatives today agrees with the resolution proposed by the House Internal Security Committee the power of that committee to effectively prosecute any person for contempt will be seriously eroded if not completely eviscerated. And in the ultimate analysis it must be remembered that if the power to protect its own processes and to enhance its own dignity and majesty of the Committee on Internal Security is eroded and debased, this erosion and debasement inevitably carries over to every other arm of this House of Representatives.

I ask you, therefore, to vote against the resolution proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. The adoption of that resolution will in my judgment bring adverse and possibly catastrophic consequences upon the Committee on Internal Security. If the Members of the House of Representatives adopt and ratify that resolution they will concur in an unprecedented action in which the House of Representatives, for no better reason than its own convenience, will deny to American citizens whom this House has caused to be indicted, access to those totally nonconfidential documents which the judicial branch of our Government has decreed should be made available to these individuals.

If these plaintiffs are given access to the material to which they have a judicial right the Members of Congress will not be imperiled in their essential functions or prerogatives. And if these plaintiffs should ultimately prevail in their civil action against some members of the staff of a House committee neither the Members of Congress nor

congressional functions would be impaired but, hopefully, might even be enhanced because they would then be required to conduct their future investigations under a more narrow and more clearly constitutional mandate.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will remain in the well, I would like to ask him one question.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has raised several points which he deems axiomatic. I think it is also axiomatic in the course of getting a fair trial, as we have seen in the Manson case and in the case of the Black Panthers in New Haven, that quite often these trials are long, cumbersome, and they are expensive.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has not fully stated the case because the plaintiffs have asked for materials which are not readily accessible. They have asked for a compilation of all press clippings when there is no such compilation of all press clippings. There are many thousands of items in the files of the Committee on Internal Security. To compile these—and we do not have them compiled now—would require extensive time and would require a great expenditure of money. The gentleman from Massachusetts talks about axiomatic items. I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he is willing to go to what it might cost insofar as the necessary expense of producing this voluminous material, say, \$10,000, \$15,000 or \$20,000 of additional appropriations to bring about this compilation? It is not our desire to withhold material, it is merely that the material is not compiled, and it would be necessary to do so. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts specifically support an appropriation of \$10,000 or \$15,000 in order to have an in-depth study of every file, every folder, and to have a search of those files? Will the gentleman specifically support that type of request?

Mr. DRINAN. No such thing, let me say, as the gentleman from Ohio has suggested, is requested for by the plaintiffs' attorneys at all.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that what I have suggested is correct in that we do not have the various files prepared; therefore, we must gather the information. This is not put in under little headings in each separate file. We must go through every single file folder, every investigator's file, every report, and get the information they say we have. This would take an inordinant amount of time. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts realizes that; does he not?

Mr. DRINAN. No, I do not, because in the record—and I have read the entire, voluminous record of this long, protracted case, and the counsel for the plaintiffs have agreed that they would ask for only those clippings in any file of any person subpoenaed by the committee since 1957. So a clerk could bring them the clippings. They would not see the files. This could be done in less than 8

hours without any serious inconvenience to the members of the staff. This is stipulated and agreed to by very reasonable men who act as counsel for these three plaintiffs.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. May I ask this question: These clippings they are asking for are a 10-year collection of clippings that are in the various files—are those clippings available through any other source, or did the Committee on Un-American Activities have exclusive access to the papers and periodicals from which they were obtained?

Mr. ASHBROOK. As the gentleman from Missouri so aptly pointed out during the course of his presentation of the cases and the resolution, they are in effect asking for something that anyone in the public could gather. They are accessible to them. They can go to the same newspaper files in Chicago or elsewhere and gain what they want.

We do not have them cataloged as the plaintiff's desire. To comply completely we would have to search thousands of files and folders. It would take an inordinate amount of time and would involve great expense.

It is not a question of not being willing to comply. It is a question of an oppressive and unreasonable request and that is why we have failed to comply. But the clippings they want they are able to get from newspaper or library sources, and they have the same accessibility to that as we would have.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Is it true to state then that they have every source of obtaining the same information as the House Committee on Un-American Activities and they could obtain it from the same sources, which was public information at the time the newspaper published it, and is available to all people?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would assume that it is intrinsic, in their request they are asking for press clippings, it would be something public, that the newspapers published. So they would have the same access to it.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for pointing out that the gentleman now standing in the well, and I know the gentleman did not mean to convey erroneous facts when he used the terminology "two documents." I would state, and the gentleman pointed this out, that they are asking for more. I think the gentleman will agree they are asking for more than two documents. They are asking for probably what will amount to 600—600 unedited transcripts. These will number thousands in all probability—news clippings and so on.

But I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for pointing that out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). The gentleman from Ohio

(Mr. ASHBROOK) has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, also I want to point out I think the argument of the gentleman in the well, would be much stronger if this were in fact a criminal proceeding. But I would point out that this is a civil proceeding.

At this point it is not a criminal proceeding. This matter has been in the courts, Members of the House, since 1967 and there has been an indictment by a grand jury. It has been up to the Supreme Court twice. It has been in the court of appeals twice. It has been in the Federal district courts, I do not know how many times, between a one-judge court and the three-judge courts. These are civil proceedings to enjoin criminal proceedings and we have never had a trial of the criminal proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing out these distinctions and I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts since I mentioned his name.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, may I point out that because it is a civil proceeding there is a stronger moral obligation on this body to give the evidence that a Federal court has directed us to give.

Furthermore, that same Seventh Circuit Court has said, and this was said on August 5, 1969, that these plaintiffs should not be compelled to go through years of criminal litigation as in the Gojack case where the defendant had to stand trial twice, was convicted twice, appealed unsuccessfully twice and finally obtained a new trial from the Supreme Court, and finally, the dismissal of charges against him that were brought by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

If this is, as the distinguished chairman stated in his remarks, a novel and unique procedure, that is no reason to prejudice these three plaintiffs in their trial in Chicago.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 more minutes for the purpose of answering the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Members of the House, there is no recent precedent in the House of Representatives for the action we are proposing today. However, there is a very recent precedent in the other body in Senate Resolution 471 which was adopted as recently as September 25, 1970. I want to emphasize the language of the resolution adopted by the Senate by reading the last "resolved" clause, which also applied to civil proceedings to enjoin at that point certain legislative proceedings. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the power of inquiry with process to enforce it is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function, and that action by the courts which anticipatorily infringes upon or impedes the right of Congress to require the appearance of witnesses pursuant to its legislative powers, and thus stays contemplated congressional action to be taken pursuant to its investigative processes violates the doctrine of separation of powers and would be an illegal and unwarranted infringement by the judicial

branch upon the powers, responsibilities and duties of the legislative branch.

In those civil proceedings the chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. McCLELLAN, was subpoenaed before the court. The resolution adopted by the Senate provided as follows as to his testimony and the records that he should produce:

Resolved, That neither the said Chairman, the said members, the said General Counsel, nor any staff employees are to testify to or otherwise disclose any documents, records, correspondence, memoranda, and other written or verbal information in the possession of said individuals or of the Subcommittee which are not matters of public record; be it further

This was the action taken by the other body. It does serve as a precedent for this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri, the able chairman of the House Internal Security Committee. He has spread a great deal of sand today about the matter that is before the House. I think that if he would speak on this matter the next time we have an ice storm it would do a great deal to melt the ice in the whole Washington area, because as he described the tortured progeny of litigation that was engendered here, two things became lost in the shuffle: First, none of those cases is before us; second, the House started the fight. This is not a case of somebody going in and taking potshots at the House.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I should first like to finish my statement.

Mr. ICHORD. I wish the gentleman would explain how the fight started.

Mr. MIKVA. I am about to get into that. These people were subpoenaed before the House Internal Security Committee some years ago.

Mr. ICHORD. The House Internal Security Committee was not then in existence.

Mr. MIKVA. The House Committee on Un-American Activities was in existence. If the gentleman would like some of his time back, I wish he would say so; but I will take only 2 or 3 minutes. I will try to be as accurate as I can. I had forgotten that the committee had changed its name.

Mr. ICHORD. No committee of this body is a continuing committee. Every committee expires at the end of each Congress, and we have to set them up again by the adoption of new rules. The Committee on Un-American Activities is no longer in existence.

Mr. MIKVA. Let me say that the original action was started when these witnesses were cited by the House of Representatives—not this House, obviously, because it was not then in existence—by a House of Representatives for contempt of the then existing Committee on Un-American Activities. In response to that contempt citation which the House voted and on which the U.S. attorney in Illinois then proceeded to bring an action, these three filed a civil suit seeking vari-

ous injunctive relief, and the courts meshed the two suits, the three witnesses then asked for certain discovery proceedings.

Over and over again you heard the chairman say that it is for this House to decide which parts of the order should be complied with. Well, it is for this House to decide, but only if we are going to be prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner. But for a body which urges restraint, the observance of the legal processes, and law and order as often as we do, it ill behooves us to say whether we like this part of the court order or that part of the court order, or this is a part we will observe or that is a part we will observe.

There are ample appellate processes open. Specifically this order, this little two-page order, which is the only matter before this House, has never been appealed. No modification of that order has ever been sought, either before the three-judge court, or Judge Hoffman, or the Supreme Court of the United States, all of which are open to the defendants in the civil suit.

Similarly, even if they do not want to seek to modify the order, if the gentleman from Ohio is correct, and this is compliance, then a great deal of the time of the House is being wasted. If it turns out that the gentleman from Ohio is correct, and what the chairman is proposing to do is compliance, then there is no skin off anybody's nose. If that is not correct, then the court at that time can order the staff members to produce additional documents; there can be a determination at that time as to whether or not there has been compliance. So I must say to the Members of the House we are doing one of two things: either we are thumbing our nose at a U.S. court, which is really what I think we are doing, and which I think is very bad comity—that is c-o-m-i-t-y, I will say to the Chairman—for the legislative branch of the Government to do; or we are wasting a great deal of time: if the gentleman from Ohio is right, then we do not need this resolution. House Resolution 9, which was passed on the first day of the session authorizes this committee, or any other committee, to comply with orders of the courts.

We ought to vote this down for one of those reasons, that either it is totally unnecessary, or it is one more chapter of "who does what to whom" between the courts of the United States and the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman does concede the courts of the United States cannot compel this House to do anything?

Mr. MIKVA. The Members of the House are not parties to this lawsuit. Is that correct?

Mr. ICHORD. The House is not a party to this lawsuit. At one time the Members were.

Mr. MIKVA. That is correct. And the courts properly dismissed them out. Is that right?

Mr. ICHORD. At one time the former Committee on House Un-American Activities were parties to this suit.

Mr. MIKVA. But this court the gentleman has been taking such potshots at dismissed them out.

Mr. ICHORD. It was decided in the suit Powell against McCormack to proceed against employees of this House rather than to proceed against the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I point out again that these are civil proceedings and that the contempt citation that was voted by the House of Representatives amounted to no more than a warrant directing the U.S. district attorney to go into the criminal district court in the State of Illinois and to seek an indictment. A grand jury was convened. These individuals were indicted for contempt of Congress, a violation of the law, a criminal offense. This matter has proceeded in the civil action now for 4 years. We have never gotten to the trial of the criminal case.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say for the record, I believe the gentleman from Illinois did not want to leave two impressions which I believe were irrelevant. First of all, he said the House started the action. This is not the case. I was present when the hearings were being conducted. The plaintiffs in this case, the defendants in the contempt citations, by their contempt started the action, not the House of Representatives. By showing sheer contempt for the House and by refusing to reply to any of the questions, they started the action.

So first of all, it is incorrect to say that the House started this action. The defendants themselves in the contempt case, started the suit by their action—not the House.

Second, to say the Government had the option of appealing—this would be more a case, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, of thumbing our nose at the court. We could say they have no right to ask for anything. Quite the contrary, rather than thumbing our nose at them, we have come forward with everything that is possible and reasonable to answer, and we are presenting that to them; so rather than appealing, which would be thumbing our nose at them, and saying they must prove to us we have to produce these documents and papers, we are voluntarily providing them.

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is aware the Federal court has the power to dismiss a case where there has not been compliance with an order for a discovery procedure?

Therefore, the court could dismiss the contempt charges, which they may well do if we do not comply with the discovery procedure. Is that not a possibility?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Absolutely. I would say further to the gentleman from Illinois, the court may very well say this has been a reasonable compliance with the request.

The gentleman from Illinois well knows, to use the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, it is axiomatic that the plaintiff's attorney and the defendant's attorney often ask for things beyond the bounds of reasonableness.

We think we have responded reasonably. If they say "No," then we are wrong. If they say, "You have produced what is necessary," then we are right.

I happen to believe we have reasonably responded. That particular question is up to the court. We feel we have done everything we should.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I would make the further point that this House of Representatives, the present Committee on Internal Security and the former Committee on Internal Security, is not in the business of enforcing criminal law or of punishing people or of trying people. That is for the court.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLING). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This House of Representatives, as a co-equal branch of Government along with the other body, the Senate, does have the inherent power to punish for contempt of its processes; but we have not chosen to do that. We have turned that over to the courts. All we do when we vote a contempt citation is to direct the district attorney to go in and seek an indictment. It is up to the courts to perform their job as they see fit.

Speaking personally, it is true that they could dismiss the proceedings, but that is not our business. It is their business to enforce the criminal law, to give the defendant his day in court.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE).

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the chairman a question or two. I ask as a nonmember of the committee who is somewhat lost in trying to follow the proceedings.

Mr. ICHORD. Was the gentleman in the Chamber earlier, when I addressed myself to the appeals, and how many times this has been in the Supreme Court and in the circuit court of appeals?

Mr. WALDIE. Yes; the failure to understand is not because of a lack of ability in the gentleman's presentation, but rather and inability on my part to absorb.

Mr. ICHORD. It is such a rambling procedure that I may have been rambling too much.

Mr. WALDIE. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

As was suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, in his view—and I only cite it for consideration—he believes that the adoption of this resolution, if I have not

mistakenly paraphrased his comments, would result in our thumbing our nose at a court which has ordered the House to do something.

Mr. ICHORD. That is the view of the gentleman from Illinois. I do not concur in that view.

Mr. WALDIE. I understand. Then he advises that rather than adopt the resolution, which he construes to be a thumbing of our nose at the court, in fact we should defeat the resolution.

The question I have to ask I will address to the gentleman as chairman or to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA). If adopting the resolution constitutes thumbing our nose at the court, since it is a partial attempt to comply with the order—and I believe it is only partial—then defeating the resolution, it would seem to me, would be an absolute rejection of the court order.

I am not prejudging it. I may very well vote to tell the court, "It happens to be none of your concern."

I should like to know, however, these two things. What will be the result of refusing passage of this resolution in terms of the three people who were cited for contempt initially by the committee? What would be the result of this action on those contempt citations?

Mr. ICHORD. Let me answer the question of the gentleman from California. I believe it is a very good question.

The defeat of this resolution would not accomplish the objectives which the gentleman from Illinois seeks. As chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security I can say that the House Committee on Internal Security is only custodian for these documents, which are documents of the House. A court cannot order this House to produce any of its documents unless it has the permission of the House. If this resolution is voted down I could not deliver the documents requested to the court without further authorization of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ICHORD. I yield myself 1 additional minute for the purpose of answering the gentleman from California.

I would still, if this were defeated, before I could surrender any of these documents, have to come back to this House with a resolution, because I do not have authority nor does any Member of this House have authority to submit one document to the court.

Mr. WALDIE. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. ICHORD. Yes.

Mr. WALDIE. I assume if we defeat this resolution—

Mr. ICHORD. It would not accomplish his objective.

Mr. WALDIE. That is right. No information in the possession of the committee or of the House would be turned over to these people for whatever use they desire to put it.

Mr. ICHORD. This is a matter affecting the privileges of the House. These are documents of the House of Representatives. The former House Committee on Un-American Activities was only an arm of this Congress, and the Committee on Internal Security is only the cus-

todian of these records. I do not have nor does anyone else have authority to submit them. I would not submit anything in this regard to the court.

Mr. WALDIE. If the court had no compliance with their order, does that mean they would be in a position where they would no longer proceed against the three people?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ICHORD. May I inquire, Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of answering the gentleman from California.

I do not know what the courts will do in regard to this action. I would hope that the courts would consider this a sufficient compliance with the motion for discovery and the motion to produce documents, because we are in this resolution providing everything they should need, including the unedited transcripts of the proceedings in Chicago and all of the press clippings and all of the releases and all of the committee reports relating to those hearings. We are denying them only two things; that is, the unedited transcripts over a 10-year period, consisting of 600 transcripts, because I believe this would be a violation of the privileges of the House, and also the many thousands of press clippings that were never compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would say to the gentleman from California that I have given up long ago predicting, with any degree of certainty, a decision of the courts. I have been out of the active practice of law for many, many years now. Recent decisions, in fact have repealed a great deal of the law I knew. It is my opinion, but I could be wrong, that the courts will consider this in sufficient compliance. They will go ahead and decide the civil suit and then perhaps the defendants will receive their day in court 6 years after the alleged offense was committed in the criminal proceedings that are also pending in the district court of the city of Chicago of the State of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, I have 3 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two and one-half minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I promised the gentleman from New York that I would yield to him, and I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I marvel at the sensitivities of the House Committee on Internal Security. With one of the largest staffs of any committee of the House, and with one of the lightest—if not the lightest—legislative burdens of any House committee, in terms of numbers of bills referred, the chairman of the committee thrusts the Congress into a conflict with the Federal judiciary. He contends that it would be too burdensome

to comply with the order of a Federal district court to produce materials ruled necessary in a judicial proceeding.

Only last year, the House Committee on Internal Security brought before the House a resolution which, in effect, sought to restrain another Federal court—in this case the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia—from action within its legal parameters with regard to another of the committee's activities. This resolution today is another direct rebuff of the authority of the courts.

By way of background, I would just briefly review the contorted proceedings of this venture. In 1965, Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, Milton Cohen, and others were called to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee, the predecessor of the House Internal Security Committee. Prior to their appearance, the plaintiffs in the case which the resolution before us today involves brought a civil action seeking a declaratory judgment that the rule creating HUAC was unconstitutional, and that, therefore, an injunction should issue restraining the hearings. Since that first step by the plaintiffs, this civil action has gone from the district court, to the court of appeals, to a three-judge court, to the Supreme Court, back to the district court, back to the court of appeals, back to the Supreme Court, and now, once again, back to the district court. It is the district court's discovery order which is now at issue before the House.

The chairman of the Internal Security Committee has dwelled on the length of time which has been occupied by this litigation. Actually, that is a red herring. Justice is not subservient to convenience. But even pursuing that red herring down the stream of rhetoric for the moment, one finds, sparkling in the murky water—to pursue the metaphor as well—the fact that much of this time has been spent dealing with the defendants' court actions:

The legal stratagems of the members of the House Un-American Activities, and then of the new defendants—employees of the Internal Security Committee. Surely, if justice is to flow expeditiously, we might look to those who protest its slow progress—and by the way, very expensive progress, as well—and ask if they have not erected dams in the stream to block the herring, to complete the metaphor.

Why do the plaintiffs request the unedited transcripts and newspaper clippings which the resolution before us intentionally does not provide to them? For a very simple reason—these materials are crucial to their case. Their contention is that the interpretation of the rule creating the House Un-American Activities Committee, as expressed by the continued conduct of the House Un-American Activities Committee, "attributes a meaning to the rule which renders it unconstitutional, and that this conduct consisted of the exposure of witnesses, including plaintiffs, to public scorn and obloquy and harassment and intimidation of these witnesses without any legislative purpose but rather to chill and deter them and others in the exercise of

their first amendment rights." *Stamler v. Willis*, 371 F.2d 413, 414 (7th Cir. 1966).

The resolution before us would not turn over to the plaintiffs, as directed by the court order, the unedited transcripts. Yet, these are necessary, as obviously the court concluded in issuing its order. They are necessary because they may reveal a pattern of harassment of witnesses and witnesses' counsel by the committee.

The resolution before us would also not turn over to the plaintiffs newspaper clippings. Yet these too are necessary, because they may well demonstrate that witnesses before the committee, and even persons merely named by the committee, subsequently experienced harassment, pressures, and even loss of employment.

In brief, the materials which the resolution resists providing are at the crux of the plaintiffs' case—a case which twice the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit has concluded raised a substantial constitutional issue. See, *Stamler v. Willis*, 415 F.2d 1365 (7th Cir. 1969); *Stamler v. Willis*, 371 F.2d 413 (7th Cir. 1966).

The resolution before us sweeps past all this, and the chairman of the committee pleads inconvenience. Even this claim is without merit. Inconvenience is no justification for sacrificing justice. Nor is inconvenience really even involved. The plaintiffs have offered their assistance in assembling the materials. All that is involved are some 600 unedited transcripts. No one is asking the committee staff to read them, or to tabulate them, or to index them. All they have to do is hand them over to the plaintiffs. Nor is producing the newspaper clippings such an onerous task.

The conflict between the Congress and the judiciary which is foisted upon us by the resolution is unnecessary. The defendants need only have gone into court and requested a modification of the order. If their claim were legitimate, I am sure the judge would consider it. Surely, he should have been given the opportunity to consider the issue—a conclusion expressed, by the way, by Judge Hoffman himself, yesterday, when he was apprised in court of the resolution to be offered today to the House—that is, the resolution now before us.

At any rate, the floor of the House is unfortunately a poor arena for debating difficult, technical issues involving litigation. But this need not obscure the very basic issues involved. We are being asked to resist the order of a Federal court. We are being asked to do so solely on the grounds that it would be inconvenient and burdensome for the Internal Security Committee staff to assemble the materials—clearly a factor of no relevance when we are talking about justice, and clearly an assertion with little merit so far as actual work is involved.

I should like to quote from the 1969 Stamler decision, at pages 1369-1370. The court's statement is clear answer to those who support the resolution before us:

The judiciary has always borne the basic responsibility for protecting individuals against unconstitutional invasions of their rights by all branches of the Government. Thus the Supreme Court has overturned

a major policy decision of the President because he exceeded his powers in seizing the steel mills. *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 72 S.Ct. 863, 96 L.Ed. 1153. And the Court has ruled that an Act of Congress designed to prevent members of the Communist Party from holding jobs in defense facilities, and action taken pursuant to that Act by the Secretary of Defense, was unconstitutional because it placed a greater restraint on First Amendment freedoms than was necessary to guard against espionage and sabotage. *United States v. Robel*, 389 U.S. 258, 88 S.Ct. 419, 19 L.Ed.2d 508. Most recently, the Court determined that federal courts have jurisdiction to review the lawfulness of the exclusion of a duly elected member of Congress despite the constitutional authority of the House to judge the qualifications of its members. *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 89 S.Ct. 1944, 23 L.Ed.2d 491. The Congress has no more right, whether through legislation or investigations conducted under an overbroad enabling Act, to abridge the First Amendment freedoms of the people, than do the other branches of government. For free expression—of transcendent value to all society, and not merely to those exercising their rights—might be the loser. *Dombrowski v. Pfister*, *supra*, 380 U.S. at p. 486, 85 S.Ct. at p. 1121.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the question raised by the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE), the defeat of the pending resolution would not impede full compliance with the court's order, because on January 21 the House passed House Resolution 9, which authorizes the Clerk of the House to supply papers or documents in compliance with a court order. In addition, of course, another resolution which fully satisfies the discovery order could be brought up at any time.

Second, I would like to ask this question of the gentleman from Missouri. Both he and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) spoke of the inconvenience and the burdensomeness of complying with the order for newspaper clippings. Is it not a fact that newspaper clippings are maintained in the files of the committee under the names of the witnesses?

In other words, the files are labeled with the names of the witnesses and contain newspaper clippings regarding them. Is that not true?

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me first of all answer the first question which the gentleman raised.

Mr. RYAN. No, I did not raise the question. The gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE) did.

Mr. ICHORD. First of all, though, the gentleman makes a statement that the House Resolution 9 would authorize me to comply if this resolution is defeated. House Resolution No. 9, if you will read it very carefully, does not authorize me to give anything. I would have to frame another resolution and bring it back to the House of Representatives for action.

Now, in regard to the second question of the gentleman, I do not know, but there are certain press clippings in the files. I have been advised by the staff of the committee that they have not been compiled. They would be scattered throughout the records. I would say that it would take hundreds upon hundreds of hours and research in all probability

to get those press clippings. I do not know where they are.

Mr. RYAN. Is it the gentleman's position that there are no clippings filed with the witness files?

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

The gentleman from Missouri has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It is my understanding that press clippings as such are not evidence; that there are perhaps press clippings associated with the names of the witnesses, but they are not evidence in any sense of the word. They are not arranged, definitely not arranged, the way they want them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 292, nays 63, not voting 77, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—292

Abbott Cleveland Fulton, Pa.
Abernethy Collier Fulton, Tenn.
Adams Collins, Tex. Fuqua
Alexander Conable Galifianakis
Anderson, Ill. Corbett Garmatz
Andrews, Ala. Cotter Gaydos
Andrews, N. Dak. Coughlin Gialmo
Archer Daniels, Va. Gibbons
Arends Daniels, N.J. Gonzalez
Ashbrook Danielson Goodling
Aspinall Davis, Ga. Grasso
Baker Davis, Wis. Gray
Baring de la Garza Green, Oreg.
Beicher Delaney Griffiths
Bell Dellenback Gross
Bennett Denholm Grover
Bergland Dennis Gubser
Betts Dent Hagan
Blaggi Derwinski Haley
Blanton Dickinson Hall
Boggs Dingell Hamilton
Bow Donohue Hammett
Brademas Dorn Hanley
Brasco Downing Hansen, Idaho
Bray Dulski Harsha
Brinkley Duncan Harvey
Brooks duPont Hastings
Brotzman Dwyer Hebert
Brown, Mich. Edmondson Heckler, Mass.
Brown, Ohio Edwards, Ala. Henderson
Broyhill, Va. Erlenborn Hicks, Mass.
Buchanan Esch Hicks, Wash.
Burlison, Tex. Eshleman Hogan
Burlison, Mo. Evans, Colo. Holifield
Byrne, Pa. Evins, Tenn. Horton
Byrnes, Wis. Fascell Hosmer
Byron Findley Howard
Cabell Fish Hull
Camp Fisher Hungate
Carney Flood Hunt
Carter Flowers Hutchinson
Cederberg Flynt Ichord
Chamberlain Ford, Gerald R. Jacobs
Chappell Forsythe Jarman
Clancy Fountain Johnson, Calif.
Clark Frelinghuysen Jonas

Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lent
Link
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClory
McClure
McCollister
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Martin
Mayne
Mazzoli
Melcher
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mizel
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Peysner
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Rousselot
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Scherle
Schmitz
Schneebell
Schwengel

NAYS—63

Abouzeck
Abzug
Addabbo
Anderson, Calif.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Begich
Blester
Bolling
Burke, Mass.
Burton
Carey
Celler
Clay
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Dellums
Dow
Drinan
Eckhardt
Elberg
Ford, William D.
Gallagher
Gude
Halpern
Harrington
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Kastenmeier
Koch
McCloskey
McCormack
Matsunaga
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mikva
Mitchell
Morse
Mosher
Nedzi
Obey
Podell
Rees
Roe
Rosenthal
Roy
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Seiberling
Stanton, James V.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waldie
Whalen
Yates

Scott
Sebellus
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Slak
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Steele
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Udall
Vander Jagt
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Wampler
Ware
Watts
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Winn
Wolf
Wyatt
Wyder
Wylle
Wyman
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—77

Anderson, Tenn.
Barrett
Bevill
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boland
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Fla.
Caffery
Casey
Chisholm
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collins, Ill.
Coimer
Crane
Diggs
Dowdy
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Foley
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Gettys
Goldwater
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hays
Hillis
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Kuykendall
Long, La.
McCulloch
Madden
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Mollohan
Murphy, Ill.
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara
Pettis
Rangel
Reid, N.Y.
Riegle
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Sarbanes
Saylor
Stanton, J. William
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stuckey
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Ullman
Whalley
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Zablocki

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

On this vote:
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.
Mr. Bevill for, with Mr. Fraser against.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Reid of New York against.
Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Bingham against.
Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Collins against.
Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Diggs against.
Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mrs. Mink against.
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. O'Hara against.
Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Rangel against.
Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Frenzel.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Whalley.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Terry.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Sarbanes with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Messrs. BRASCO and BYRON changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KYL changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREATING A PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BOLLING, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 19 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES 19
Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1971, there is hereby created a permanent Select Committee on Small Business to be composed of fifteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.
Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such com-

mittee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of small business; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and (4) to study and investigate problems of small business enterprises generally, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided*, That the committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

Sec. 3. The committee may from time to time submit to the House such reports as it deems advisable and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as the committee deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Sec. 5. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, there is created a permanent Select Committee on Small Business (which is not a standing committee of the House) to be composed of nineteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

"Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to—

"(1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of small business;

"(2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business in order to determine (A) whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business, and (B) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and

"(3) the problems of small business enterprises generally; and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public

interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. 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. 3. Such committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction but is authorized to make studies, investigations, and reports; however, no bills or resolutions shall be referred to the committee.

"Sec. 4. The committee may submit from time to time to the House such reports as the committee considers advisable and, prior to the close of the present Congress, shall submit to the House a final report of the committee on the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as the committee considers advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

"Sec. 5. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, subject to clause 31 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as the committee considers necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witness.

"Sec. 6. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking evidence including sworn testimony.

"Sec. 7. Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in connection with the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754), or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or employees, or other Members or employees, traveling abroad."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is an appropriate time to explain to the House what the intention of the gentleman from Missouri is, by direction of the Committee on Rules, to do this afternoon.

This is the first of 15 resolutions that it is proposed to call up. One of these resolutions makes in order a bill. To the best of my knowledge, there is no controversy on any of these matters except one, and that will be the last matter to be called up. It is the question of an investigative resolution for the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

The resolution before us now creates the usual Select Committee on Small Business. This time it is described as a permanent select committee, recognizing the fact that each 2 years a new Congress establishes these select committees. So we are going to accept it as a permanent

select committee. But its authority is not changed. The only change that takes place in its constitution is its size, and at the request of the leadership on both sides it has been increased from 15 to 19 in this Congress.

Now, there was a long committee amendment read to this particular resolution. There will be a long committee amendment to each of the succeeding resolutions except the one that deals with the question of making in order a bill with reference to counterpart funds. That bill, incidentally, is merely to undo a mistake made in the Reorganization Act which eliminated for the House, but not for the other body, the use of counterpart funds when travel is involved.

Members will find, as we come to each of the resolutions, that there are three different categories of investigative resolutions which will be considered as we get to them. As I say, so far as I know only one is controversial. But there are three categories. They are all in the categories and they are to be handled precisely as they were handled in the last Congress. We have conformed each resolution to the provisions of the Reorganization Act, as the rules were changed with regard to when a committee could or could not meet, and these are conformed with to comply with the new rule.

There are also other minor changes that conform to the Reorganization Act. That is the reason for having a long committee amendment to every resolution.

I will be glad, of course, now to answer any questions on this resolution or, as we progress, to answer any questions on the other resolutions.

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

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

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

Do I correctly understand that this committee is authorized to travel abroad?

Mr. BOLLING. This committee is not authorized to travel abroad. It can travel only within the confines of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. So that is the reason why it is precluded from using counterpart funds in section 7, the last paragraph of the bill?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that this committee can sit at any time the House is in session regardless of the parliamentary situation?

Mr. BOLLING. No; they cannot sit when we are under the 5-minute rule. That is provided in the committee amendment. We have conformed it to the new Reorganization Act, but they cannot sit when we are under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there is a technical error in the committee amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that on page 6, line 2, after the word "any" the word "other" be inserted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.
Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker,

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has explained the overall situation in his usual very able manner, and I concur in every statement he has made.

May I simply add a few things, Mr. Speaker, with the thought in mind that after we get through consideration of this resolution, every other one should be able to pass without any lengthy discussion or, in my opinion, without having the amendment completely read, because they are all in conformity with the principals set forth by the gentleman from Missouri.

As the gentleman from Missouri mentioned, the resolution relating to mutual security funds or the use of counterpart funds is a little different, but all the rest relate to investigative jurisdiction.

Briefly, may I say that for four reasons we have had to rewrite every one of these resolutions. First, we had to clarify the areas of jurisdiction. None have been changed but, first, we refer to rule 11 and then the particular clause which has heretofore set forth the jurisdiction of each committee.

Second, we cover the sitting of committees while the House is in session. Every committee now will be able to meet up until we come to the 5-minute rule, then, with the exception of five committees, they cannot sit. Those five committees are Rules, Appropriations, Standards of Official Conduct, Internal Security, and Government Operations.

The third change is made to comply with the legislative review responsibility which the Legislative Reorganization Act provides. At the end of each session each committee will have to submit a report summarizing its previous legislative review activities.

The fourth is the language in connection with counterpart funds.

May I say, in addition to that, it has all been broken down, as the gentleman from Missouri has stated, into three categories: Those who travel only within the United States, including the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the Committee on Education and Labor. There are certain exceptions on Education and Labor as to where they can go. In the resolution relating to that committee's jurisdiction, they are authorized to go to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. But that is the rule now with relation to their authority. Other than that, they cannot travel without coming back to the Rules Committee for a special resolution.

The committees whose members will be authorized to travel within and without the United States include Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Armed Services, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Science and Astronautics.

Those that can travel within the United States and without, with certain limited authority, which is what I mentioned a minute ago, are the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Veterans'

Affairs, Banking and Currency, Public Works, Judiciary, and Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to any of these resolutions. I have heard of none. Several chairmen of the committees came before the Rules Committee. Some wanted a little more authority on travel, and they wanted certain language stricken out of one or two of the resolutions that might have placed a little limitation on their committees. But I am satisfied that every committee will have their full investigative authority to enable them to function very efficiently under each of the resolutions we are presenting. I think they are in accordance with the rules and provisions of the Reorganization Act. I not only urge the adoption of this resolution but each and every one subsequent thereto. I reserve the balance of my time. I have no requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4713, TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 258 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 258

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4713) to amend section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct an omission in existing law with respect to the entitlement of committees of the House of Representatives to the use of certain currencies. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill designed to undo the mistake in the Reorganization Act which deprives the House of the use of counterpart funds rather than appropriated funds in travel by any committee or by any other agency of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy about this. When the rule is adopted, I propose to ask that the bill itself be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, so we may proceed promptly with its passage.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I simply say that I concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Missouri, and I hope the resolution will be approved.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 4713) to amend section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct an omission in existing law with respect to the entitlement of committees of the House of Representatives to the use of certain currencies, just made in order by the adoption of the rule, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4713

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190d), as amended by section 118 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1156; Public Law 91-510), is amended to read as follows:

"LEGISLATIVE REVIEW BY STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 136. (a) In order to assist the Congress in—

"(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of the application, administration, and execution of the laws enacted by the Congress, and

"(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modifications of or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, and execution of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that committee.

"(b) In each odd-numbered year beginning on or after January 1, 1973, each standing committee of the Senate shall submit, not later than March 31, to the Senate, and each standing committee of the House shall submit, not later than January 2, to the House, a report on the activities of that committee under this section during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

"(c) The preceding provisions of this section do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, House Administration, Rules, and Standards of Official Conduct of the House."

SEC. 2. Title I of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—"Sec. 136. Legislative review by Senate standing committees."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"Sec. 136. Legislative review by standing committees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective as of noon on January 3, 1971.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that no debate is required, and I hope that the bill will be passed.

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

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 213 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 213

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1971, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation relating to all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, 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 shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

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 Education and Labor 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*, (1) That 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) that 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.

That each member or employee of said committee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Education and Labor, 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 6 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 the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, 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. Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I stated earlier, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the resolution and the committee amendment thereto be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 217 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 217

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations in connection with all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, including, but not limited to, the following matters:

(1) The United States Postal Service, its administration, operation, and management; and the United States mails and other postal services.

(2) The Postal Rate Commission.

(3) Personnel requirements and manpower utilization, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Federal civil service generally.

(4) Pay, leave, allowances, and other emoluments of Federal civilian officers and employees.

(5) The Federal civil service retirement, insurance, and health benefits programs.

(6) The classification of Federal civilian positions.

(7) The Bureau of the Census, National Archives and Records Service; and the collection, reporting, and data processing activities of the Government of the United States generally.

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), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within 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 over the signature of the chairman or, in his absence, the vice chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman or, in his absence, the vice chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman, or vice chairman, or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 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 15 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 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. Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, for the reasons cited before, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the committee amendment thereto be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 18 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 18

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies as required in connection with bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to it and, more specifically or in addition thereto, in connection with the following matters:

(1) (a) The status, progress, and administration of irrigation, reclamation, and other water resources development programs of

the Department of the Interior and of other agencies insofar as the latter affect the work of the Department of the Interior with respect to such programs, including (i) policies and procedures relating to such programs, (ii) projects previously authorized, (iii) projects proposed for authorization and construction, and (iv) developments under the Small Reclamation Projects Act and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act; (b) compacts relating to the use and apportionment of interstate waters; (c) the application to Federal agencies and activities of State laws governing the control, appropriation, and distribution of water; (d) the saline water research and development program; (e) the water resources research program; (f) water resources planning conducted pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act, including the establishment of river basin commissions and financial assistance to the States for water and related land resources planning; and (g) activities of the National Water Commission.

(2) (a) The administration and operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws, including those which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of oil, gas, helium, geothermal steam, and associated resources of the public and other Federal lands; (b) mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including the conditions, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; (c) mineral resources surveys and the exploration, development, production, and conservation of mineral resources; (d) research facilities needed to improve the position of the domestic mining and minerals industries; (e) capability of mining schools to support research facilities and assure domestic industry of a continuing source of technical talent; (f) proposed long-range domestic minerals and energy programs, including availability of domestic minerals and energy to fulfill all domestic requirements; (g) impact upon domestic mining industries caused by the transfer or disposal of excess and surplus Government-owned metals and minerals; and (h) the effects upon domestic mining industries resulting from the world metal situation and the means available to the Government to permit domestic mining industries to compete favorably in domestic and world markets, including cooperation with established international organizations.

(3) The status, progress, and administration of: (a) the national park system and its units; (b) other national units established for the protection, conservation, preservation, or recreational developments of areas on public domain lands, or areas on reservations created out of the public domain, or areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; (c) national outdoor recreation plans and the land and water conservation fund programs; and (d) historic preservation programs.

(4) (a) The administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of public lands administered by the Department of the Interior, of forest reserves created out of the public domain and of areas of the Outer Continental Shelf; (b) administration, operation, and implementation of the Wilderness Act; planning the use of federally owned lands and lands adjacent thereto; and (c) the withdrawal or restriction on use of public domain or Outer Continental Shelf lands, including reservations created out of the public domain, by military and nonmilitary agencies of the Government from normal operation of the public land and mining laws and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(5) (a) The administration of Indian affairs by agencies of the Government participating therein, the programs and policies of those agencies, the adequacy of existing

Indian legislation, and the effectiveness with which it is being administered; (b) the release of Indian tribes and bands from Federal supervision, preparation therefor, and the effects thereof; (c) the availability to Indians of health, education, and welfare services and the extent to which they are receiving the full benefit of Federal programs in these areas; (d) the utilization of tribal lands and other resources, with particular attention to the means of developing the skill and aptitudes required for such utilization.

(6) The status, administration, and progress of the territories and insular possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the operation and administration of the Revised Virgin Islands Organic Act of 1954, the Virgin Islands Corporation Act of 1949, and Guam Organic Act of 1950, all as amended; local conditions bearing upon and the provisions to be included in Organic Acts for American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the extension of various laws of the United States to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the granting of citizenship to residents of American Samoa; operations of the Peace Corps in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and American interest in Antarctica.

(7) The Administration of the laws and programs mentioned in the preceding paragraphs in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the effect of those laws and programs on the environment, the balance achieved under such laws and programs between population needs and environmental protection, and any recommendations with respect to such laws and programs made by the Council on Environmental Quality in its annual environmental quality report to the Congress.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of making such investigations and studies, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit, hold hearings, and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States as the nature of the investigation or study requires, and be represented at any meeting called by an established international organization to consider matters that affect the areas of jurisdiction of the committee; may do so not only during the session but also during periods of recess and adjournment; and may 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 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 Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and its Members and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 490(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expand 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) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of ac-

travel transportation costs; (3) that 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; (4) that each member or employee of said committee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 18, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass with the following amendment:

Strike all after the word "Resolved," and insert in lieu thereof: "That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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 10 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 the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of 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) The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States.

"(c) Pursuant to clause 28 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 Interior and Insular Affairs 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 or 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 U.S. 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. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the resolution and the committee amendment thereto be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLLING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: On page 9, line 3—Strike all of Sec. 3 and add in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 3. Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 109 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 109

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

(1) 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 formulation and implementation of United States 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;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act and by other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of the United States programs of oversea assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of paragraph 7 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

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 Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d 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 committee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 7 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 Foreign Affairs 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 U.S. Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identi-

cation 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. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution and the committee amendment be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection. The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO MAKE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 170

Resolved, That (a) effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction, including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; ownership and control of transportation facilities; adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy.

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions which impede the free flow of air commerce; promotion of travel and tourism; routes, rates, accounts, and subsidy payments; airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace; aircraft, and airline liability; aircraft research and development; market for American aircraft; air navigational aids and traffic control;

(3) Allocation of radio spectrum; cable television; pay television; satellite communications; ownership, control, and operations of communications and related facilities; policies with respect to competition among various modes of communication, including voice and record communications and data processing; policies with respect to governmental communications system; coordination of communication policies both domestic and foreign; impact of foreign operations, international agreements, and international organizations on domestic and foreign communications; technical developments in the communications field;

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various securities Acts; adequacy and effectiveness of the regulatory structure provided for in the various securities Acts; and the adequacy and effectiveness of self regulation in the securities industry;

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs for an expanding economy; ade-

quacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission, and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies;

(6) Advertising, fair competition, packaging, and labeling;

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather;

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security system;

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, nursing homes, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices; other matters relating to public health, including problems of the aging; protection of the public against abuse of narcotic drugs, barbiturates, amphetamines, marijuana, and other dangerous drugs;

(10) The War Claims Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act, including the provisions relating to direct foreign investment;

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials;

(12) Traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States; factors responsible for such accidents and resulting deaths and personal injuries; measures for compensation for damages and economic losses; measures for increased motor vehicle safety; and

(13) The administration of provisions of law relating to the above subjects and all others which are in the jurisdiction of such committee.

(b) The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside 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.

(b) The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953 (31 U.S.C. 724) or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under clause 28 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House; except that (1) no member or em-

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 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 counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

(b) 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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 12 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 hereof 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 witness 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 committees activities within the United States; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce 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 com-

mittee 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. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution and the committee amendment be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 20 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 20

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors.

(1) The programs of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, nursing home care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation); and

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances; with a view to determining whether or not

such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interest of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs.

The committee is also authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people, or segments thereof, in the name of American veterans by appealing to the desire of the American people to assist such veterans and their survivors or dependents;

(2) whether an undue proportion of such charitable contributions is used to meet the expenses of conducting such appeals and for other administrative expenses rather than for providing services for or benefits to veterans;

(3) whether any of such appeals are fraudulent in nature;

(4) whether additional supervision of the fund-raising activities conducted by organizations chartered by Act of Congress in the name of veterans is necessary or desirable; and

(5) the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans.

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 investigations and studies, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary, except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Sec. 2. In addition, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee and not more than two staff assistants to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam for the purpose of conducting a full and complete investigation and study into the disability compensation and pension program, the death compensation and death pension program, the dependency and indemnity compensation program, insurance, education, vocational rehabilitation, hospital and medical care, and other subjects properly coming within the jurisdiction of said committee in the Republic of the Philippines and in the case of American veterans and servicemen in South Vietnam the above-mentioned subjects and the servicemen's group life insurance program: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake

any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

Sec. 3. The committee is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the establishment, operation, and maintenance of cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior. For the purposes of this section the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, as it deems necessary. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

Sec. 4. 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 Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under clause 28 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives: *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.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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 20 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 the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, 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, memoran-

dums, 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) However, the committee is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee and not more than two staff assistants to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam for the purpose of conducting an investigation and study of subjects properly coming within the jurisdiction of the committee in the Republic of the Philippines and in the case of American veterans and servicemen in South Vietnam.

"(c) In addition, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within and without the United States, for the purpose of conducting an investigation and study of the establishment, operation, and maintenance of cemeteries properly coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

"(d) 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 Veterans' Affairs 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. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution and the committee amendment be dispensed

with, and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 21 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 21

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including but not limited to the following:

(1) administration and operation of the Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Commission and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American merchant marine;

(2) administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and all laws and problems relating to fisheries and wildlife;

(3) administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws and problems relating to functions thereunder;

(4) administration and operation of the Panama Canal and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and

(5) the natural resources and environment of the oceans:

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

For such purposes the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof as authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress 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 over 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. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

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 Merchant Marine and Fisheries

of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d 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 committee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 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 14 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 witnesses.

"(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 Merchant Marine and Fisheries 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 difference in time zones."

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution and the committee amendment be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AND MAKE INQUIRIES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 243

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in or related to the fields of astronomical research and development (including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities), outer space (including exploration and control thereof and air and space law), and other scientific research and development (including international scientific cooperation) coming within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any

subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act within or without the United States, during the present Congress, 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. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its studies, investigations, and inquiries, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

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 Science and Astronautics 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*, (1) That 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) that 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.

That each member or employee of said committee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the word "Resolved" and insert in lieu thereof: "That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, 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 18 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.

"Pursuant to clause 23 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 Science and Astronautics 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. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution and the committee amendment be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 22 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 22

Resolved, That effective from January 21, 1971, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration, expansion, and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the use of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements and commodity marketing and pricing systems upon United States agriculture.

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies.

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers.

(5) The formulation and development of improved programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities.

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committee and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees.

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended; the development of land use programs pursuant to the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 and the Agricultural Act of 1962 and the Agricultural Act of 1970.

(8) All programs of food assistance or distribution supported in whole or in part by funds authorized to be used by the Department of Agriculture, including but not limited to the food stamp program, the commodity distribution program, the school milk program, and programs established pursuant to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

(9) The implementation and administration of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, the Wholesome Poultry Products Act of 1968, and the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970, including the establishment and development of inspection services as required by the Acts.

(10) All matters relating to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, and all agricultural chemicals registered and regulated under such Act.

(11) All other matters within the jurisdiction of the committee: *Provided*, That, the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations

and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, 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: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of carrying out this resolution, with respect to paragraph (1), the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act outside the United States. Subpenas may be issued over 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. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

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

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, 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 Agriculture of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code, for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority as set forth in paragraph (1) of this resolution: *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 committee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Agriculture, 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 I 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 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) However, with respect to matters within its jurisdiction pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act outside the United States.

"(c) 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 Agriculture 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. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the resolution and the committee amendment thereto be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, like other committee chairmen, and I am sure like other Members of the House, I understand the reasoning behind the Committee on Rules' policy of avoiding jurisdictional disputes between other House committees. I, therefore, support House Resolution 22, as amended.

I appreciate also the overlapping jurisdiction of various committees, but I wish to make as a matter of record at this point several specific jurisdictional areas that have been conferred on the Committee on Agriculture since the last revision of House Rule XI in 1946.

These are as follows:

First. The restoration, expansion, and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the use of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, 23d Congress as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements and commodity marketing and pricing system upon U.S. agriculture.

Second. All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Third. All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained-yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies.

Fourth. Price spreads between producers and consumers.

Fifth. The formulation and development of programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities.

Sixth. The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees.

Seventh. The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, 83d Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended; the development of land use programs pursuant to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 and the Agricultural Act of 1970.

Eighth. All programs of food assistance or distribution supported in whole or in part by funds authorized to be used by the Department of Agriculture, including but not limited to the food stamp

program, the commodity distribution program, the school milk program, and programs established pursuant to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. In this regard, I recognize that a great many advantages can be obtained by merging the food stamp legislation with general welfare, and along with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER), I have communicated our willingness to the Ways and Means Committee, to merge and meld these programs together under the jurisdiction of his committee.

Ninth. The implementation and administration of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, the Wholesome Poultry Products Act of 1968, and the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970, including the establishment and development of inspection services as required by the act.

Tenth. All matters relating to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, and the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1971, as well as all agricultural chemicals registered and regulated under such act.

Eleventh. Matters relating to rural development through comprehensive community planning, resource conservation and development, extension service activities, rural environmental assistance, rural community grants and loans for public services, and other economic fiscal and social development in the Nation's rural areas.

Twelfth. All other matters within the jurisdiction of the committee as established by rule or precedent of the House.

I wish to make clear, Mr. Speaker, that these legislative matters were and are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 142 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 142

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and ground, roads and highways as well as all other environmental, public works and economic and regional development matters within its jurisdiction, and, in Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American highway is located, international roads and highways.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during

the present Congress at such times and places in the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, Canada, Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located, whether the House has recessed or 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, 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.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, Canada, Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1953 (31 U.S.C. 724) or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under clause 28 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, except that (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 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 counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

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.

With the following committee amendment:

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 142, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass, with the following amendment:

Strike all after the word "Resolved," and insert in lieu thereof: "That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Public Works, 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 16 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 the United States, Commonwealths, territories and possessions thereof, Canada, Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located, 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 members designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

"(b) The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States, Commonwealths, territories and possessions thereof, Canada, Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located.

"(c) 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 Public Works 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."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 114 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 114

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to all matters falling within the jurisdiction of the committee under rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives or any law of the United States including:

- (1) Banking and currency generally.
- (2) Control of price of commodities, rents, or services.
- (3) Deposit insurance.
- (4) Federal Reserve System.
- (5) Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.
- (6) Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.
- (7) Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.
- (8) Public and private housing.
- (9) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.
- (10) Export controls (the Export Control Act).
- (11) International Finance (the Asian Development Bank Act, the Inter-American Development Bank Act, the International Finance Corporation, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development).
- (12) International trade (the Export-Import Bank Act).

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 may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it considers advisable, during the present Congress.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee, or any of its subcommittees, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within 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: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of carrying out this resolution, with respect to paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act outside the United States.

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. The chairman of the committee, or any

member thereof designated by him, may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, 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 Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code, for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority as set forth in paragraphs (10), (11), and (12) of this resolution: *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; and (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 committee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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 4 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 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 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) However, with respect to matters within its jurisdiction pursuant to the Export Control Act (50 App. U.S.C. 2021, etc.), the Asian Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 285, etc.), the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283, etc.), the International Finance Corporation Act

(22 U.S.C. 282, etc.), the International Development Association Act (22 U.S.C. 284, etc.), the International Monetary Fund Act (22 U.S.C. 286, etc.), and the Export-Import Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 635, etc.), the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act outside the United States.

"(c) 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 Banking and Currency 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. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution and the committee amendment be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLLING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a clarifying amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: On page 7, line 20, the word "filled" should be "filed."

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there is a printing error in the amended resolution. On page 7, line 20, the word "filled" should be "filed." I ask that this technical amendment to the amended resolution be adopted by unanimous consent.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 161 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 161

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee: *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 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 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: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act outside the United States. 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.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, 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 the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code, for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority. *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; (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 committee shall make to the chairman of said com-

mittee 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.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on the Judiciary 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 13 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 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) However, with respect to matters within its jurisdiction pursuant to subsection (h) of clause 13 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301-1303, 1311-1315), and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331-1343), the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act outside the United States.

"(c) 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 the Judiciary 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."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND STUDY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 27 and ask for its consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 27

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following:

(1) the organization, management, operation, and administration of any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia;

(2) the organization, management, operation, and administration of any independent agency or instrumentality of government operating solely in the District of Columbia; and

(3) those operations or activities directly affecting the District of Columbia, of any governmental agency or instrumentality operating on a regional basis entirely within the Washington metropolitan area: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

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 the United States, whether the House is in session, 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; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. 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.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Con-

gress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on the District of Columbia for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on the District of Columbia, 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 5 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 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. Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and not withstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on the District of Columbia for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution and the committee amendment thereto be dispensed with and that they be printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may use.

I understand that there are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia who would like to be heard on this, and I am prepared to yield time to them.

I would only say that this resolution

conforms to the other resolutions we have had. We have made it conform to the Reorganization Act. Insofar as I know, it is the same resolution that we had last year.

Does the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia desire time?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for 3 minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, after consulting with the ranking minority member of the District of Columbia Committee, I introduced House Resolution 27. It is the usual resolution we have been introducing for the past years. There has never been any complaint before this occasion expressed by any member of the committee. I felt we were within our rights in introducing this resolution along with other chairmen of the standing committees.

I understand that there is some question over the fact that we possibly did not take this proposed resolution up before the full District Committee. However, I would like to state that we had no committee organized at that time. Further, I notice that the Foreign Affairs Committee and several other committee chairmen have had such resolutions passed here today and they had not been organized at the time the resolutions were introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we were well within our rights in bringing forth this resolution.

Of course, I fully understand that we can investigate any agency in the District of Columbia under this resolution. However, under the reorganization act I must go before the District of Columbia Committee and get permission from the majority of the committee to investigate any of the agencies in the District of Columbia if this resolution is adopted.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, not because I believe that the District of Columbia Committee ought not have investigative powers, because obviously it ought to have them, but because I am troubled by the fact that the investigative power this committee has had in the past has been abused. Not only has it been abused, but it has been delegated to nonmembers of the House. Just last year the District of Columbia Committee brought some opprobrium upon this House of Representatives as the result of a report on the subject of the school system in the District of Columbia, which was issued pursuant to its investigative authority. As a result of that report, which among other things, suggested that anyone who was a graduate of Antioch College was unqualified to teach in the schools of the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. MIKVA. Yes; I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. As a routine matter the Subcommittee on Investigations requested the school board to furnish them the names of all the teachers who had graduated from this particular college, as the gentleman mentioned, only because we had complaints from the teachers and parents stating that they had too many teachers from that college and they did not think that other colleges were being treated fairly. I do not mind anyone asking how many teachers are teaching in the public school system of the District of Columbia who come from the University of South Carolina or any other school and, therefore, I do not see anything wrong with asking how many are teaching from the college which the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my chairman, did they in fact ask about any other university during this period of time?

Mr. McMILLAN. This was the only one they had any complaints about.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, if I may continue my litany about this report throughout the month of December 1970, in the Washington papers there was account after account of this report and other reports that had been issued by the District of Columbia Committee, or rather under the committee's imprimatur. A very distinguished member of the District of Columbia Committee who cannot be here today during the consideration of this resolution, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), pointed out the fact that even though he was a member of this Special Select Investigating Committee, he never saw the reports until they were printed, and that he never had the opportunity to file dissenting views.

This entire question was thrashed out in the Democratic caucus and the Democratic Members will remember that this was discussed at some length.

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

Mr. MIKVA. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. The subcommittee held 14 days of open hearings on school conditions and the Member which the gentleman from Illinois has mentioned was a member of that subcommittee, but whether he attended those hearings or not I do not know. However, before I filed the report on the floor of the House I had the investigators spend 1 solid week trying to get this Member to read this report and apparently he never did read it.

Mr. MIKVA. The gentleman from Minnesota is not here to defend himself, but he did prepare a written speech in which he complained about the issuance of reports in the name of the committee when he had had no opportunity to read them or to file dissenting views in the report.

I think the reputation of the gentleman from Minnesota speaks for itself and I cannot imagine the gentleman making this kind of a statement if, in fact, he had had the opportunity of reading the report.

Once again, I point out that it was not an abuse by any particular member of the subcommittee because it turns out

that a good portion of the report was written by a nonmember of the House, singling out this one college as being some kind of subversive institution. It turns out that the consultant for the committee did most of the writing for the committee and, in fact, it was put in print with only the approval of the chairman and such Members as he consulted.

That is why I raise it at this time, because the distinguished chairman of the committee in responding to some of the complaints raised about the manner in which the District of Columbia Committee had been functioning, answered that, and I am now quoting from a document that the chairman circulated to his colleagues on February 1:

Committee investigations were authorized by special resolution approved by the Rules Committee and by a vote of the House, and funded by supporting resolution providing the necessary funds.

This is the resolution we have under discussion:

Reports of the studies and investigations by special subcommittees are routinely transmitted by the subcommittee to the chairman, who in turn files the report of the special subcommittee with the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, my desire is not that the District of Columbia Committee be prohibited from engaging in investigations. Rather, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia I would like to know in the future that when there are investigations being taken in the name of the Committee on the District of Columbia that those of us who are on that committee, whether we are "troublemakers" or not, will be given an opportunity to have something to say as to the input of the investigation and the scope of that investigation.

I suggest that, based on what the chairman has said here before, if this resolution passes the House today then it is "Katie, bar the door," and we have lost an opportunity to do anything. If the chairman would say that as far as he is concerned the subcommittee is going to run in a different manner than last year, then I certainly do not want to deny the committee any of its legitimate investigating functions.

However, I would like to make sure that we do not engage in any investigations in the future that will carry my name in the report unless I have an opportunity to say something about what the report says.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to state again that under the Reorganization Act that we passed in the House last year it will be necessary for all of the chairmen to discuss any investigations with all the members of their committees. And that is my interpretation of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. MIKVA. If the chairman would

permit me to ask him a question about the procedure specifically:

Will the full committee have an opportunity to approve any investigation before it is commenced?

Mr. McMILLAN. They will have approval, certainly.

Mr. MIKVA. Will the full committee have an opportunity to approve any report that is issued?

Mr. McMILLAN. Let me repeat to the gentleman that I did my best to make all Members read the report.

Mr. MIKVA. I merely asked whether or not the report will be approved by the full committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. I even had the report mimeographed and sent to the gentleman's office for him to read, and the gentleman did not come up and ask, before I had already filed the report, to file a supplementary report. I think that I did all I could in that case.

Mr. MIKVA. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that none of us desire to wash this committee's linen in front of the House, except that the earlier remarks that the chairman made publicly made some of us feel that we had no alternative but to raise the question now, or be forever barred from raising it. I for one would not like to have the Committee on the District of Columbia, on which I serve, and serve very proudly, issue reports in which I felt I could not or others could not have made known their dissenting views.

In light of the assurances the chairman has mentioned about the proceedings in the future, I am reassured, and hope that we can continue our efforts to try to be the best committee in the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to comment that I do not want to get into any internal affairs with any committee but I believe that the gentleman from Chicago (Mr. MIKVA) had a chance to present his views before the Committee on Rules. I presume that this resolution is absolutely in accordance with the Rules of the House, such as have the other resolutions that have been passed here today, and that no changes have been made in the jurisdiction, and that it is in accordance with clause 5, rule XI, which is set forth on page 334 of our rules, and that that is precisely what it is.

There are other ways to proceed if something has to be done, such as for a resolution to change the jurisdiction, which would come before the Committee on Rules, in an effort to change the Rules of the Committee, Mr. Speaker, but other than that I think that this is in order, and I would urge the adoption of House Resolution 27.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL).

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the implication made by the gentleman from Illinois concerning his quotation of the gentleman from Minnesota. We are getting into semantics here that are rather tricky.

I would call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota did say in his statement:

I did not have an opportunity to read this report.

What he did not say was that he did not use the opportunities that were presented to him on several occasions to read this report. There was only one copy of it let out at that time, but I am reliably advised that on several occasions he was called and it was either to bring it to his office or he could come to the committee office, but that counsel would not turn that one report loose out of his possession. So the fact remains that he did not have an opportunity because of his own volition and not because he was denied an opportunity of reading that report.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to oppose the passage of this resolution. I think it is a proper function of the committees of the House to conduct investigations, certainly, in furtherance of their oversight responsibilities for legislation that has been passed.

But I hope that nobody in the House misunderstands exactly what the problem is in the House Committee on the District of Columbia. I hope no one is confused about the fact that the decisions of the chairman and the appointment of subcommittees and subcommittee chairmen is for one purpose and for one purpose alone—to create rubber stamp subcommittees for his purposes.

The chairman has said as much, and I say parenthetically that I have no personal animosity toward the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), the chairman of the committee. But I do have a great deal of animosity for the manner in which the committee's business has been conducted during the past 4 years and some weeks that I have been a member of the committee.

For example, when I read in the morning press that my committee has conducted an investigation and has reached some conclusion, I think it is a little late for me to be finding out about it. Perhaps it would be a sign of some progress if the chairman could arrange that as a member of the committee I might be given a news release on the night before so that at least I would know before somebody what the committee is supposed to have done.

It is this problem that I find, frankly, very odious.

Again I say it is the procedure—it is the things that are done. I do not attack the individual himself. I said during the Democratic caucus that personally I have no animosities and no resentment or hatred in my heart for the committee chairman. It is the procedure with which I quarrel.

During the session in which we adopted our rules including one requiring specific jurisdiction for the subcommittees—rule by law rather than rule by man—the chairman said:

Well, you just do not need a chairman.

Now I would turn that point over on its other side and say if every subcom-

mittee chairman—irrespective of a tradition that the chairman is supposed to believe in and apparently is held dearly by the House—if every subcommittee chairman is to be a rubberstamp for the committee chairman without regard to the length of service of such subcommittee chairmen, then really we do not need a committee. We can just let the committee chairman make a determination and report it to the floor of the House. These matters are going to be pressed, of course, at the Democratic caucus and will be brought up from time to time. The only reason I have asked for time today is just so that there will not be any confusion about what is going on inside that committee.

I happen to oppose the seniority system. I believe it is un-American. I believe democracy is the American way. I will tell this House there is one thing I consider worse even than the seniority system where at least the chips fall where they may by fortuity—I would say that democracy is best—seniority is bad. But putting the fix in for rubberstamp subcommittee chairmen without regard to democracy or seniority is by far the worst.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOW THE ARMY PAYS FOR ADS THAT SHOULD BE FREE—A CASE OF PR OVERKILL

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the evidence mounts that our defense establishment is overselling itself.

Pentagon public relations now sets the taxpayers back somewhere between \$30 and \$190 million a year, depending on whose estimate you accept.

Doubtless, many of the activities are justified, but some clearly border on the absurd.

A case in point is a \$10.6 million "ad blitz" planned by the Army to drum up volunteers, and described in detail last week by the authoritative trade publication, Broadcasting magazine.

I find considerable irony in this unprecedented campaign to saturate the country with paid radio and television plugs for a Federal agency—the kind of commercials that most stations carry free as a public service.

Federal policy assumes that the airwaves belong to the public, but here the public is getting socked more than \$10 million to enable a public agency to use the airwaves.

Fortunately, some stations have seen through this ploy, and are either turning down the Army's money, or else simply refusing to run the ads.

I asked both the Army and N. W. Ayer & Son, the agency handling this account, for a breakdown of how the

money was to be spent. Typically, the Army, which is so quick and thorough in the dissemination of self-serving information, was slow in responding to my request. But the Ayer agency, to its credit, complied promptly.

An account executive for the Philadelphia-based firm revealed that \$5,815,000 of the \$10.6 million is earmarked for radio, \$3 million for the three major networks, and \$1 million for a bonus effort over local television in eight selected cities. Out of these budgets, the Army will pay \$600,000 for the production costs of the television commercials, between \$200,000 and \$300,000 for producing the radio segments and the usual 15-percent commission to N. W. Ayer. Another \$90,000 is allocated for research on the impact of the ads.

This dubious campaign started yesterday, and is scheduled to last 4 months. There are precedents for the Army paying production costs and agency fees for advertising of this nature. But there is no reason the public should have to pay for the on-air time for these public service spots, and I have written Secretary Laird to urge that he use his good offices to obtain the necessary time without cost.

One of the basic licensing requirements of radio and TV stations, after all, is to make time available for precisely this kind of programming. As a former broadcaster, and present member of the Communications Subcommittee, I am deeply concerned about the implications of any effort to erode the public's access to the airwaves.

My letter to Mr. Laird and the pertinent article from the February 22 issue of Broadcasting follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., Feb. 26, 1971.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C. 20301

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was astounded to learn from the enclosed copy of an article in Broadcasting that the Army intends to spend more than ten and a half million dollars for the production and broadcasting of radio and television announcements. I concede the need of the Army for new recruits and admit the possibility that broadcast of such announcements will help fill the Army's need. I am convinced, however, that the same broadcast exposure over radio and television in response to the Army's needs can be obtained without the expenditure of this substantial sum.

As a veteran of four years service during World War II as an enlisted man, I know that the Army has in its ranks a large number of capable men who are thoroughly experienced in radio and television production and broadcasting techniques, as well as in advertising copy writing and production. As a former radio and television news commentator, and now as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am well aware that radio and television stations offer free time for public service announcements.

It seems to me that the Army, utilizing its own personnel and facilities, can produce a series of radio and television announcements that would be the more convincing because of the manner in which they were produced. Radio and television stations would, if properly approached, schedule such announcements for regular broadcast without charge as a public service. They might not always

be scheduled in prime time, but the frequency of exposure and the savings in cost would more than compensate for such scheduling.

If the Army were to produce and arrange for the broadcast of its own announcements, the cost involved would be that entailed only in the use of Army equipment and whatever charges might be made against the use of personnel already on Army payrolls. Such personnel, I need hardly point out, are utilized extensively in the making of Army training films. Some additional costs would be incurred for secretarial help in contacting stations on an individual basis, instead of by networks, but these would be minimal by comparison with the ten million plus that the Army so casually contemplates spending to achieve the same result.

I consider the proposed expenditure by the Army to be completely unjustified in the existence of an acceptable alternative that by contrast costs little. I ask that you investigate the Army proposal, with a view to bringing about its cancellation and the substitution of a procedure similar to that I have outlined. If I can be of any assistance, by virtue of my own special experience in this field, you may call on me at any time.

Sincerely,

LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,
Member of Congress.

[From Broadcasting, Feb. 22, 1971]

ARMY ENLISTS AYER FOR AD BLITZ

The U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) is scheduled to pump \$10.6 million into an unprecedented experimental four-month radio and TV advertising campaign created by N. W. Ayer & Son, Philadelphia. Designed in an effort to increase the number of volunteers for Army service, the Army will be using paid time for recruiting advertising on both television and radio in both network and spot. The mammoth campaign has been scheduled to run from March 1 through June and to saturate the country.

Not all stations, however, regard it as a windfall. There have been complaints from some that have carried free recruiting spots in the past and a rejection by at least one major station which refuses payment for such public services.

The Army has contracted with Ayer to produce 30 new 20-second commercials for TV and 100 new radio spots in 30- and 60-second lengths. Frank G. Kenesson, director of information services at Ayer, said the agency began lining up the broadcast time in early February in attempts to reach the Army's primary target audience of young men 17 to 20 years old as well as other persons who may influence their thinking.

The intensity of the TV campaign is emphasized by Ayer's plan to place an average of 13 recruiting spots per week in every TV market in the country via the major networks. Purchases at ABC, NBC and CBS are estimated at more than \$3 million. Locally, high-level TV saturation in a number of markets is planned where local TV buys will double the national schedule. At CBS the Army has spent over \$1 million for participations beginning Tuesday, March 9. The shows involved are *Mannix*, *Mission: Impossible*, *Gunsmoke*, *Hee Haw*, the *Thursday* and *Friday Night Movies*, plus multiple sports affairs. At ABC, USAREC expenditures are estimated at \$750,000, including the *Sunday* and *Monday Night Movies*, *Room 222*, *Love, American Style*, the *Movie of the Week*, and sports. Participations purchased at NBC are tallied as comparable to the other networks, but the only show named so far is *The Bold Ones*.

The radio campaign roster includes the ABC Contemporary Network, Blair Radio Network, local contemporary music stations, local general stations, local ethnic stations,

and clear-channel stations. The specific stations involved were not disclosed. Tentative schedules call for 144 radio spots per week in each of the top-100 markets, 36 spots per week in the second 100 markets, and 24 spots per week in approximately 1,000 other markets.

Eldon Wyant of USAREC's Advertising and Information Division at Fort Monroe, Hampton, Va., described the Army's new advertising tactic as an attempt to stimulate enlistments through the use of prime time. He commented that although the Army has previously received large amounts of free public service time, these messages were generally aired during nonprime time when few potential enlistees were listening or watching. According to Mr. Wyant, pre- and post-campaign studies will be conducted to ascertain the results of the Army's advertising barrage. Hopefully such studies might help reduce draft calls or promote an all-volunteer Army, but specific information concerning these studies was not available from either the Army or Ayer. However, Mr. Kenesson at Ayer felt that comparing pre- and post-enlistment data would be at least a partial if not significant indication of Army advertising effectiveness. In addition, Mr. Wyant pointed out that the result of these studies would be released to other branches of the armed forces, and that the Army's present time buying did not mean that it would be authorized to do so beyond the termination date of the advertising experiment.

But although the Army has had little difficulty making purchases from the networks, some stations have flatly rejected the proposal or even expressed resentment.

WGN-AM-TV Chicago turned down \$50,000 worth of the Army recruiting business, according to a letter written last Monday to N. W. Ayer & Son's Philadelphia office by Ward L. Quaal, president, WGN Continental Broadcasting Co., group owner. He said the refusal applied also to the group's other outlets, KDAL-AM-TV Duluth and KWGN-TV Denver.

Writing to John Coverly-Smith, Ayer broadcast supervisor, Mr. Quaal said the WGN stations have "always given time for such messages free of charge and we will continue to do so as long as I am steward of these precious properties."

Noting, for example, that WGN-TV ran eight free join-the-armed forces announcements during December, Mr. Quaal assured Mr. Coverly-Smith "that we will schedule spot announcements for recruitment purposes just as we carry messages for other public service entities, including the Navy and the Air Force."

WGN Continental has turned down other similar business earlier. Mr. Quaal wrote Illinois Governor Richard Ogilvie Dec. 24, 1970, to explain why he was refusing to accept \$11,000 worth of radio spot business from the state on WGN designed to alert highway motorists on the dangers of ice and snow, tires, drinking, etc. The drive, involving the use of 10-second and 30-second spots, was placed through Sperry-Boom Inc., Rosemont, Ill., advertising agency.

Mr. Quaal told the governor that it "is our responsibility and also that of all broadcasters, whether in Illinois or any other state, to air safety messages as those proposed by Sperry-Boom. It was a fine idea, but we cannot accept payment for these spot announcements, which we have rewritten and are airing over our facilities as public service messages, as we have in the past, to alert motorists using the highways."

Sperry-Boom explained the highway safety account is handled as a regular commercial-type account. The agency said the campaign began at the holiday season and is to run through the July 4 weekend. About 40 stations presently are involved in the schedule, it was related, and WGN has been the only outlet to refuse the business.

Taking another view, Howard McDonald, partner and co-manager, KRNS (AM) Burns, Ore., stated in a letter to USAREC dated Feb. 12: "You are no longer qualified for public service time on this station. Our public service time is reserved for groups and organizations that do not have access to advertising budgets. I personally resent any government body buying any form of advertising and I strongly disapprove of your action."

Meanwhile, other federal representatives called on advertising talents. It became known last week that the Department of Commerce has signed a \$550,000 six-month contract with Marsteller Inc., New York, to compose an advertising campaign to sell American business on "export awareness." The test project, authorized by Congress in 1969, is being handled by the Bureau of International Commerce, with Ron Demer, a special assistant, in charge.

The campaign, which is not yet final, is expected to use business magazines, and to be similar to a \$35,000, seven-time test that took place last summer in Minneapolis-St. Paul. There a package of media was bought that included regional editions of *Time*, *U.S. News and World Report*, *Sports Illustrated*, as well as local magazines and newspaper supplements. That campaign was by The Adworks Inc., New York. The national test is due to start in April.

Under the contract with Marsteller, the agency will be reimbursed on a sliding scale depending on how much is spent in media. This runs from \$36,000 for expenditures below \$300,000 to a maximum of \$48,000 for outlays between \$400,000 and \$500,000. The other \$50,000 will be spent for a modest public relations project that would include sales conferences, trade-press releases, direct mail, and speaking dates for Commerce officials, according to Mr. Demer.

The move comes just as the moment when the department is reducing its public-relations activities by \$800,000. But, Mr. Demer stressed, there is no connection between his advertising campaign and the reduction, since the export project was in the planning stage well before the cutbacks were ordered.

This is not the only advertising campaign in which the Department of Commerce is engaged. For years, the U.S. Travel Service, an independent office in the department, has advertised abroad, urging Europeans and others to "Visit the USA." In the last fiscal year, it operated on an advertising budget of \$1,076,000, with most of that spent on media advertising in Europe, Japan, Canada and Mexico. This fiscal year, ending June 30, its advertising budget is smaller: \$821,000, with media buys concentrated in Great Britain, West Germany, Canada and Mexico. In both years, the Mexican advertising was focused principally on TV. The agency is Ogilvy & Mather, New York.

PROPOSED REVISION OF RULE FOR RECOMPUTATION OF RETIRED AND RETAINER PAY

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, "To amend section 1402(a) of title 10, United States Code, to revise the rule for recomputation of retired and retainer pay to reflect later active duty."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 92d Congress. The Bureau of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the

presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

This bill provides that notwithstanding the limitations of section 5(1) of the Uniform Service Pay Act of 1963—incorporated as footnote 1 under 10 U.S.C. 1402(a), relating to the recomputation of retired or retainer pay to reflect later active duty—members of the Armed Forces recalled to active duty after October 1, 1963, who "serve or have earned at least two years of active duty thereafter," shall be entitled to recomputed retired or retainer pay upon release from active duty based on their grade and the law governing the computation of retired or retainer pay at time of release.

The footnote in question, relating to the recomputation of retired or retainer pay to reflect active duty performed after retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, provides:

For a member who has been entitled, for a continuous period of at least two years, to basic pay under the rates of basic pay in effect upon that release from active duty, compute under those rates. For a member who has been entitled to basic pay for a continuous period of at least two years upon that release from active duty, but who is not covered by the preceding sentence, compute under the rates of basic pay replaced by those in effect upon that release from active duty. For any other member, compute under the rates of basic pay under which the member's retired pay or retainer pay was computed when he entered on that active duty.

The present provisions of 10 U.S.C. 1402(a) are unduly restrictive. The restriction can be traced back to the so-called Uniformed Services Basic Pay Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 122). Prior to the passage of that act, retired personnel were permitted to recompute their retired pay on the basis of any pay increase granted to members of the active uniformed services. The 1958 Pay Act made a significant departure from this practice by providing a percentage increase of their existing retired pay. This was further changed in 1963 by providing that retired pay would be readjusted periodically based upon the consumer price index—CPI.

When it became impossible to recompute one's retirement pay on the basis of a pay increase for active members, it was feared that in order to recompute on the basis of the new pay scale, retired members would manage to have themselves recalled to active duty for 1 day rather than accept a percentage increase of the present retired pay. Therefore, Congress inserted in the 1958 Pay Act a provision requiring a minimum of 1 year's active duty in order to recompute their retired pay. This provision appeared in 10 U.S.C. 6483 and 10 U.S.C. 1402(a).

When the original Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963 was introduced in the House as H.R. 3006, and in the Senate as S. 847, there was no provision in either bill dealing with recomputation of retired or retainer pay to reflect later active duty.

The House Armed Services Committee added an amendment to 10 U.S.C. 1402(a) in its first draft of H.R. 5555, which later was passed by the House requiring that a member serve for at least 1 year to be eligible to recompute his retired or retainer pay to reflect later active duty. This was based upon the provision of the 1958 Pay Act and was for the same purpose. The legislative history discloses that very little discussion was had by the House committee as to the purpose of the amendment, except that it was meant to prevent a recomputation by a member who had made only a token tour upon recall to active duty.

The Senate amended the provision to provide the present requirement that a member serve for a continuous period of 2 years in a basic pay rate to be eligible to compute under those rates.

An inequity exists in that a person may serve 3, 4, 5, or more years after being recalled to active duty, but under present restrictions he cannot compute his retirement pay on the basis of his last pay rate, whereas a man serving beside him in the same rate and performing the same duties can receive the benefit of the current pay scale. This situation has existed since 1963 because there has been an increase in basic pay every year thereafter.

The restriction in the present law is highly artificial and unduly restrictive. It affects many Fleet Reservists recalled to active duty to serve during the Vietnam buildup in the critical rates for hospital corpsmen and Seabees. Additionally, under special programs designated to help meet increased requirements, the Department of the Army has implemented several programs to recall from retired status for a period of 2 years or more officers and enlisted personnel. These individuals are or will be restricted in recomputing retired pay under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 1402(a).

I am informed that the Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, is recommending enactment of this general legislation which would provide that any retired member, Fleet Reservist, or Fleet Marine Corps Reservist, who has served on active duty after retirement or transfer, for 2 years or more, be entitled to recompute his retired or retainer pay on the basis of rates of basic pay in effect when he is released from active duty. Enactment of this legislation would not result in any appreciable increased budgetary requirements to the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of this legislation appears below:

H.R. 5373

To amend section 1402(a) of title 10, United States Code, to revise the rule for recomputation of retired or retainer pay to reflect later active duty.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1402(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by amending footnote 1 of the table therein to read as follows:

"For a member who has been entitled to basic pay for a continuous period of at least two years upon that release from active duty, compute under the rates of basic pay in effect upon that release from active duty. For any other member, compute under the

rates of basic pay under which the member's retired pay or retainer pay was computed when he entered on that active duty, increased by any applicable adjustments in that pay under section 1401a of this title after he initially became entitled to that pay."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act is effective on October 1, 1963.

CONGRESSMAN STRATTON OFFERS A REALISTIC AND WORKABLE ALTERNATIVE TO REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, I introduced legislation H.R. 5069, to offer a realistic and workable alternative to the general revenue-sharing proposals recently put forward by President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller.

Under my bill, individual States, cities, counties, and towns would be authorized to levy taxes on their own residents in the form of an additional percentage of the Federal income tax. This tax would then be collected by the Federal Government, along with the regular Federal tax returns, on a kind of piggyback basis, free of charge to the States and local communities, with the proceeds then remitted to them for their individual use.

One of the chief arguments being used in support of the revenue-sharing plan is that States and local governmental units have far too limited taxing powers, and that property taxes and sales taxes, especially, are far less fair and efficient than the Federal graduated income tax.

By making the Federal tax system available to the States and local communities on a kind of piggyback basis, we eliminate this argument completely and give the local governments every tax advantage enjoyed by the Federal Government.

The only difference is that in the case of my bill, it becomes obvious that these additional funds are not free in any sense, but come from the taxpayers. The same is also true of funds under revenue sharing, but the impression has been widely generated that somehow all this shared money will be free. This has been a most unfortunate and misleading impression and ought not to be allowed to stand.

Besides giving the States and communities the advantage of the efficient Federal collection system, this procedure would also have the following advantages.

First, it will mean that those who do the spending also do the raising. I still believe that any governmental unit is bound to be more careful with tax money when they have to take the responsibility for levying that tax.

Second, the person who pays the tax will see the immediate benefits of his money, instead of having some of it siphoned off to States thousands of miles away. According to my figures, for example, under revenue sharing as proposed by President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller, New York State taxpayers

would pay 12.07 percent of the added revenue collected by the Federal Government while receiving only 10.68 percent of the funds in return. Under my plan, the State that levies the tax would get every cent of it back again.

Enactment of this alternative will be especially beneficial to the taxpayers of New York State and I am optimistic about the prospects of action on this bill as Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee has already indicated he believes this is one alternative to the President's suggestion that should be seriously considered.

FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF WELFARE COSTS

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join with 14 of my New York colleagues in introducing a bill to provide for the full Federal assumption of welfare costs.

We view welfare as a national problem and it should therefore be a Federal responsibility. The State and local tax bases, particularly local property and personal income taxes, are inadequate to serve as a source of funds to pay for this program now. They certainly cannot fund the 100-percent increase predicted by 1975 unless the program is reformed.

In New York the State and local share is now in excess of \$1.7 billion. Its cost has increased 40 percent in our State in 3 years and there is no peak in sight.

Cities and suburbs alike are joining in such actions as seeking legal relief by rejecting their share of welfare costs in actions in the Federal court.

They are forced to take such actions because the burgeoning cost of welfare is depriving State and local governments of their ability to cope with demands for maintenance and improvement of services in the fields of education, law enforcement, sanitation, public health, and so forth.

Our State and other States in similar circumstances must demand that we obtain a fair share of Federal support for dependent persons and families.

We will seek to join with other delegations in this effort and to enlist the support of other Members of the House without regard to party.

In introducing this legislation we seek to prepare the way for an improved and reformed welfare system such as is now being recommended by the administration before the Committee on Ways and Means.

We view such suggestions as Federal standards for all areas, work incentives, and work requirement programs for the able-bodied and trainable persons in public service employment, Federal assistance and day care centers including construction and more efficient administration of welfare as signs of a new and nonpartisan nationwide effort to substitute dignity for dependency in the field of family security.

This can only be a truly effective national effort if it is not made to depend

upon the State and local tax base as it does in New York and elsewhere.

With a fair share of Federal assumption of welfare by a takeover in New York we would hope our State and local officials would begin to plan for apportionment of released revenues on new priorities, which are being sacrificed or starved for funds because of mandated or unavoidable welfare costs.

Finally we should like to make it clear that our effort to achieve a fair stipend through the Federal assumption of welfare is in no way intended to compromise the effort which has been made in our State or in any State to provide a decent standard of living to those families who are forced to seek public assistance. Our bill makes specific provisions for the filing of a State plan in New York to take into account the family needs in New York State and in any State to make certain that the concept of compassion and concern for families and children in need will continue to be observed in any Federal takeover.

CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL HALT WAS PERMANENT

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the now discredited Cross-Florida Barge Canal have kept up a continual attack in the hopes of eventually causing President Nixon to reverse his decision halting the project to prevent irreparable damage to the State's environment.

The canal supporters are wasting their time.

The President's halt was permanent. The canal has been reviewed repeatedly; no further review is necessary. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal, quite simply, is dead, dead, dead—as it should be.

The matter now open to discussion is what to do with the area in the future. Some work, I understand, must be done to minimize further environmental damage. Included in this is construction of a highway bridge on State Road 40 near Ocala to assist in reducing the flood hazard.

This work must not be interpreted as an indication that the President might change his mind at a later date and resume the canal project.

In fact, studies are underway to prepare recommendations for the area's future development.

To this activity I would urge all those interested in the canal—pro and con, here and in Florida—to devote their energies. Let us come up with the best possible use for the canal area—best in the interest of all.

Even advocates of the canal, for example, now say that the beautiful Oklawaha River Valley should be preserved for the use and enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

The canal has been discussed for 150 years. In early years, the project was rejected on economic and environmental grounds. It was not until World War II that the present project was authorized but no work was done until recent years.

The proponents have had their say all these years. Now, finally, the public is being heard on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Unfortunately, canal advocates seem bent on throwing up smokescreens to hide the fact that a 107-mile ditch across the middle of Florida would do substantial damage to the environment.

The latest stratagem is to charge that President Nixon acted for purely political motives in halting the canal—a project long viewed by many as one of the worst boondoggles in our history.

If it is political to act in the public interest, to recognize that Americans are growing ecologically aware and determined to preserve our great natural heritage—if this is “playing politics,” then I pray this Nation’s leaders do more of it.

The slick public relations campaign launched by canal advocates is aimed at diverting the attention of the public and the Congress away from two fundamental considerations:

First. The canal will cause substantial damage to the environment of Florida, a State whose economy is largely dependent upon the blessing of nature.

Second. The taxpayer is being asked to foot a \$200 million bill for a project that will not reduce the cost of groceries anywhere in America.

Ironically, those accusing President Nixon of “playing politics” are not above playing that game themselves.

In a personal letter last week, the chairman of the canal authority attacks me for presuming, as a freshman Congressman, to state my support of the President’s action.

He charges that I am uninformed about the canal and that I have suddenly come out against it to gain personal publicity.

The record clearly indicates that I am not new to the conservation cause: As a Florida State senator for the past 10 years, I constantly spoke out against the canal for environment reasons and voted against the appropriation of State funds to carry on the project.

The canal proponents have barraged the public with self-serving statements in recent weeks. I believe it is time that the other side be heard. And this freshman Congressman intends to see that it is.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I again want to offer information to the House on the effectiveness of a military-civilian project at Fort Sam Houston, in San Antonio, where Army medical helicopter crews are providing mercy service to critically injured or ill citizens of 10 counties. This is the MAST service—military assistance to safety and traffic—manned by the 507th Medical Company, Air Ambulance. I believe that this has been a most valuable service to my constituents, and I believe it should be continued.

I am far from alone in this opinion.

Let me cite responses from public officials and citizens:

Charles J. Hitzfelder, Hondo, sheriff of Medina County:

I have had occasion to call for the MAST service several times, and I have been very happy with the result. Please add my endorsement for continuation of a program that permits these able Army air medics to be essential in the life-line of service in times of emergency.

Mayor Franklin D. Keller, of Lacoste:

Please do all you can to have the life-saving service of MAST continued and expanded throughout our area. I feel this is a very worthwhile service and by all means should be continued.

Sister Laverne Mettlach, administrator, Memorial Hospital, Floresville:

We have found this program to be invaluable. In a number of cases, we feel certain that because of speedy treatment obtained, lives were saved and more rapid recovery resulted. We feel the program is a great asset to this area, especially since there is no additional funding necessary for its existence.

As I have explained previously, the funds are provided for the military training and service of the Air Ambulance Company, and the military personnel benefit from these lifesaving training missions.

I continue quoting the people who know best the value of the MAST service.

Joe H. Fietsam, publisher, Floresville Chronicle-Journal:

I can cite one case where the helicopter was set down on the highway adjoining a restaurant to pick up a heart patient, and other times they have landed at the scene of automobile crashes. The helicopter has been timed on one or two occasions, and in our issue of August 13, the one with the photos, a call was sent from Memorial Hospital in Floresville, to Fort Sam Houston, 29 miles away, and from the time of the call, landing in Floresville, and being airborne from the hospital in Floresville, only 35 minutes had elapsed. Their ability to get patients to the city for emergency treatment has saved lives. The entire county has been in favor of keeping this service.

Mayor E. W. Calk, Lytle:

We do want this service. It is badly needed because of traffic problems en route to the hospital during working hours. We are looking for your assistance in helping us keep this much-needed service.

Faye E. Walker, city secretary, Hondo:

As a citizen of Medina County, I urgently request your interested action in retaining the emergency helicopter ambulance service as a permanent service.

Drs. Robert R. Reese and O. E. Hall, Jr., Bohman Clinic, Cuero, Tex.:

Our experience with this service shows it invaluable in providing our patients with the best medical care available. It places within our reach prompt consultation and treatment which we are unable to offer our patients here in Cuero.

Mayor Samuel H. Tschirhart, Castroville:

It is with sincere appreciation that we acknowledge the service rendered our community by MAST. Daily we learn of the many lives that have been saved by its immediate availability—when minutes can mean the difference between life and death. City Council and other citizens join me in saying “Thank you” from a grateful community.

Let me close with a comment from one of the chopper pilots. Like others of the company, he is a Vietnam veteran. Comparing his war experience with the responsibility of moving injured and wounded citizens, Capt. Samuel B. McLamb said:

MAST is much the same, but without the shooting.

I hope and trust this important program will not be shot down on our home-front.

THE POST'S SUPPORT OF THE CAPITOL BOMBING

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, when I first learned of the bombing of the Nation’s Capitol yesterday, one of my first thoughts was to wonder how the Washington Post would possibly be able to editorialize in favor of it. There was no doubt in my mind but that they would find a way to support the bombing; my only question was how they would justify it.

This morning’s editorial manages to do it in the tortured logic we are accustomed to.

There are a few sentences at the beginning which deplore the bombing, but, beginning with the second paragraph, it is downhill all the way in favor of the bomber. Several Senators are characterized as hysterical in their outrage. The one Senator who has, as much as any other been associated with the new, violent left wing is, on the other hand, made to look like the only sane voice in the other body.

The person or persons responsible for this crime against every American is due more than the patronizing tut-tut of the Washington Post. The just reward is life imprisonment. The only extenuation which should be considered is that the demented bomber may well have been encouraged to do what he did by the Washington Post.

I can only wonder what the Post reaction would be to a bomb planted under their pressroom.

The reprehensible editorial follows:

THE BOMBING OF THE CAPITOL

The planting of a bomb under the United States Senate is a bad piece of business, which could have had far more tragic consequences had the bomb been planted in another place, and been set to explode at another time, with no telephone warning in advance. So we condemn it and urge that something be done rather quickly to tighten up security at the Capitol. Not the least unsettling aspect of this affair is the fact that earlier telephone threats apparently did not suggest to the police a need for tightening up. It is not pleasant to contemplate the need for a heavy guard around so hallowed a monument to freedom as the U.S. Capitol and there is no doubt that this tells us something about the condition of our society—about the violent streak that is certainly there, and about the easy contagion of extremism in a time of dark frustrations and deep disillusionment.

But in the absence of any more information than was available yesterday to the leaders of government who were so quick to

pass judgment on this affair, we would add that it is not only the bombing itself but also the reaction to it which was disturbing, at least to us. It was almost as if we had not had bombings of corporate offices on Wall Street or black churches in the South or the defiling of government buildings or the public burnings of the American flag; it was as if we were suddenly confronted with a whole new level of outrage—how many times was that word used?—because *this bomb was planted under the Senate floor*. The automatic assumption of many of those who commented was that the perpetrator was insane—and the next assumption, following immediately upon the first, was that it was a dark and devious political plot.

"We cannot tolerate such senseless acts," said Sen. Robert Taft, without so much as a suggestion as to how, as a practical matter, we should go about not tolerating them. "I don't know what group it is," said Senator Dominick, leaping instantly to the conclusion that it was a "group," and never mind the fact that we have had the assassinations of President Kennedy, and Martin Luther King and Sen. Robert Kennedy, without any conclusive evidence that these acts were the work, in each case, of more than one vicious and unbalanced mind. Yet Senator McClellan was talking of "an element in this society that works to foment revolution—they are anarchists and they will resort to any tactics they think will disrupt the operation of government, weaken its effectiveness or bring about its overthrow or destruction." That is strong talk, when you cannot have the slightest idea what, in this instance, you are talking about.

Sen. Hugh Scott likewise pronounced it as "apparently a political bombing," and then went on to deplore the way its effect is "likely to be exaggerated" at home and abroad. "They won't realize that it's one bomb in one washroom." Well perhaps they won't—and maybe they shouldn't, if it was in fact a "political bombing," in the sense of a concerted act by an important revolutionary force. Or if, as the Vice President put it, it was "a calculated act of outrage which will be neither tolerated nor condoned by Americans who value our system and its institutions."

Although we cannot accept the implications in Senator McGovern's altogether divergent and in many ways overdone reaction—"it is not possible to teach an entire generation to bomb and destroy others in an undeclared, unjustified, unending war abroad without paying a terrible price in the derangement of our own society"—there is at least something to be said for the theory that excesses breed excesses. And there is something to be said, also for the theory that there is a "derangement"—a sickness of some sort—at work in our society. At its worst, it can lead to fearful violence; in any case, a bomb in a Senate washroom is nothing to be in any way complacent about. But neither is it something that seems likely to yield to the treatment of over-heated rhetoric from men in positions which presumably call for cool leadership in a critical time.

POSTMASTER GENERAL BLOUNT ADMITS IGNORANCE ON PASSPORT ERRORS

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been increasingly alarmed over the headlong and heedless manner in which the State Department has been pressing its plans to have passports issued by Post Office employees.

I have endeavored to keep in close touch with developments in this area because I had hopes that both the Post Office and the State Department would see the errors of this plan and put a halt to it.

It now appears, however, that the Post Office ignored the repeated warnings given to it by the Director of the Passport Office that postal employees were making far more than the previous number of errors in processing passport applications.

Moreover, postal officials—including Postmaster General Blount—apparently were misled by high State Department officials into thinking that their employees were doing a fantastically good job of processing passport applications.

They were not. For example, during one 30-day period in the 6-month test, the Houston, Tex. post office had a 33.4 percent error rate.

This occurred, of course, in what is the slack season for passport applications. You can imagine what may happen when already harried postal employees are deluged with the tidal wave of applicants planning to go abroad this summer.

Mr. Speaker, there is no earthly reason to put yet another burden—the processing of passport applications—on the shoulders of those Government employees who already have to struggle with the workload of what is probably the most inefficient department in this Government.

We already have a Passport Office that has a proven record for efficiency.

I suspect, if the truth were known, the plan to put the Post Office in the travel business is nothing more than some State Department bureaucrat's latest effort to get rid of the Director of the Passport Office, Miss Frances Knight.

A story in the February 26, 1971 edition of the Des Moines Register quotes a Post Office official as saying the Department wants to take another look at the State Department plan for processing passport applications.

I hope the second look will be considerably more thorough than the first one.

Mr. Speaker, I include the newspaper article for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

POSTAL BOSS "NOT AWARE" OF ERRORS ON PASSPORTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Postmaster General Winton Blount said Thursday he had no idea the error rate was running about 15 to 18 per cent on applications for passports handled by postal employees in the last six months.

A Post Office Department spokesman said Thursday that the department had received 30 letters from Miss Frances Knight, director of the passport office, calling attention to a great increase in errors since processing of applications has been taken over by postal employees in 11 cities.

William Dunlap, deputy special assistant to Blount, said that "we have been receiving letters from Miss Knight's office, but we had never bothered to add them up."

"GREAT JOB"

"We tried to follow through on the specific problems as they arose, but we had no notice that statistics showed this margin of error," Dunlap said. "The only thing we had been

hearing from (Miss) Barbara Watson (director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs) was that we were doing a great job.

"The secretary of state (William F. Rogers) had also told Blount that he thought we were doing a good job," Dunlap said. "We are going to try to find out what is going on here."

The test program involves 19 post offices in 11 cities in Connecticut, Texas and Michigan.

Only a week ago Miss Watson told a meeting of the International Aviation Club that "the results of the pilot project have been encouraging."

"It now seems likely that use of post offices to accept passport applications will be expanded nationwide to some 500 cities by the end of 1971, and ultimately to 4,000 first-class post offices," Miss Watson said.

Dunlap said the Post Office Department was unaware of the State Department plan for such fast expansion, and would want to take another look at the error rate.

KEPT ADVISED

Miss Knight has kept Miss Watson's office advised of the fact that the error rate on passport applications was less than 5 per cent prior to being turned over to the Post Office Department.

It has been Miss Knight's contention that the initial acceptance of passport applications is one that requires considerably more skill than postal employees have.

She has warned her State Department superiors that the error rate has been so high that it makes the whole passport system vulnerable to organized crime and subversives.

In July, 1970, the number of passport applications with one or more errors was 20.3 per cent. In October, errors dropped to 13.9 per cent. They were up to 20.3 per cent in December and 18.9 per cent in January.

The general post office in Houston had a 34.4 per cent error rate—one in three applications—for January. Only in one small post office was the error rate less than 5 per cent. Willimantic, Conn., had a rate of only 2.6 per cent.

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

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to join my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) in introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in support of a model cities program to train unemployed scientists, engineers, and returning servicemen for jobs in local government. A similar resolution has been submitted to the other body by Senator CHILES and Senator BROOKE. We are presently soliciting cosponsors for this resolution, which we will reintroduce as soon as the list is completed.

I am sure all would agree that two of the most pressing issues in the country today are unemployment and urban decay. Tens of thousands of highly-trained scientists and engineers are unemployed and veterans returning from Vietnam are unable to find jobs, while our cities are searching desperately for the trained manpower to help them cope with mounting problems.

In response to these needs, the Assistant Secretary for model cities of the Department of Housing and Welfare has

developed an imaginative program which would recruit, train, and place in municipal jobs up to 1,500 persons from the defense and aerospace industries and up to 500 returning servicemen. This demonstration project can be supported by funds already available in the model cities program and would not require additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, this program is well conceived, soundly developed and well designed to meet some of our country's vital needs. While modest in its initial scope, it represents an important step toward redirecting our national energies to areas of rising priority. I hope that my colleagues will agree in urging that it receive the full support and cooperation of the administration.

The resolution reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Congress authorized the Model Cities Program by Title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966; and

Whereas participating state and local governments have taken, through the Model Cities Program, significant steps to improve their capacity to effectively plan and manage the distribution of scarce public resources; and

Whereas one of the roadblocks impeding full achievement of Model Cities objectives as well as the objectives of other Federal programs in the difficulty of state and local governments in attracting qualified personnel; and

Whereas the large number of unemployed defense and aerospace related scientists and technicians and the growing number of "Vietnam era" GIs now being separated from the various services provides the Administration with significant opportunities to assist state and local governments in meeting existing and anticipated personnel needs; and

Whereas a number of Model Cities have initiated with success specific programs to retrain and hire returning GIs and whereas Model Cities initiated in the spring of 1970 an innovative pilot program which led to the recruitment and retraining of "non-urban trained" professionals for placement in positions with city governments throughout the country; and

Whereas it is proposed that the Model Cities Program be the vehicle to recruit, place and train on the job up to 1500 participants from the aerospace industry and 500 returning GIs in positions in state and local governments; and

Whereas the Model Cities sponsored program will provide the Federal government with a prototype model or system susceptible of replication: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Model Cities Program should be used to develop and demonstrate a nationwide system to recruit, place and train on the job, out of work aerospace individuals and homeward bound servicemen, and place them in vacant positions in state and local governments, and that the Administration should pledge its cooperation at all levels in helping to carry out the program.

THE SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, the shadow of crime fell across all Americans long ago. It has been lifted, in part,

during the past 2 years, and our efforts must not flag now. It is my conviction that the goal of nationwide crime reduction can be reached quickest through the special revenue sharing program for law enforcement submitted to Congress today by President Nixon.

While crime has grown into a national problem and a nationwide concern, the fact remains that the responsibility for the control of crime rests solidly with State and local governments. It has always been so in our country, and it must remain so.

Even if it wanted to do so, the Federal Government cannot patrol all of our streets or conduct every trial or operate every prison. Logic and tradition have placed those functions where they belong, at the State and local levels where they are close to the people and responsive to the needs of the people.

To assist States and localities in crime control, Congress created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in 1968. Its role is to help fashion criminal justice improvements through financial and technical assistance.

I feel the LEAA program, under the leadership of the Nixon administration, has brought substantial benefits to the country. A statewide crime control program is now a reality in every State. While the program has worked well, it can foster even greater results—through the special revenue sharing program proposed today by the President.

At present, most of LEAA's funds go to the States in block action grants—the formula presently calls for 85 percent of the action funds to be awarded in block grants, with the remaining 15 percent given at LEAA's discretion. This is a program developed by the Congress itself.

That apportionment strikes me as a fair one, and it would be retained under special revenue sharing. However, what does not strike me as particularly appropriate is the present requirement that States and localities must provide matching funds. For most LEAA-sponsored projects, the formula now calls for the Federal Government to contribute 75 percent of the funds for a project's cost, with the State-local share at 25 percent.

Anyone who has studied our cities, counties, and States knows beyond a shadow of a doubt that they are hard pressed to find revenues for improvement of vital public services. Under the President's special revenue sharing program, the matching requirement would be eliminated for State and local governments for action funds. In addition and more importantly from my point of view, in the case of block grant funds, State and local governments would have total responsibility on how the money was used.

We are, and we should discard old methods in favor of new approaches that will produce needed results, that will give all of our citizens the protection against crime that is theirs by right.

Some critics of revenue sharing contend it merely will give funds to governmental units which have not measured up in the past. I reject that argument, for revenue sharing will bring Government closer to the people; and by be-

coming closer, it will meet their needs in ways that reality dictates.

President Nixon's special revenue sharing program will help to rekindle both the efforts and imaginations of State and local officials throughout the Nation. I urge early and affirmative action by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support for expanding the activities of National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. This research arm of the LEAA offers excellent opportunities for improving the techniques of reducing crime. The National Institute can provide the leadership and example from which all levels of government can benefit.

THE NATION'S CAPITOL—THE NEW BATTLEGROUND

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the war has now been brought home, and quite dramatically, with a civil rights worker losing his nonviolent cool and touching off a high explosive in the Capitol Building. Few should be surprised at this domestic acceleration in violence since our police and security officers have reported to us for several years that the civil rights movement, aided in some instances by OEO funds, was conducting classes in explosives, bombs, and other fright mechanisms to intimidate and vilify the American people.

It is most difficult to see how a ghastly explosion in the bowels of our Nation's Capitol could possibly be considered dissent, a protest for equality, or constructive rebuttal, but then few of the new left teachers start with logical premises or conclude with reasonable conclusions. Suffice it to say that such revolutionary teachings emphasize destroying the past to rebuild for the new future.

I even dare suggest that if the Capitol bomber is ever apprehended, the apologists will further defame the United States by treating him or them as some kind of hero of the new left. In fact, it may even remove Angela Davis from the front page.

The most amazing lack of developments is that none of the liberals has as yet demanded the resignation of J. Edgar Hoover as has been the usual diversionary tactic. But, Bernadette Devlin, a self-avowed Communist and convicted advocate of violence in her own country and against her own people, remains on tour in the United States by courtesy of a license given by the U.S. State Department.

This present act of aggressive warfare against our Nation has resulted in the greatest amount of damage to the Capitol since the burning in 1814 by an alien military force. It was Reds in 1814 also—Redcoats, that is.

Symbolically this bombing was directed against the American people and their form of government. National public indignation can be expected to be swift, certain, and outspoken.

I insert a related news clipping in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 1, 1971]

CAPITOL DAMAGED BY BOMB; SENATE KEEPS SCHEDULE, BUT BANS VISITORS

A bomb early this morning exploded in a room in the ground floor of the U.S. Capitol's Senate wing, causing severe damage.

A half-hour before the explosion, the Capitol switchboard received an anonymous warning, which tied the opposition to the Indochina war.

Bomb experts were trying to identify today the explosive device which detonated in a washroom about 100 feet from the Great Rotunda at 1:32 a.m., damaging at least 10 nearby rooms.

ARCHES CRACKED

Mario E. Campioli, the assistant architect of the Capitol, said that a number of load-bearing hallway arches were cracked when they were lifted by the blast. However, he said that as far as could be determined, there were no new cracks today in the West Front, already braced because of structural weakness.

The Senate chamber itself was not damaged and the Senate reconvened as scheduled at 10 a.m. Visitors were admitted to the House side and the Rotunda, but only authorized persons were allowed into the Senate side.

Capitol police were inspecting packages of all visitors and requiring some to present identification.

The bomb's force was such that it blew out skylights several floors above. No one was injured.

ANONYMOUS CALL

About 1 a.m. a telephone operator at the Capitol received a call from an anonymous man who, according to Metropolitan police, said:

"Evacuate the building. You may have received other calls like this, but this one is real. Evacuate the building immediately. This is real. This is in retaliation for the Laos decision. The bomb will go off in 30 minutes, 0130."

The message was received by Capitol operator Norma J. Fullerton at 1:00 a.m. exactly, according to the police communications and records division.

A force of 30 Capitol policemen promptly started a search of the building and were the only persons in it when the bomb went off.

"It was a hell of an explosion," said one guard. "You'd have to be deaf if you didn't hear it inside the building," said another, "but you couldn't hear it outside."

A similar bomb threat was received about 1 a.m. Saturday, a Representative said, but police found no bomb.

OPEN UNTIL 5 P.M.

The building was open to the public until 5 p.m. yesterday, he said, and the washroom, situated down a narrow, side corridor and unmarked, was left unlocked.

Capitol Police Capt. James Trollinger said that although the washroom has been used mostly by senators and their staff members, others could have entered it. "The door's never been locked to my knowledge," he said.

The Capitol is open seven days a week and ordinarily visitors must produce identification and pass only after the normal 5 p.m. closing time.

A policeman assigned to the Senate side recently told a reporter that it is almost impossible to protect the building from bombers without closing it to the public.

"Anyone can walk in here," he said, "walk into a men's room, hide a bomb in a waste can or behind a stall and walk right out again."

"Even if we knew there was a bomb in the building, there are so many places to hide it, it would be all but impossible to find it."

Trollinger said there are about 585 members of the Capitol police force and that it has 40 vacancies.

Capitol Police Chief James Powell said security was immediately increased today. Police for the first time, were checking all packages today and requiring employees to sign in and denote their destination.

Albert was one of a number of persons who had to sign in with police at an entrance to the Capitol on the House side as he arrived today.

This precaution was taken at tunnel entrances, but reporters noted that the public was entering the Capitol freely through the main doors to the House side and the rotunda.

Only authorized persons were admitted to the Senate side, however, and all were required to present identification.

Public officials, including President Nixon, expressed shock and outrage at the bombing. Many senators called for increased security precautions at the Capitol, but stressed that the public should continue to have free access to the building where they can see democratic processes at work.

The President said security measures at the Capitol should be improved, perhaps along the pattern of the Executive Protection Service, which protects foreign diplomatic buildings, Ziegler said.

He said Nixon plans to offer the training facilities of the Executive Protection Service and the Justice Department to police.

The heavy plate glass atop the East Front entrance to the Senate wing, though supported by wrought iron grillwork shattered—the only sign from the outside that something was amiss within the building.

At the site of the blast itself, nothing remained of the interior of the 12-by-12 foot men's lavatory. Sinks, urinals and toilets were pulverized, the concrete floor broken into large rocks and two of the masonry walls bulged.

No door within 50 feet of the washroom was intact, and bits of wood were embedded in the corridor walls. The barbershop adjacent was pelted with flying doors, window-frames, tiles and bricks. It was pockmarked with debris.

RUBBLE SIFTED

The inside windows to the Senate dining room 100 feet from the blast were shattered, but workers still busily set tables for breakfast. Moving away from the site, the signs of the blast diminished quickly, possibly because most of the force of the explosion must have been absorbed by the massive masonry of the room itself.

A half-dozen FBI experts worked on their hands and knees sifting through the rubble, much of which was as fine as coffee grounds, searching for some piece of metal or other clue to the bomb itself.

Strangely the lights worked, the wiring even a few feet from the room itself seemed intact; heating pipes and other conduits below the floor also were undamaged.

By the time the press was admitted to the bomb scene, workers and police had five hours of cleaning behind them. Curtains were drawn over broken glass wherever possible, broken doors were removed, mountains of plaster and brick were piled neatly along the short corridor leading to the washroom.

But there was no disguising the wall that had been pushed a foot and a half out of line or the raw wood splintered at every doorway.

Ceiling cracks were visible within a radius of 30 feet from the room where the bomb exploded, but only an engineer or architect could accurately assess the impact on the old mortar, the sandstone walls or the underpinning of the blast area.

Thomas Clancy, supervising engineer for the architect of the Capitol, said workmen

were still investigating the degree of the damages.

The second floor—where the Senate chamber is located—escaped with almost no damage. A few prisms from chandeliers in the corridor fell to the floor and shattered and one statue was partially jarred from its base, but there was no other visible damage.

Architects apparently plan to duplicate the damaged items as much as possible. One workman was labeling wooden window frames by window and section and said they would be discarded once they were duplicated.

Almost as soon as the bomb exploded, experts from the District police, the FBI and Army demolition squads swarmed through the building and over its grounds, looking for evidence.

The blast occurred in a room off a small rotunda open to the public, which is next to the chamber beneath the Great Rotunda. The barbershop site is next to a Senate Appropriations Committee hearing room.

The bombing was the Capitol's first since July 1915 when a device left in the Senate Reception Room exploded during the night.

A man named Frank Holt, who the next day wounded financier J. P. Morgan at Glen Cove, N.Y., confessed to having planted the bomb as a protest over arms sales to allies during World War I.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 1, 1971]

TOURISTS VISITING CAPITOL HAVE FACED FEW REGULATIONS

Until today's bombing, the 1 million or so tourists who visit the U.S. Capitol annually have been free to go anywhere in the building between 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. except private offices and the floors of the two chambers.

Capt. James Trollinger of the Capitol Police said he had no word on whether this policy would be changed, but seven hours after the explosion only employees and press were allowed to enter the building on the Senate side.

Trollinger said at midmorning that, except for today's restriction of visitors on the Senate side, no new security regulations for the Capitol had been issued.

He added, however, that Capitol police and Senate officials would be conferring through the day on the need for any long-range changes in building security policy.

A "building check" normally is carried out at 4:30 p.m. when the structure closes for the day, Trollinger added. Although he did not specify procedures, he said the men look for "anything that doesn't belong where it is."

The only regulations on visitors, he said, apply in the Senate and House galleries, considered part of the chambers. Visitors are not allowed to carry cameras or packages of any type into them, he said, except women are allowed to retain their purses.

THE ISSUE—HIGH INTEREST VERSUS LOW INTEREST RATES—THE 92D CONGRESS SHOULD AVOID THE HIGH-INTEREST TAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the patient—the American public—has recovered from the high fever of the highest interest rates in the history of this land, the Nixon administration is proposing that he be pushed out into the cold once again.

That is the sum and substance of the

proposal to allow \$10 billion of long-term Government securities to be marketed without regard to the congressionally imposed ceiling of 4¼ percent. This would be a removal—I repeat, a removal—of the 4¼-percent ceiling which has been in effect for 53 years.

Removal of this ceiling—under the guise of this \$10 billion back door scheme—would reverse the trend toward lower interest rates and saddle the American public with another round of tight money and high interest rates. The trend toward lower rates is just beginning to trickle down to the consumers, the farmers, and the small businessmen. Now, the administration—through its Secretary of the Treasury, John Connally—proposes that the Congress go along with an ill-timed, poorly thought-out scheme to wipe out the 4¼-percent ceiling.

The administration's gall stems from the belief that the people have a short memory. The administration believes that the American people—now that interest rates have begun to decline—will forget about the hardships of 1969 and 1970 when interest rates rose and hung at the very highest levels ever recorded in the history of this Nation. The administration believes it can sneak this legislation through the Congress while the people are deceived into thinking that we are headed toward a low-interest policy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not as easily deluded as the Nixon administration thinks. The people will remember the disastrous effects of the high interest charges of 1969, and millions are still suffering from the consequences of these high-interest policies. The American people know that the 4¼-percent ceiling is a congressional mandate for low interest and they will not be fooled with high-sounding phrases about debt management, the bond markets, and the sad tales of the overworked Treasury officials.

Even if Secretary Connally has forgotten his democratic upbringing, let me assure this House that the people of the United States have not forgotten what the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government obligations means.

Not only is the Nixon administration attempting to fool the American people, but it also believes that it can pull the wool over the eyes of the 435 Members of this House. Secretary Connally—carrying out the will of the White House—is perfectly willing to have the 92d Congress serve as the fall guy for any future interest rate increases—any increases which occur over the next 2 years. If the Congress allows the 4¼-percent ceiling to be broken, it will be blamed—and rightfully so—when interest rates go up later this year.

I hope there are no Members—be they Republicans or Democrats—who will want to carry a high-interest tag into the 1972 elections.

Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing about this proposal is that the Congress is forced to repeatedly relive history and to reeducate the executive branch. Once before, we had a Secretary of the Treasury—who once bore proudly the label of Democrat—who joined a Republican ad-

ministration and who quickly trotted up to Capitol Hill with a grandiose scheme to wipe out the 4¼-percent ceiling. This man was Robert B. Anderson—who I must admit was also from Texas.

He tried to sell the Congress in 1959 and 1960 on the wonders of allowing the debt managers to market long-term Government securities without regard to interest rate ceilings.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it appears that Secretary Connally has found former Secretary Anderson's speech file at the Treasury Department. The similarities are startling. The phrases are the same. The proposal is almost identical. It just happens to be the Nixon administration instead of the Eisenhower administration.

But, my friends, it is a Democratic Congress. It was a Democratic Congress in 1959 and 1960 which turned down Secretary Anderson's ill-conceived scheme. We still have a Democratic Congress and it will be a Democratic 92d Congress which rejects—in overwhelming numbers—this latest proposal to impose high interest rates on the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this House who were not here in 1959 and 1960 will go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and review the debates that took place at that time. The Democrats won that fight and I am convinced that the action of the House of Representatives was a major factor in the great Democratic victory of 1960.

In 1960, the Democratic Party stated in its platform:

The Republican high-interest policy has extracted a costly toll from every American who has financed a home, an automobile, a refrigerator or a television set.

It has foisted added burdens on taxpayers of State and local governments which must borrow for schools and other public services.

It has added to the cost of many goods and services, and hence has been itself a factor in inflation.

It has created windfalls for many financial institutions.

The \$9 billion of added interest charges on the national debt would have been even higher but for the prudent insistence of the Democratic Congress that the ceiling on interest rates for long-term Government bonds be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my Republican friends will forgive me for recalling the good deeds of the Democratic Party in the late 1950's. Let me say that I realize that there are many good Republican Members on this floor who deplore high interest rates and I hope that they will be with us tomorrow afternoon when we vote down this back door scheme to wipe out the 4¼-percent ceiling. I hope that my Republican friends do not repeat the mistakes of some of their colleagues of the late 1950's.

In the past few days, I have talked privately with some of these Republican Members and I am convinced that they plan to resist the strong pressure from downtown on this issue. This issue—here in 1971—need not be a partisan issue unless the Republican leadership desires to make it so.

The American people will divide the

issue in clear terms—high interest rates versus low interest rates. That will be the division which will be recorded for the people to analyze and study in the coming months.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that some of the experts are predicting another jump in the prime interest rate later in the year. If this happens—and if we remove the 4¼-percent ceiling—it will be very difficult—if not impossible—for the 92d Congress to wipe off the tag of "the high-interest Congress."

The sad thing about this proposal is that the administration—and the debt managers down at the Treasury—have absolutely no need for this new authority. Secretary Connally all but admitted this fact in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. In fact, the testimony—as printed by the Ways and Means Committee—shows plainly that Secretary Connally was surprised that the committee was willing to go along with the scheme. He was so surprised that he failed to bring the facts and figures to document his request.

But for some reason, this sad little effort has reached the floor of the House. The House can do a great service to Secretary Connally and the Nixon administration by firmly rejecting this proposal and burying the issue for the rest of this Congress.

Secretary Connally was extremely vague about the interest rates which might be charged the taxpayer if the Government went into the long-term market without the congressional restrictions involved in the 4¼-percent ceiling. Caught by surprise, Secretary Connally has said that the interest rates on long-term obligations would be "somewhere in the ballpark of I would guess 6 percent, 6½ percent, in this general range."

This is startlingly imprecise language for a Secretary of the Treasury who is making a proposal which might cost the taxpayers billions and billions of dollars in added interest charges.

But accepting Secretary Connally's instant economics, it becomes quickly apparent just how bad a deal the proponents of this legislation are attempting to foist on the American public.

Last week, the Treasury Department marketed short-term obligations for around 3½ percent—or 2½ percent to 3 percent below what Secretary Connally is proposing in the long-term market. Mr. Speaker, it takes no great expert to come up with the conclusion that 6½-percent interest is more than 3½-percent interest.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a clipping from the Washington Post of Tuesday, March 2, which establishes the low interest available on short-term Government borrowings:

TREASURY BILL RATE HITS 7½-YEAR LOW

The costs to the government for short-term borrowing continued to fall this week, as Treasury bill rates dropped to their lowest point in seven and a half years.

For 91-day bills the rate was 3.347 per cent, down from 3.497 last week and at the lowest point since Sept. 9, 1963, when the rate was 3.343 per cent. A total of \$1.9 billion 91-day bills were sold.

For 182-day bills, of which \$1.4 billion were sold, the rate fell to 3.467 per cent, down from last week's 3.590 per cent, and also the lowest since Sept. 9, 1963, when it was 3.460 per cent.

Based on the proposed borrowing of \$10 billion, this interest rate differential—between long term and short term—would cost the taxpayers about \$300 million in added interest charges annually. The additional costs, of course, would eventually be much larger than this since once the ceiling was broken we would have a flood of long-term securities issued at high interest rates.

Actually, Secretary Connally's estimate of 6 percent to 6½ percent may well end up being highly conservative. Since Secretary Connally made his public announcement about removing the 4¼-percent ceiling—the long-term bond market has worsened drastically.

Last Sunday's New York Times states:

By the early part of last week, interest rates on high-grade corporate bonds had jumped nearly a full point from the low levels reached in early February.

Similar analysis—indicating the worsening condition of long-term markets—have appeared in the pages of the Wall Street Journal and the financial pages of other major publications across the land. The situation undoubtedly will get worse in coming weeks since corporations are expected to enter the long-term market to make borrowings in excess of \$3½ billion during the month of March. This will be a recordbreaking bond offering by corporations.

Yet we have an administration which is asking the Congress to push the Treasury Department out into this crowded and uncertain long-term market.

It is highly regrettable that Secretary Connally appeared before the Ways and Means Committee without any economic data to indicate the impact of massive long-term borrowings by the Federal Government. I do not think that the House of Representatives should consider any piece of legislation when the proponents of the measure can give no inkling as to its effect on the public.

It is regrettable that Secretary Connally—and his battery of Treasury experts—did not discuss with the Ways and Means Committee the serious impact of long-term Government borrowings—at high interest rates—on local and State governments. Local and State governments, including school districts, are entering the bond markets in growing volume after a long drought created by high interest rates and tight money. Now, the administration proposes that the Federal Government enter this same long-term market, pushing out local governments and stopping thousands of badly needed projects.

If this proposal to eliminate the 4¼-percent ceiling goes through, there will be hundreds of schoolhouses, water and sewer plants, and urban renewal projects canceled. It is ironical that the Nixon administration—which is proposing revenue sharing with the States—would turn around and suggest some-

thing which would sop up the available funds for local and State entities.

The home buyer—who has suffered mightily in this high-interest period—is similarly hurt by the 4¼-percent proposal. The home buyer is seeking long-term money—25- and 30-year mortgages—and the Federal Government is threatening to siphon off this credit. Certainly the Congress owes the long-suffering home buyer more.

Mr. Speaker, long-term borrowings by the Federal Government tend to sop up credit and to dampen economic development. We already have well in excess of 6 percent unemployed and this current proposal, if successful, will drive more people into the unemployment ranks.

Members of the House should realize that long-term savings are in short supply and that the long-term market has a very limited liquidity. When the Federal Government enters the long-term market—particularly in periods of high interest rates—it becomes a vicious competitor with long-term investments which create jobs and which provide funding for schools, jobs, urban renewal, water and sewer plants and similar projects.

In contrast, the short-term market is by definition much more liquid and better able to handle Government borrowings without creating serious and adverse conditions for public projects and job-creating businesses.

In their desperate effort to sell this scheme, the proponents have spread many misconceptions about the 4¼-percent ceiling. We have heard a lot about so-called debt management. There have been claims that the 4¼-percent ceiling makes debt management difficult.

If the proponents are saying that the 4¼-percent ceiling make it difficult for the debt managers to impose high interest rates on long-term Government borrowings, they are quite correct. The 4¼-percent ceiling is intended to make it difficult for the debt managers to lock in high interest rates which the taxpayers would have to pay over the 20-, 30-, 40-, and even the 50-year life of long-term bonds.

The Congress never intended to make it easy for the bureaucrats in the debt management office to gouge the American taxpayer. I am much less concerned about the difficulties of the debt managers than I am in the interest bills that the taxpayers will have to pay. If marketing short-term Government securities takes 10 minutes off of the golf games of the various debt managers, I think the Federal Government will still survive.

However, Mr. Speaker, the 4¼-percent ceiling does not prevent the Federal Government from entering the market to borrow the money it needs. The Treasury Department has ample authority to borrow in the short-term market. It can market bills and notes of any kind so long as the maturities do not exceed 7 years. In 1967, the Congress lengthened the definition of a note from 5 years to 7 years and the Treasury Department has yet to make full use of this new authority.

The Congress is not prohibiting the Nixon administration from marketing

long-term Government obligations. It is just preventing the administration from marketing the bonds at high interest rates. The 4¼-percent ceiling does not prevent marketing of long-term bonds and the Nixon administration will be able to market all of these types of obligations just as soon as policies are adopted which will drive down interest rates in the long-term market. Retention of the 4¼-percent ceiling is an incentive for the debt managers to pursue and promote policies which will drive down long-term rates. It is wise for the Congress to keep this incentive in the law.

The Treasury Department was able to market long-term Government bonds within the 4¼-percent ceiling until interest rates started skyrocketing in mid-1965. During the 1965-71 period, the Federal Government—as the Congress intended—had had to drop out of the long-term market. It can come back into this market just as soon as the long-term rates drop.

The proponents of this legislation—and I do not blame them—have grasped at various straws to support their case for higher interest rates. The hearing record cites a one-paragraph letter from various former Secretaries of the Treasury—none of whom appeared to answer questions. The proponents have put much stock in the view of these former Secretaries without informing the public or the Congress that these former officials are today commercial bankers, investment advisers, or investment bankers. In one case—David Kennedy—the former Secretary is still a member of the administration and it would be most surprising if he did not support the administration position on the 4¼-percent ceiling. These former Secretaries of the Treasury are all honorable men but it would be amazing if they went against the position of the banking and financial community which now pays their salaries.

In fact, the hearing record contains letters from the American Bankers Association, the Investment Bankers, and similar financial organizations urging that the Congress stick the consumers with higher interest rates through removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling. This has been the traditional viewpoint of bankers through decades of monetary policy.

Unfortunately, the many consumer, labor, and rural organizations—which represent people—were not represented in the hearing record which is being distributed in support of this legislation. All of these groups oppose—in strong terms—the removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling. These groups include:

The AFL-CIO; the United Auto Workers; the Cooperative League of the USA; the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; the Consumer Federation of America; the National Rural Housing Coalition; the National Farmers Union; the National Council of Senior Citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD copies of various telegrams and letters which have been received from some of these organizations:

AFL-CIO,

Washington, D.C., March 1, 1971.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The AFL-CIO strongly urges defeat of section 3 of H.R. 4690 which would allow long term Government obligations to be marketed without regard to interest ceiling. At a time when interest rates are falling on long term loans, it would be counter-productive to the Nation's economic interest to end the longstanding 4¼-percent rate. American working men and women are now paying the heavy cost of inflation and should not be called upon to pay further the cost of unneeded higher interest rates on Government borrowing.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,

Director, Department of Legislation.

UNITED AUTO WORKERS,

February 22, 1970.

UAW strongly opposes lifting interest rate ceiling on \$10 billion of long-term Treasury bonds. We believe such action would be unduly costly, and would have detrimental effect on home mortgages and state and municipal bond markets. We urge your Committee to reject Treasury proposal.

LEONARD WOODCOCK,

President.

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA

FEBRUARY 22, 1971.

On no subject during its 55-year history of working in behalf of rural and urban consumers has the Cooperative League of the USA been more consistent than it has in opposing high interest rates which strike at the health of the entire national economy, but especially at those on low and fixed incomes who are least able to cope with the immediate devastating effects of any relaxation of interest rate controls.

These include the young newly married couples seeking homes, the elderly trying to make it on small pensions, and the poor of any age.

At its most recent biennial Congress in New York this position was restated in a unanimous action when the Congress declared:

"The Cooperative League believes that a high-interest, tight-money policy in no way benefits the general welfare, but has the effect of stifling economic activity and growth. Cooperatives and small businesses are especially handicapped by such a policy, to the detriment of the people they serve."

Therefore, the Cooperative League of the USA can only view with dismay the proposal to remove the long-established interest ceiling in the sale of \$10 billion in long-term government bonds at a time when interest rates are declining for all types of government commitments. To reverse this policy in this way will have a wide-ranging effect throughout the economy that will cost every consumer in ways he cannot afford.

[Copy of Telegram]

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC

COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

February 23, 1971.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is strongly opposed to the proposal which would allow the Treasury Department to issue \$10 billion of long-term government securities without regard to the traditional and statutory 4¼% interest rate ceiling on such borrowings. The nearly 1,000 rural electric cooperatives serving some 24 million rural people are on record against a high interest rate policy because of its detrimental effect on farmers, small businessmen, homeowners and on economic development both in rural and urban America. The proposal to by-pass the interest rate ceiling on some Federal

borrowings would set a bad precedent that has serious implications for our national economy, which is already suffering from the general high level of interest rates. We strongly urge that the existing 4¼ per cent ceiling remain in effect on all Federal long-term borrowings.

ROBERT D. PARTRIDGE,

General Manager.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA

FEBRUARY 26, 1971.

"Consumer Federation of America believes the consumer has a responsible role in the American economy. We have consistently supported low interest rates. We organized the Emergency Committee for Low Interest Rates in 1969 and through this coalition sought to inform both the Congress and the Administration of our concern.

"I am writing you on behalf of CFA's 190 member organizations whose members are in every state and number in the millions. We are deeply disturbed at efforts to allow the Federal Treasury Department to issue \$10 billion of long-term government securities without regard to the statutory 4¼% ceiling. To lift the ceiling on long-term government debt and allow interest rates to soar for future generations seems to us an irresponsible position for this country to take.

"We urge you to lead the fight in the House of Representatives against efforts to repeal the 4¼% ceiling."

Mrs. ERMA ANGEVINE,

Executive Director.

THE NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION

FEBRUARY 23, 1971.

The National Rural Housing Coalition urges you to oppose the Administration's effort to lift the ceiling on the interest rate on long-term Federal bonds. This 53-year-old ceiling represents a Congressional commitment to reasonable interest rates and such a commitment is of vital importance to housing. Interest charges constitute at least one-fourth of monthly housing costs and have been one of the most rapidly rising components in recent years. To allow the Treasury to lock the public into paying higher rates for long-term borrowings would not only be a disservice to taxpayers, it would represent a Congressional sanction of high interest rates and of the damage they do to achievement of our national housing goals.

For far too long the Congress has abdicated its responsibility to "Coin money and determine the value thereof." The interest rate ceiling is the last vestige of its constitutional responsibility.

CLAY L. COCHRAN,

Chairman of the Board.

[Copy of Letter]

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

FEBRUARY 26, 1971.

High interest rates have consistently hurt the farmers and rural citizens across the land. We strongly oppose any tampering with the 4¼% ceiling on long-term obligations of the Federal Government. Removal of the ceiling would help to drive up interest rates throughout the economy and would be another serious blow to the family farmer.

In addition, removal of the 4¼% ceiling would place the Federal Government in direct competition with local communities and state governments which are seeking to finance badly-needed projects after years of tight money and high interest rates. Rural development would be set back for years if the Federal Government was allowed to enter the long-term market at prevailing interest rates.

The Federal Government is able to finance short-term debt for 3½% today and there is no reason to impose long-term debt on the American taxpayer at rates from 6%

to 6½%. Removal of the 4¼% ceiling would be a bonanza to the banks and the wealthy and a serious setback for farmers and consumers.

TONY DECHANT,

President.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is obviously confused about its monetary and fiscal policy. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee plainly shows that the administration is not prepared to properly consider long-term financing. Secretary Connally gave only the vaguest kind of answers to the basic questions presented him at the hearing. Several times, members of the Ways and Means Committee pressed the Secretary for facts about the effect of the removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling. The following exchange between the Honorable JOHN WATTS of Kentucky and Secretary Connally illustrates just how little the Treasury Department knows about its own proposal:

Mr. WATTS. If Congress did raise the interest rates, you would have to come up with some figures that you decided to try an issue on, would you not?

Secretary CONNALLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATTS. And you would have to come up with some length of time.

Secretary CONNALLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATTS. And you don't have those figures now?

Secretary CONNALLY. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. WATTS. And you didn't want to go to that trouble until you have the authority to do it; is that right?

Secretary CONNALLY. I didn't want to presume too much on the committee, Mr. Watts. This rate had not been changed since 1918, and I frankly didn't think I was going to be so persuasive as to be able to accomplish it this morning.

Mr. Watts. You came up with the expectation of not getting it?

Secretary Connally. No, sir. Not today.

Mr. Speaker, the administration also seems totally confused about the interest rate picture. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee found Secretary Connally walking on all sides of this vital question. First, Secretary Connally stated:

I will not attempt to forecast interest rates. But I must express my conviction that it would be imprudent to refrain entirely from medium or long-term financing in the hope that market rates will soon decline to a level that would make such financing practicable within the current ceiling. The possibility of increases, as well as the hope of declines, must be considered in appraising possible costs.

Then later in the same hearing, Secretary Connally said:

I would assume that with interest rates declining as they are now, that the possibility would exist within the next several months that we could issue some long-term bonds at a very favorable rate of interest.

In one case, Secretary Connally seems to be preparing the Congress for another increase in interest rates; in the other he seems to be attempting to prepare the Congress for a decrease in interest rates. Apparently, the Congress is supposed to guess which is the correct answer.

The administration apparently does not know which way it is leading the country on monetary policy—or which way monetary policy is leading the ad-

ministration. But apparently the administration wants to drag Congress along as the scapegoat wherever it goes on monetary policy. If it can convince the Congress to remove the 4¼-percent ceiling, the administration knows that the Congress will have to share the blame for any later increases in the interest rates. It is a neat political game that only requires that the Congress play the role of dupe.

Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress has a distinct responsibility to uphold low interest rates and not to accept administration proposals which would lead to higher rates. Most of this Congress, and this includes quite a few Republicans—ran on platforms calling for low interest rates. Tomorrow, I shall offer a motion to strike section 3 of H.R. 4690. This will delete the provision which would allow the Treasury to market \$10 billion of long-term Government obligations without regard to the 4¼-percent ceiling. A vote in favor of the motion to strike will be a vote for low interest rates. We will have a record teller vote and it is important that all Members be present to record their votes for low interest rates. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a series of questions and answers regarding the 4¼-percent ceiling:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Does the 4¼% ceiling on long-term Government obligations prevent the Treasury Department from borrowing to meet money needs of the Federal Government?

A. No, the Federal Government has ample authority to borrow in the short-term market—bills and notes with maturities not exceeding seven years.

Q. What is the effect of the 4¼% ceiling on debt management?

A. The 4¼% ceiling prevents the debt managers from obligating the taxpayers to high interest rates on long-term Government bonds of 20, 30, 40 or even 50 years. It prevents the Federal Government from entering the long-term market when that market is tight and interest rates are high.

Q. If the 4¼% ceiling is retained, when would it be possible for the Nixon Administration to market long-term Government bonds?

A. The Nixon Administration will be able to market all of the long-term Government obligations that it desires as soon as policies are adopted which will drive down rates in the long-term market. Retention of the 4¼% ceiling is an incentive for the debt managers to pursue and promote policies which will drive down long-term rates.

Q. Don't the proponents of removal of the 4¼% ceiling claim that the Federal Government has been unable to market long-term securities in modern times?

A. This claim is false. The Federal Government has marketed long-term obligations within the 4¼% ceiling as late as mid-1965. When interest rates started skyrocketing in the 1965-71 period, the Federal Government—as the Congress intended—had to drop out of the long-term market.

Q. If the 4¼% ceiling were removed, what would be the likely interest charge to the taxpayer on long-term bonds?

A. Long-term Government bonds previously issued are trading in the open market with yields ranging from 6% to 6½%. In testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on February 17, Secretary of the Treasury John Connally said the interest rate on long-term obligations would be "somewhere in the ballpark of I would guess 6%, 6½%, in this general range."

Q. How does 6 to 6½% compare with what the Government is currently financing in the short-term market?

A. There is a large amount of liquidity in the short-term market and as recently as last week, the Treasury Department marketed issues for 3.4% and 3.5% interest. The short-term rates are almost 50% lower than those in the long-term market.

Q. Has the Treasury Department submitted any economic analysis or projections which would indicate the impact of long-term Government obligations issued without regard to the 4¼% ceiling?

A. The Treasury Department has submitted no economic data and Page 24 of the hearing record published by the Ways and Means Committee contains replies from Secretary Connally indicating that no such studies have been conducted. Secretary Connally explained the lack of data in this manner: In a colloquy with Mr. Watts, Secretary Connally explained the lack of data in this manner:

Mr. WATTS. You don't have those figures now?

Secretary CONNALLY. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. WATTS. And you didn't want to go to that trouble until you have the authority to do it; is that right?

Secretary CONNALLY. I didn't want to presume too much on the committee, Mr. Watts. This rate had not been changed since 1918, and I frankly didn't think I was going to be so persuasive as to be able to accomplish it this morning.

Q. Since the Treasury has not marketed long-term bonds since mid-1965, has the 4¼% ceiling created any debt management problems over the past five years?

A. No, and Secretary Connally is the best authority for this. In his appearance before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Connally admitted that the Treasury Department would not have marketed long-term government obligations even if the 4¼% ceiling had been removed.

Q. Is the Treasury Department proposing removal of the 4¼% ceiling because it feels interest rates are declining or is it because they think interest rates are going up again?

A. In the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Connally gave both answers. First, Secretary Connally stated:

"I will not attempt to forecast interest rates. But I must express my conviction that it would be imprudent to refrain entirely from medium or long-term financing in the hope that market rates will soon decline to a level that would make such financing practicable within the current ceiling. The possibility of increases, as well as the hope of declines, must be considered in appraising possible costs."

Then later in the same hearing, Secretary Connally said:

I would assume that with interest rates declining as they are now, that the possibility would exist within the next several months that we could issue some long-term bonds at a very favorable rate of interest.

In one case, Secretary Connally seems to be preparing the Congress for another increase in interest rates; in the other he seems to be attempting to prepare the Congress for a decrease in interest rates. Apparently the Congress is supposed to guess which is the correct answer.

Q. Isn't the proposal just to allow \$10 billion of long-term bonds to be issued without regard to the 4¼% ceiling?

A. Yes, but this is simply a backdoor means of removing the ceiling. Limiting the first issues to \$10 billion is a gimmick designed to fool the public and the Congress. Once the ceiling is removed for \$10 billion,

the authority will simply be extended from time to time and the 4¼% ceiling will be gone forever.

Q. Hasn't Secretary Connally indicated that he would use the power carefully?

A. Secretary Connally could have hardly given any other answer. It is the same answer given the Congress by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Small Business Administration and all the other agencies. All want the Congress to grant more power and more money and all promise to use it wisely and prudently. Secretary Connally is no different.

Q. In other words, the Congress would be transferring power that it now has over interest rates to Secretary Connally and future Secretaries of the Treasury?

A. Yes, Congress would be relinquishing its last major control over interest rates and debt management. The taxpayers would be left at the mercy of whoever occupies the post as Secretary of the Treasury.

Q. How much are the taxpayers now paying in interest charges on the national debt?

A. The taxpayers are now paying more than \$20 billion annually in interest charges.

Q. Would this interest bill to the taxpayers be increased by removal of the 4¼% ceiling?

A. Absolutely. With short-term rates at 3.5% and long-term rates at 6.5%, it would appear that the interest charges on many new borrowings will be nearly double if the Congress goes along with removal of the 4¼% ceiling.

Q. Doesn't the Treasury Department claim that various Secretaries of the Treasury who have served in previous administrations support removal of the 4¼% ceiling? Why would they hold such a position?

A. The Ways and Means hearing record does show a brief one-paragraph letter signed by former Secretaries of the Treasury; however, none were invited to appear as witnesses to answer questions. More importantly, these former Secretaries—with one exception—are now in private life and draw their salaries as commercial bankers, investment bankers, and investment advisors. One of the former Secretaries of course is David Kennedy, a former banker from Chicago who is still part of the Nixon Administration and who would be expected to support the Administration's view. The other Secretaries are all honorable men but it would be amazing if they went against the position of their present employers on this issue.

Q. What has happened to the long-term bond market since Secretary Connally appeared before the Ways and Means Committee?

A. Interest rates have been rising spectacularly in the long-term bond market. The Wall Street Journal, the New York Times—and various financial publications—have noted this trend in the past few days. The Sunday New York Times states:

"By the early part of last week, interest rates on high grade corporate bonds had jumped nearly a full point from the low levels reached in early February."

Q. In other words, the Federal Government would be entering a market in which interest rates are going up?

A. That is correct. And the situation is expected to get worse in coming weeks. Corporations are expected to sell more than \$3½ billion of long-term bonds during the month of March—a record-breaking amount. Thus the Federal Government would be entering a long-term market which is becoming fantastically crowded and in which interest rates are rising.

Q. What effect would the removal of the 4¼% ceiling have on local and state bond issues?

A. Local governments—including school districts, cities, and states—are moving into the long-term bond market after the long

drought created by tight money. The entry of the Federal Government—through removal of the 4¼% ceiling—in this market, would crowd out many local communities and cause thousands of badly-needed projects to be postponed once again.

Q. What would the removal of the 4¼% ceiling mean to the average homebuyer?

A. The Homebuyer, like local governments, needs long-term money—mortgages of 25 and 30 years—and the Federal Government would be in direct competition for these types of funds.

Q. Isn't it argued that the short-term government securities compete with thrift institutions?

A. Today short-term interest rates on government securities are about 3½%. Savings and loan institutions are paying 5% on pass-book savings, so it would be difficult for a 3½% rate to be drawing funds from the savings and loans. More importantly, the average small saver does not buy government securities and is in fact discouraged from doing so by Treasury policies.

Q. What is the difference between the long-term and short-term markets and why is there so much concern about the Federal Government entering the long-term market?

A. Long-term savings are always in shorter supply and the long-term market has a limited liquidity. When the Federal Government enters the long-term market—particularly in periods of high interest rates—it becomes a vicious competitor with long-term investments which create jobs, and which provide funding for schools, water and sewer plants, housing, urban renewal, and similar projects.

In contrast, the short-term market is by definition much more liquid and able to handle government borrowings, without serious and adverse effects on public projects.

Q. What effect do long-term Government borrowings have on economic policy?

A. Long-term borrowings by the Federal Government tend to sop up credit and to dampen economic development. Long-term borrowing would almost certainly worsen the unemployment situation in the nation.

Q. Does the record show anywhere how much the Government would charge the taxpayers for these long-term bonds and when and how they would be marketed?

A. These questions—which should be the key to any consideration of the legislation—are answered in vague and incomplete terms by the Treasury. Secretary Connally talks about the possibility of marketing these bonds in “weeks” or “months.” At the same time, he refuses to explain what the interest rate would be and indicates the Treasury has made no study of the question.

Q. In short, the Congress would be buying a “pig in the poke.”

A. Yes. There is no testimony to answer the basic questions concerning the legislation.

Q. How long were the hearings on the legislation?

A. One day.

Q. What groups support the legislation?

A. The hearing record contains letters from national lobbying organizations such as the American Bankers Association, the Investment Bankers and similar financial institutions.

Q. Who opposes the removal of the ceiling?

A. Virtually all the major labor, consumer and rural organizations. They include:

1. The AFL-CIO;
2. The United Auto Workers;
3. The Cooperative League of the USA;
4. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association;
5. The Consumer Federation of America;
6. The National Rural Housing Coalition;
7. The National Farmers Union;
8. The National Council of Senior Citizens.

Q. Who gets the interest from these long-term Government bonds?

A. Purchases in the long-term government bond market are made by commercial banks, insurance companies, and other very large institutional investors. In addition, a select few at the very top-income levels are able to enter this market. So higher interest payments are a bonanza for large institutional investors and the very wealthy. The average person—who will pay much of the tax bill on the higher-priced securities—does not receive the interest payments from long-term government securities.

Q. What effect would long-term borrowings by the Federal Government—at high interest rates—have on other interest rates in the economy?

A. With growing Federal deficits—and a large national debt—borrowings by the Treasury Department would have a substantial effect on other interest rates. If the Government goes into the long-term market at high rates, the action will create shock waves throughout the money markets, pushing up other interest rates. The consumer, the farmer, the small businessman—and others who are at the low end of the monetary process—will feel the effect through higher interest rates. Local governments which will be in direct competition with the Federal Government in the long-term market will be particularly hard hit if the Treasury Department muscles in on an already overcrowded long-term market.

Every person in the economy has been hard hit by high interest rates and it would be tragic if the Congress endorsed a policy which would reverse the trend toward lower interest rates. For example, in recent years, the homeowner has been paying up to \$38,000 in interest on a \$20,000 home. Similar outrageous interest payments have hit the pocketbooks of consumers in every state and every Congressional district.

Q. Why is the 4¼% ceiling considered a symbol of low interest rates?

A. It is a Congressional mandate to hold down interest rates and the 4¼% ceiling has saved the taxpayers billions of dollars over the years. Congress has let much of its influence over interest rates and monetary matters slip away, but the 4¼% ceiling on long-term government bonds remains as a symbol—as a Congressional statement that the nation wants the lowest possible interest rates and that Government borrowings should be made at the lowest possible interest rate. Removal of the ceiling would be interpreted widely as a signal that the Congress was abandoning traditional low interest policy.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House deserve credit for their leadership roles in the various fights to hold down interest rates.

A large number of Members were active on this issue during the 91st Congress and I know that many new Members in the 92d Congress are of like mind.

Ever since the 4¼-percent issue came up in the Eisenhower administration, we have maintained a low interest rate committee of which I have had the opportunity to serve as chairman. The membership of this committee has varied from Congress to Congress and I want to list those members who were active on the committee during the 91st Congress. Needless to say, there were others who were sympathetic to the efforts of this group, but whose names are not listed as part of the formal committee.

I place a copy of a list of members of the Low Interest Rate Steering Committee in the RECORD:

LIST OF MEMBERS

Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio.
 Brock Adams, Wash.
 Joseph P. Addabbo, N.Y.
 Glenn M. Anderson, Calif.
 Frank Annunzio, Ill.
 William A. Barrett, Pa.
 Tom Beville, Ala.
 Jonathan B. Bingham, N.Y.
 Frank J. Brasco, N.Y.
 Bill D. Burlison, Mo.
 Phillip Burton, Calif.
 James C. Corman, Calif.
 Dominick V. Daniels, N.J.
 John H. Dent, Pa.
 Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Mich.
 John D. Dingell, Mich.
 William Jennings Bryan Dorn, S.C.
 Edwin W. Edwards, La.
 Joshua Ellberg, Pa.
 Joe L. Evins, Tenn.
 Nick Galifianakis, N.C.
 Cornelius Gallagher, N.J.
 Tom S. Gettys, S.C.
 Henry B. Gonzalez, Tex.
 Kenneth J. Gray, Ill.
 Edith Green, Ore.
 William J. Green, Pa.
 Martha W. Griffiths, Mich.
 G. Elliott Hagan, Ga.
 James M. Hanley, N.Y.
 Richard T. Hanna, Calif.
 William D. Hathaway, Maine
 Augustus F. Hawkins, Calif.
 Wayne L. Mays, Ohio.
 Ken Hechler, W. Va.
 Henry Helstoski, N.J.
 Chet Holifield, Calif.
 Richard H. Ichord, Mo.
 Joseph E. Karth, Minn.
 Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wis.
 James Kee, W. Va.
 Edward I. Koch, N.Y.
 John J. McFall, Calif.
 Ray J. Madden, Ind.
 James R. Mann, S.C.
 Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii
 Lloyd Meeds, Wash.
 John Melcher, Mont.
 Abner J. Mikva, Ill.
 George P. Miller, Calif.
 Joseph G. Minish, N.J.
 Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii
 Robert H. Mollohan, W. Va.
 John E. Moss, Calif.
 Robert N. C. Nix, Pa.
 Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Mass.
 Edward J. Patten, N.J.
 Claude Pepper, Fla.
 Bertram L. Podell, N.Y.
 Melvin Price, Ill.
 Roman C. Pucinski, Ill.
 Thomas M. Rees, Calif.
 Henry S. Reuss, Wis.
 Peter W. Rodino, Jr., N.J.
 Fred B. Rooney, Pa.
 Edward R. Roybal, Calif.
 William F. Ryan, N.Y.
 Fernand St Germain, R.I.
 B. F. Sisk, Calif.
 Tom Steed, Okla.
 Robert G. Stephens, Jr., Ga.
 Louis Stokes, Ohio.
 Leonor K. Sullivan, Mo.
 Fletcher Thompson, Ga.
 Robert O. Tiernan, R.I.
 Morris K. Udall, Ariz.
 Al Ullman, Ore.
 Lionel Van Deerlin, Calif.
 Charles A. Vanik, Ohio.
 Jerome R. Waldie, Calif.
 Charles H. Wilson, Calif.
 Lester L. Wolff, N.Y.
 Jim Wright, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, special credit should also be given to those Members who sponsored low-interest resolutions during the 91st Congress. The idea for these resolutions was originated by the Honorable

JIM WRIGHT, of Texas, and the Honorable BILL ALEXANDER, of Arkansas, and they did much to keep the interest-rate issue before the Congress and the American public. Mr. Speaker, the following is a list of those Members who sponsored low-interest-rate resolutions in the 91st Congress.

LIST OF SPONSORS

Brock Adams, Wash.
Joseph P. Addabbo, N.Y.
Bill Alexander, Ark.
Glenn M. Anderson, Calif.
William R. Anderson, Tenn.
William A. Barrett, Pa.
Tom Beville, Ala.
Ray Blanton, Tenn.
Edward P. Boland, Mass.
J. Herbert Burke, Fla.
Earle Cabell, Tex.
Patrick T. Caffery, La.
Bob Casey, Tex.
Bill Chappell, Jr., Fla.
Don H. Clausen, Calif.
James C. Corman, Calif.
Dominick V. Daniels, N.J.
John H. Dent, Pa.
John D. Dingell, Mich.
Don Edwards, Calif.
Edwin W. Edwards, La.
Dante B. Fascell, Fla.
Walter Flowers, Ala.
Donald M. Fraser, Minn.
Sam Friedel, Md.
Nick Galifianakis, N.C.
Sam Gibbons, Fla.
Henry B. Gonzalez, Tex.
Kenneth J. Gray, Ill.
Edith Green, Oreg.
James A. Haley, Fla.
Seymour Halpern, N.Y.
James M. Hanley, N.Y.
Michael Harrington, Mass.
Wayne L. Hays, Ohio
Ken Hechler, W.Va.
Ken Hechler, W. Va.
Floyd V. Hicks, Wash.
Chet Holifield, Calif.
James Howard, N.J.
William L. Hungate, Mo.
Richard H. Ichord, Mo.
Harold T. Johnson, Calif.
Ed Jones, Tenn.
Edward I. Koch, N.Y.
Robert L. Leggett, Calif.
Ray J. Madden, Ind.
Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii.
John Melcher, Mont.
Abner J. Mikva, Ill.
Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii
Lucien N. Nedzi, Mich.
Robert N. C. Nix, Penn.
David R. Obey, Wisc.
Arnold Olsen, Minn.
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Mass.
Richard Ottinger, N.Y.
Otto E. Passman, La.
Bertram L. Podell, N.Y.
Richardson Preyer, N.C.
David Pryor, Ark.
Roman C. Pucinski, Ill.
Graham Purcell, Tex.
William J. Randall, Miss.
Thomas M. Rees, Calif.
Robert A. Roe, N.J.
William F. Ryan, N.Y.
James H. Scheuer, N.Y.
Robert L. F. Sikes, Fla.
John M. Slack, W. Va.
Louis Stokes, Ohio.
W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr., Ga.
James W. Symington, Mo.
Roy A. Taylor, N.C.
Fletcher Thompson, Ga.
Robert O. Tiernan, R.I.
John V. Tunney, Cal.
Morris K. Udall, Ariz.
Lionel Van Deerlin, Cal.
Jerome R. Waldie, Cal.

Richard C. White, Tex.
Lester L. Wolff, N.Y.
Jim Wright, Tex.
Gus Yatron, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of these Members—and others who are interested in low interest rates—will stay on the floor as much as possible Wednesday afternoon so that we can put this 92d Congress on the right course concerning monetary policy. We now have a chance to put our words and promises into action.

PRAYER IN OUR SCHOOLS

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Supreme Court Ruling on compulsory prayer in our public schools, schoolchildren across our land are being denied the privilege of even offering voluntary prayer.

I am today introducing a resolution which proposes an amendment to the Constitution relating to prayer in public schools and other public buildings.

This resolution mentions specifically schools as among those public buildings in which voluntary prayer would be permitted. Since some regard even voluntary prayer as something requiring formal procedure, the measure permits meditation as a substitute for voluntary, nondenominational prayer.

The people in my district have petitioned my efforts toward reversing the Court ruling so that their children might have the opportunity to give thanks to God and continue the traditions of our forefathers. We are a religious people and a prayerful people. In these times of constant turmoil and shifting values, we all need the reassurance which God can give.

The text of the resolution follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public school or other public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate voluntarily in nondenominational prayer or meditation.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, today the Pres-

ident has forwarded to the Congress a proposal to transform the LEAA block action grant program into a special revenue-sharing system. This is an important forward step. It is not a repudiation of the LEAA program; rather it is a logical and necessary improvement.

With the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 the Congress acknowledged its determination to aid State and local governments in their efforts to control crime and improve their criminal justice systems.

Americans have always opposed a Federal police state. A basic tenet of our society has been that the primary responsibility for law enforcement and criminal justice rests with State and local governments. With the growing threat of crime and public disorder, it became apparent that State and local authorities needed assistance to carry out these responsibilities.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration program, created by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, has been the vehicle for the furnishing of the Federal assistance.

The LEAA program has been based upon the requirement that each State develop a comprehensive plan for the improvement of law enforcement throughout the State. The act contains detailed specifications of the matters to be included in the plan. After approval of the plan by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, a block action grant is made to the State to fund the planned programs: Today, 85 percent of the action funds available to LEAA go to the States as block action grants. In fiscal year 1971 this will amount to about \$340 million.

As originally drawn, the act required that State and local governments bear 40 percent of the cost of most projects, with the Federal Government paying 60 percent. Late last year, Congress passed a series of amendments to the act, including one that reduced the State-local share to 25 percent for most projects, with the Federal share increased to 75 percent.

But that attempt at relief for hard-pressed State and local governments did not go far enough. Under the proposal submitted today, with the exceptions noted later, no matching requirement would be imposed on State and local governments. The Federal block action grants could be used to pay 100 percent of any and all projects undertaken by the recipients.

At present, 15 percent of the total action funds are given by LEAA not in block grants but in so-called discretionary action grants. These the agency awards on a categorical basis to help meet special priority needs and to supplement projects funded by the block grants. These discretionary grants are retained under the special revenue-sharing program. However, the matching requirement for these grants would also be eliminated.

Under the President's proposal, the concept of block grants to the States is retained, and 85 percent of the action

funds will continue to go to States on the basis of their relative population. However, the Federal Government will no longer impose a requirement that State and local governments contribute matching funds in order to receive those grants.

A second major change contained in today's proposal is the elimination of the requirement that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant prior approval to the comprehensive State plan. A comprehensive State plan will still be necessary and must be submitted to LEAA not later than December 31 of each year. LEAA will review the plan and provide the State planning agency with such comments and recommendations as it deems appropriate. This change is recognition of the fact that the State and local governments, in the final analysis, should be the best judges of their needs and priorities. The function of the Federal authorities is to assist—to lend technical expertise.

A third significant change from the present program is the deletion of the requirement of maintenance of effort. Today's law directs that the plan contain assurances that the Federal funds will be so used as not to supplant State and local funds, but to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for law enforcement.

As the President so clearly pointed out in his February 4 message on revenue sharing, State and local governments are facing a bitter dilemma. As he said:

On the one hand, they must cut services or raise taxes to avoid bankruptcy. On the other hand, the problems they face and the public they serve demand expanded programs and lower costs.

The removal of the matching requirements for the action funds and deletion of the maintenance of effort provision will give the State and local recipients financial assistance and added flexibility in their financial planning.

I have discussed the three major changes the special revenue-sharing proposal would make. I would now like to point to some important provisions of the assistance program which would not change.

The present pass through requirements are retained. The States would thus have to make available to units of general local government the same percentage of the Federal funds required under present law. Also retained is the requirement that the plan include the allocation of an adequate share of assistance for law enforcement problems in areas characterized by both high crime incidence and high law enforcement activity.

While the matching fund requirements are removed from the block action grants—which would now be special revenue-sharing payments—and from the discretionary grants, the matching requirements would still remain for planning grants and for the new grants for correctional institutions and facilities. These latter grants were authorized in the amendments which Congress passed at the end of the last Congress—in the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970—Public Law 91-644 approved January 2, 1971.

MAN IN SPACE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the stirring presentation to Congress by the men of Apollo 14, I would like my colleagues to take note of the fact that I, along with 15 other members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, have introduced legislation authorizing the President to proclaim the third week in July of each year as National Man in Space Week.

Joining me in sponsoring this measure were the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER); the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON); and Mr. BELL, Mr. CABELL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FREY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. ROE, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WINN.

I have proposed that a National Man in Space Week be established because, despite the fact that the national space program in general and the manned space flight program in particular have benefited all mankind so greatly, there is no officially sanctioned and designated means by which the American people and people around the world can celebrate and commemorate the achievements of our space pioneers and our space program.

Establishing a National Man in Space Week would fill this present void. Affixing it in the third week in July of each year would be most appropriate, for it was during this week in 1969 that Astronaut Neil A. Armstrong became the first human being to tread the surface of the moon.

Mr. Speaker, the scope and the excellence of the Apollo mission series and the courage U.S. astronauts have displayed in the face of the unknown are both in the highest traditions of greatness that have made this Nation what it is today. Moreover, the dogged determination and ability our astronauts have exhibited in Apollo mission activities has provided a most compelling and needed reaffirmation of the fact that Americans and this Nation can reach unlimited heights of achievement when there is total commitment to a worthy goal.

I urge my colleagues to establish a National Man in Space Week. The space pioneers of this Nation have extended the horizons of man far beyond the borders of this tiny planet. Their accomplishments deserve to be preserved and commemorated for our posterity.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ASKED TO CANCEL VISA OF MISS BERNADETTE DEVLIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Justice Department to cancel the visa of Miss Bernadette Devlin who, according to United Press International,

offered to lead a demonstration against President Nixon in Des Moines, Iowa.

In light of the bombing incident we had at the Capitol, it is obvious we do not need anyone stirring up violent dissent in the United States and surely we have enough agitators in this country without importing a foreign national to stir up hatreds and unrest.

I have sent a telegram to Mr. Raymond Farrell, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to inquire about the conditions under which Miss Devlin received her visa. I am sure it does not contain any provisions for her to become an agitator against the U.S. Government or to sponsor such demonstrations. The Immigration and Naturalization Service should move to revoke her visa if Miss Devlin is in violation of its provisions.

Miss Devlin's conduct is presumptuous and an insult to the United States and the Nation does not owe any foreign national the right to attempt to disrupt our affairs.

BOMBING OF THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the sobering results of yesterday's bomb blast in the Senate wing of the Capitol Building have shaken more than just the foundations of a manmade structure. They have shaken the foundations of a governmental system that for nearly 200 years has provided the most benevolent and free society the world has ever known.

Were the United States ruled by a despotic government, the blind reasoning behind the bombing might be better understood. I only wish I could predict that the incident would be treated as more than just the act of a splintered element of frustrated radicals. It was an act of aggression against the United States just as if an enemy plane had flown over and dropped a bomb on the Capitol. It must never occur again. Law enforcement officials investigating the case must exert every possible human effort to locate and punish the perpetrators of the bombing lest they, flushed with success, attempt a similar act.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. Americans have the greatest accessibility to news and information in the world today. There are over 11,383 newspapers in this country, 9,573 periodicals, and 6,791 commercial broadcast stations.

MILITARY SPENDING IN THE MEDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I speak today concerning a recent change in policy adopted by the Army. It is a change which should interest us all. It is a change which disturbs me. I believe that the Army has made a dangerous mistake that will threaten one of our most essential freedoms.

Mr. Brent Gunts, vice president and general manager of WBAL television station, Baltimore, has informed me that the U.S. Army Recruiting Command has proposed the spending of \$10.6 million of Federal funds to purchase time on commercial television. The money would be spent to buy spots boosting the Army recruiting program. Already a contract has been negotiated with N. W. Ayer & Son of Philadelphia, one of that city's leading advertising firms, to handle these purchases for the U.S. Army Recruiting Command.

The proposed commitment of these funds to purchase time on commercial television would represent a major revision in policy for the Army. Allow me to quote Mr. Gunts:

We consider it a highly questionable procedure and a precedent that could quickly lead to the spending of fantastic amounts of Government funds on the broadcast media.

Indeed, this step undertaken by the Army would represent, as far as I know, the first expenditure of any Government funds for such a purpose.

I want to make it very clear right now that there is absolutely no need for the Army to purchase these advertising spots. Traditionally, WBAL, and other television stations throughout the Nation, have made available to eleemosynary organizations free time in the public interest. The time made available without charge is more than sufficient to satisfy the needs of the Army, or any other branch of our Government. I find it disconcerting that the Army, unlike all the other agencies of Government, has found it necessary to purchase time over and above that amount of time already offered gratis by the stations.

The dangers are simple, obvious and frightening. As Mr. Gunts suggests in his correspondence to me, if the Army is permitted to establish this precedent, surely the other agencies of the Government will follow suit. Inevitably, the day will come when the Government will be expending millions of dollars for the purchase of commercial television time. The impact on the media might well parallel the impact of Government spending on the defense industries. I can envision the day when the military would use its purchasing power to influence the activities of television stations throughout the Nation. At the very least, a thousand opportunities and means for tampering with the media would be created.

We assembled here in Congress have not considered guidelines governing how this money should be spent. We have not even authorized its expenditure for this purpose. We have not even examined the question of maintaining the disinterest of the media in the face of heavy Government spending in that industry.

These are serious questions that must be answered.

At this point in time, I find it unbelievable that the Army should take the first step in this direction toward Government spending in the media. The credibility of the military is at an alltime low; we are considering fundamental changes in the structure of the armed services, and we have just learned that the Army has in the past spied upon civilian citizens. With this in mind, it is certainly impolitic and surprising for the Army to be leading the way in this affair. Although I must admit that the Army has often managed to surprise me.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not accusing the Army of trying to take over the media. I am simply saying that the Army, and any other Government agency for that matter, is creating a situation where it will be in a position to directly influence the media.

WBAL television has advised the NBC television network that it is not available for the U.S. Army recruiting announcements that have been purchased on that network. Allow me to quote from a letter sent by Mr. Gunts to the N. W. Ayer & Son Co., which he kindly forwarded to me. In it he says:

WBAL-TV now, as in the past, will make time available without charge to the United States Army for recruiting purposes but according to the expressed needs of the United States Army and in relationship to the best interests of the community we serve.

I want to congratulate Mr. Gunts for his decision in this matter.

Gentlemen, the right of a free and unshackled media is guaranteed in the Constitution. The implications of the new policy adopted by the Army are of grave concern to me. The reestablishment of civilian control over the military is long overdue. I hope that you will join me in asking that the Secretary of the Army forbid the use of Federal funds for this purpose.

A NEW CHINA FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE NEW AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a new first in America's history was the President of the United States giving a state of the world address. Article II of the Constitution which pertains to the executive branch provides:

He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union and recommend to their Consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary or expedient; . . .

But the Constitution is silent on any so-called state of the world message.

Apparently this most unusual report—179 pages in length and coauthored by Henry Kissinger—was not intended for the people of America but rather for heads of state, ambassadors, and diplomats of foreign nations, charged with foreign relations to let them know the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy platform for the 1970's.

Since 1949, when the Communists seized power on the mainland of China, our foreign policy has been characterized by a firm refusal to yield to the threats of Red China or to the pressures from the dear friends of Mao at home and abroad to make concessions to the Peiping regime.

In spite of this policy "in the best interests of the American people," organized efforts continued to change U.S. policies toward Communist China—diplomatic recognition, admission to the United Nations, trade—which amounts to increasing the power and prestige of an enemy of the United States and to perpetuate a totalitarian dictatorship over the long-suffering Chinese people.

To seat Communist China in the United Nations would be breaking faith with the thousands of American POW's now imprisoned in China, Korea, and North Vietnam, desecrating the memory of those young men who gave their lives in Korea and who gave and continue to give their lives in North Vietnam fighting Communist aggression.

To give diplomatic recognition to and to conduct trade with Communist China would help the enemy far more than it could possibly benefit the American people. If not in the best interests of our country why should it be at all?

While a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Nixon stated that the answer to trade with China, recognition of China, admitting it to the U.N., should come only when the Maoists indicate by deeds that they want to be a part of the civilized family of nations and not an outlaw nation.

President Nixon stated further that he would not go along with those well-intentioned people who said "trade with them" because that may change them. Because doing it now would only encourage them, the hardliners in Peking and hardline policy that they are following. And it would have an immense effect in discouraging great numbers of non-Communist elements in free Asia that are now just beginning to develop their strength and their own confidence.

When a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Nixon also said:

We have to realize, looking down the road, that Communist China within six years, seven years, at the very least, will have a significant nuclear capability. And Communist China will be outside of the nuclear club. Therefore, whoever is elected president this next time has to be thinking now as to how we develop the power around the perimeter of China which will convince the Communist Chinese leaders that they will not gain—as a matter of fact, that they will run very great risks—in the event that they attempt to expand in their sorties against India and in other countries who are their neighbors.

According to the President's state of the world address last week, a new Red China foreign policy appears to be evolving. On pages 82 to 85 of the document entitled "U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's—Building for Peace," the Kissinger-Nixon "new" foreign policy on Communist China is found.

Regarding our Asia policy for the next decade, Mr. Kissinger wrote:

We will be striving to establish a new and stable structure reflecting . . . the changing interests of the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China.

An explanation is not given as to what are the changing interests of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China nor do we know of any. Since the leaders of both Russia and Red China by their words and actions have made and continue to make clear their intention of enslaving the world under a Communist collectivist system, we must assume that Messrs. Kissinger and Nixon are not letting the people in on their secret as to what are the changing interests of the Soviet Union and Red China.

President Nixon said:

In April we authorized the selective licensing of goods for export to the Peoples Republic of China.

Despite Nixon's campaign statement that he would not trade with Red China, since that would discourage non-Communist elements in Free Asia, we now see the beginning of trade with Red China. If Nixon would not do it, why is it being done? As with other policies of Government—once a foot gets in the door, the door continues to open until there are no restrictions.

The telltale statement of the China section of the state of the world report is the following:

In the coming year I will carefully examine what further steps we might take to create broader opportunities for contacts between the Chinese and American peoples, and how we might remove needless obstacles to the realization of these opportunities. We hope for, but will not be deterred by a lack of, reciprocity.

Yet, even a more blatant policy against the sovereignty of our Nation is contained in the Export Control Report, 4th Quarter 1970, from the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, showing export licenses being granted under the current administration to provide sensitive computers and sophisticated industrial machinery to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations supplying arms and material to the enemy. I insert page 8, section 3, of Security Export Controls in the RECORD.

III. SECURITY EXPORT CONTROLS EXPORT LICENSING TO EASTERN EUROPE Commodity applications approved

License applications for commodities valued at \$55.9 million were approved for export to Eastern Europe during the fourth quarter 1970. This compared with \$33.1 million approved in the previous quarter and \$61.5 million approved in the fourth quarter 1969.

The largest dollar volume of export license approvals was for the U.S.S.R., \$21.7 million. Other principal approvals were for East Germany, \$16.5 million; Czechoslovakia, \$5.6 million; Romania, \$4.6 million; and Poland, \$4.1 million.

Chemicals constituted \$12.6 million of these license approvals, including \$3.9 million in industrial chemicals and \$1.3 million in chemical materials and products for East Germany; \$1.4 million in nylon salt and \$1.1 million in glycols for the U.S.S.R.; and \$0.9 million in industrial chemicals and \$0.7 million in vanadium pentoxide for Czechoslovakia.

Construction and manufacturing equipment aggregating \$15.4 million were licensed, primarily centrifugal compressors and acces-

sories worth \$4.9 million to the U.S.S.R.; rolling mill equipment worth \$3 million to Poland and \$3.1 million to Romania; and a multistation machine (transfer line) valued at \$1.5 million and coil winding machines at \$0.6 million, both to the U.S.S.R.

Yellow corn amounting to \$8.3 million was the only agricultural product licensed, with \$7.5 million to East Germany and \$0.8 million to Czechoslovakia.

Computers and parts valued at \$7.3 million were licensed, primarily to the U.S.S.R., \$3.2 million; Hungary, \$1.1 million; Romania, \$0.7 million; and Czechoslovakia, \$0.5 million.

Scientific and electronic equipment and parts aggregating \$0.8 million were licensed to all East European destinations. Other license approvals included video tape recorders, \$0.8 million to Hungary and \$0.7 million to Czechoslovakia, and \$0.5 million in magnetic recording and reproducing equipment to East Germany.

In other words, while the Communist bandits kill our soldiers in North Vietnam and Korea remains a battlefield where American men still die, our "new revolutionary" leader expects his people to be openminded, and even export goods to the enemy. Gone forever are those days when we sent our young men into battle, supported by a unified nation standing as one and giving them our total support so as to end the war as quickly as possible, with the minimum loss of life and releasing those who have been drafted as soon as possible. And these statements of disloyalty—of aiding and abetting the enemy—come from the President of the United States while our men are fighting and dying on far-off battlefields.

Under the present administration, we must face the inescapable conclusion that treason as defined by the Constitution is not only not treated as a crime by the judiciary, but is also ignored by the executive. How can any country survive when treason is given "constitutional" freedoms?

The "new" foreign policy on Red China bodes no good.

Such a policy exceeds merely being "soft on communism" and, while it may be sold as helping win the "peace", it may very well be at the cost of losing the war, nor can it be justified as a mere political malfeasance.

Nevertheless, in the policy vernacular of the State Department, we can be sure that this new policy is "in the best interest of the American people"—we love the enemy and they kill our young men.

Patriotism means to stand by the country.

So said a former great President. I insert the full statement of President Theodore Roosevelt on patriotism and newscippings in the RECORD:

PATRIOTISM

Patriotism means to stand by the country.

It does not mean to stand by the President or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country.

It is patriotic to support him insofar as he efficiently serves the Country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the Country.

In either event, it is unpatriotic not to tell the truth—whether about the President or about anyone else—save in the rare cases where this would make known to the enemy information of military value which would

otherwise be unknown to him. (Theodore Roosevelt, 1918; Memorial Edition, Vol. 21, p. 316, "The Works of Theodore Roosevelt.")

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1971]

HENRY KISSINGER IS KEEPING NOTES

(By Dorothy McCordle)

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, assistant to the President on National Security Affairs, is keeping notes on some "fantastic conversations" he has had at the White House which may eventually lead to a book.

"I am not keeping a diary as such," he said last night at the Italian embassy.

"But if these conversations are ever published, they will have to come under the heading of fiction. Nobody will believe them."

As usual, Dr. Kissinger found himself the center of interest as he moved from room to room at the reception which Italian Ambassador and Mrs. Egidio Ortona gave in honor of Emilio Colombo, Italy's Premier.

After Dr. Kissinger had a prolonged conversation with Premier Colombo and Minister of Foreign Affairs Aldo Moro, he was asked if he had talked with them in Italian.

"The only Italian I know I wouldn't want to use with a man," he said, as two young women guests conspicuously snuggled up to him.

Asked if he would like to visit Italy soon again, he said:

"I have no time to go to Italy. If I did, the President might find me dispensable. I have to go back to the White House in a few minutes to work on the President's state of the world message.

"Last week I told someone at the White House that I was working on the President's end of the world report."

Ambassador and Mrs. Ortona had invited 780 guests. By the end of the evening it looked as if all had come with such locust-like appetites that two large buffet tables were cleaned of the last nibble.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Sen. ——— both dropped by, but not to eat. Secretary Rogers was on his way home to a dinner party which his wife was having for close friends.

Both men have cultivated sideburns and let their hair grow longer at the back. Both are sporting neck waves. So is former Ambassador to the Organization of American States Sol Linowitz.

Director of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts William McCormick Blair, Jr. and Chairman of the Center's board of trustees Roger Stevens dropped by to thank President Colombo for the 3,700 tons of Italian marble, worth close to \$2 million, which Italy has sent to the center.

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Mar. 8, 1971]

The unwieldy length of President Nixon's "state of the world" message—it covered 180 pages—dismayed even the most loyal White House aides. Henry Kissinger, presidential assistant for national-security affairs, was given the "overkill" credit. "The President asked Henry for a thought or two," an insider reported, "and Henry wrote a book."

RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT BILL

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to have the opportunity to co-sponsor the rural job development bill recently introduced by my distinguished colleague from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS).

I believe the passage of this legislation could be the groundwork for building a

more vibrant and a stronger economy in rural America.

I also believe that with the building of that stronger economy, rural America will be revitalized and made far more attractive to those considering moving to the large cities of the Nation in search of job opportunities and social fulfillment.

We all know that, for many, the end of that search has been the crowded and desolate blocks of humanity and concrete we know as slums and ghettos.

Rural job opportunities could end that search before it really began, before our young people and others looking for employment could get out of the city limits of their own home town.

These opportunities have been too hard to find in rural America, and this is a tragedy, for I believe my colleagues would agree that despite all the promises of adventure leaving home can hold, most of our young people would much rather live among their friends and families than migrate to a cold and unfriendly city in search of a career.

This legislation is geared to expand the quantity and quality of economic and social opportunities in rural America to the point that heavy migration to the Nation's urban centers is no longer necessary.

To accomplish this goal, job-creating industries would be encouraged to locate in "rural job development areas"—counties which have no city over 50,000 population and where at least 15 percent of the families have incomes of less than \$3,000.

With a series of tax incentives, including property tax credits, an accelerated depreciation allowance and a 50-percent tax deduction on wages paid to workers involved in on-the-job training, industrial and commercial enterprises would be strongly attracted to these rural job development areas.

To qualify, 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 provides some built-in safeguards to insure that the tax incentives are not abused, and I believe this legislation has all the makings of becoming a very effective instrument in developing rural America.

I urge my colleagues to vote with me for passage of this legislation.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION'S HIGHWAY PROGRAM

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to discuss legislation which I introduced on February 18, 1971, with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) to extend the Appalachian Regional Commission's highway program for 5 years, and its nonhighway program for 4 years.

I am deeply honored to be able to co-sponsor this bill with a man like WILLIAM H. HARSHA, who, as ranking Re-

publican member of the Committee on Public Works, has long served as one of the most effective and dedicated legislators on the committee and in the Congress.

I am doubly honored by having the opportunity to sponsor legislation that will extend the life of one of the most innovative and responsible programs ever created. The program is, of course, the Appalachian regional development program.

I can think of no program, out of more than 1,100 throughout the Federal Government, in which money is better spent, in which people are more directly benefited or consulted, or in which the Government assistance concept is better applied than the program conducted by the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Its influence can be readily seen in the vast array of facilities that have become symbols of progress in the Fifth District of North Carolina, which I am privileged to represent, and throughout the Appalachian region.

One need only look at the ever-growing network of Appalachian development highways, or the primary and secondary access roads throughout the region, or the new hospitals, vocational schools, community colleges, regional health centers, water and sewage treatment plants, airports, and other facilities that have spurred development of this region to see that, in a relatively short time, the Appalachian Commission has distinguished itself as an agent of change and a sorely needed instrument of progress.

These so-called brick-and-mortar projects stand today as visible, tangible testimony to the Appalachian Commission's achievement and to its worth. But the greatest achievement of the Appalachian Regional Commission has been the restoration of hope in almost 20 million people who live in that 13-State region, that tomorrow can be better than today.

This is indeed an enviable record, and this program could well serve as an example of the real progress government can achieve if reason is applied, if time is taken to plan, and if intergovernmental cooperation is pursued rather than avoided.

This last element will stand as a lasting legacy of this program when its purpose has been served, though that time has surely not yet arrived.

To me, Mr. Speaker, a special attraction of this program is the master decision-making role played by local people, who can see the need for a project and then play a large part in seeing it through to completion.

The fact that every project must be approved by the Governor of the State involved is an important reaffirmation of the sovereignty of State governments, and of the vital role that State governments should play in so many areas. That role has not been filled in other programs, due in the main to the unwillingness of the Federal Government to surrender a part of the power it guards so jealously.

But the unquestioned success of the Appalachian program is undeniable proof that if local and State participation are

actively sought, rather than purposely pushed aside, government at all levels can function better and serve the people more effectively. And this, after all, is what government is for.

The Commission's service to North Carolina is of primary concern to me, since seven of the 29 Appalachian North Carolina counties are included in my district.

In the past 6 years, Appalachian North Carolina has received more than \$75 million for vital projects of all kinds.

Approximately \$14,413,000 of that total has gone to supplement local and State matching shares in projects that would have been too massive and too costly for those governments to implement alone.

This supplemental grant approach has been a definite asset in the development of Appalachian North Carolina, but the Appalachian Regional Commission program does not stop there.

Almost \$9 million in ARC funds has gone to improve the overall quality of health care in Appalachian North Carolina, with a series of health manpower programs, regional health center construction, improvement of health delivery systems, and other health-related activities.

More than \$6 million has been used to upgrade or initiate vocational education facilities in the 29 counties of Appalachian North Carolina. Vocational training has been proven as one of best methods of learning a skill and earning a decent income, and such training has been heavily emphasized under the Appalachian Commission plan.

More than \$1.3 million has been obligated for land stabilization and erosion control projects, important elements in our quest for a high-quality environment.

An additional \$884,000 has been used in construction of sewage and water treatment plants in Appalachian North Carolina, and this too has been an important tool in building a better environment.

Another \$1.3 million in ARC funds was involved in various research programs, including transportation patterns, useful experiments in intergovernmental cooperation, manpower development, health delivery services, and other important ventures.

Finally, the Appalachian Commission funded more than \$42 million in North Carolina for construction of segments of the Appalachian development highway system, designed to link isolated areas with the Interstate Highway System, and thus, with the broadest avenues of national commerce and trade.

After only 6 years' involvement in such a massive venture as that undertaken by the Appalachian Regional Commission, it is hard to say how great an effect its existence has had or will have on the vast Appalachian region.

I believe the program has won the right to be continued for another 4 years, so that we may better see the results of the regional development concept, and so that we may hopefully see more fruits of a great labor.

I urge my colleagues to vote with me for passage of this extension legislation.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM—MEDICREDIT

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this body concerning legislation I cosponsored last week with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON), the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL), and others of this body to establish a national health insurance program called "medicredit."

I strongly support the provisions of this bill, which gives the assurance that no American family will have to suffer undue economic hardship as a result of illness and resulting medical expenses.

The legislation provides a sliding scale of Government assistance in paying for medical treatment, with the amount of assistance dependent on a client's ability to pay.

Under the guidelines of this legislation, the poor would pay nothing for their health insurance certificate, which would provide them with medical care at no personal cost. The well-to-do would pay the full amount, and those in between would pay what they could afford.

I cannot conceive of a fairer approach to the growing crisis in health care we are experiencing throughout the Nation today. And the most important feature of this legislation is the insurance that no American would have to bankrupt himself because of a long-lasting, catastrophic illness.

We all know of instances in which lingering or severe illness has depleted a family's life savings, sometimes to the point that the family can no longer provide for its other needs and becomes an unwilling burden on society.

This legislation can change all of that. For a family whose annual income is \$3,000 or less, practically any medical expense is more than they can afford, so catastrophic coverage for these families would begin without any prior payment by the individual.

By the same token, a family making \$8,000 a year could be expected to absorb up to \$500 in medical bills before qualifying, and a \$20,000-a-year family would be expected to pay up to \$2,750 in medical bills before their government coverage became involved.

I find this to be the most equitable system yet devised to make sure that every American can enjoy good health by being able to afford good health care. This legislation represents not an approach toward a welfare state, but a realistic approach to our national goal of providing adequate health care for every American, no matter what his station in life.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in seeking passage of this legislation.

NEELY ATKINSON IS WINNER IN VFW DEMOCRACY CONTEST

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, a young man in my congressional district, Mr. Neely Atkinson, has been named the winner for the State of Louisiana in the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual Voice of Democracy Contest. His winning essay was chosen from among more than 400,000 entries submitted on the theme, "Freedom—Our Heritage."

I am extremely proud of this young man as are his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Atkinson, 4602 Norway Drive, Shreveport, La.

I would like to take a minute to read his essay to you, because I am sure you will find it as much an inspiration as I have. It reads as follows:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

Our nation today is faced with problems greater than at any other time in our past. We must meet, and deal with, poverty, racism, pollution, overpopulation, and, above all, the threat of nuclear annihilation. Almost everyday, we hear of riots and violence on our campuses, supposedly in an attempt to help meet these problems. On the other hand, a large number of Americans remain either ignorant of these crises, or apathetic. Probably the single most important question any citizen of our nation today can ask it, "How, as a citizen, can I best help my country to meet these challenges?"

In order to answer this question, we must first answer two others. Firstly, "What is freedom?" and secondly, "How does that concept of freedom apply to me?"

What is freedom? Perhaps the best answer to that was given by the Greek philosopher Epictetus nearly 2,000 years ago. "He is free who lives as he chooses." Yes, this is the essence of freedom, to do what one wishes, and nothing one does not wish. Obviously, however, people being what they are, this is not a workable social structure. Some type of government is necessary. Man, therefore, developed the concept of democracy, under which the government draws its power solely from the will of the people. This is the system we live in today.

"How does that concept of freedom apply to me?" How do I support our democracy? It is one of the paradoxes of the universe that freedom never comes alone. It is always coupled with responsibility. In the words of Thomas Paine, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it." In other words, it is not only my right to attempt to correct the wrongs I see, it is my duty.

And that brings us back to the original question: Since it is my duty, how can I best aid my country in the years ahead? The answer is to be found, not in senseless anarchy or hopeless apathy, but within our present political structure. Political power is directly derived from the will of the majority, and it is therefore my duty to make as many people as possible aware of the threats we face. Then, and only then, will we be able to meet the challenge of tomorrow. Then, and only then, when every citizen accepts his responsibility and participates in our society to his fullest extent, can we be truly free.

THE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS UPON RECEIVING THE LEGION'S DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL FOR 1969

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a speech by the President of the United States.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker,

for the benefit of those Members who were unable to attend the dinner February 16 given by the national commander of the American Legion in honor of the Congress, I am placing in the RECORD the text of the remarks of President Nixon upon receiving the Legion's Distinguished Service Medal:

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT NIXON

Commander Chamie, my colleagues in the Congress, my comrades in the American Legion, and ladies and gentlemen, all of your guests:

I am very honored to receive this Distinguished Service Award of the American Legion. And in checking the records, I found that in the past 40 years, every President of the United States has received this award from the American Legion. [Laughter.]

That proves it's bipartisan. [Laughter.] But as I considered the fact that every President of the United States has had the high honor of receiving the Distinguished Service Award of the American Legion, I thought that the time had come for a President of the United States to, in effect, give a distinguished service commendation to the American Legion. And I welcome that opportunity to do so tonight.

As my long-time friend from California, Al Chamie, has already indicated, I am this year finishing my 25th year as a member of the American Legion. I am proud of that association.

I also am aware of the fact that in the past 2 years I think I have learned more deeply than I had ever understood before what the Legion means to America and what it can also mean to the Commander in Chief of our armed services in times of great difficulty.

I recall, for example, that when a great debate was raging in our country, a debate between honest men of differing views, as to what our defense forces should be and whether we should go forward on an antiballistic missile system for defense purposes, that the American Legion took the side of a strong national defense, as it always has. It was of assistance to the Commander in Chief who had made that difficult decision.

I recall on November the 3d, 1969, when I spoke to the Nation at a time when thousands of very honest people who disagreed with our national policy, who called for an immediate, precipitate withdrawal from Vietnam in a way that would have resulted in defeat for America and of all of our purposes in that part of the world—that at that time when I called for a just peace, for ending the war in a way that we would win the peace and not lose the peace, the American Legion stood firmly by the President of the United States.

And then I recall one of the more, shall I say, lonely times, and the office of the Presidency is not a lonely office—I can assure you that there's always somebody there ready to come in if you'll just open the door—but I remember it was lonely from the standpoint of public support, and I understood why.

On April 30th of last year, I had to make a difficult decision, a decision to move on the Communist outposts in Cambodia that were being used for the purpose of killing American men in Vietnam.

When I made that decision, there were those who honestly opposed it, and I respected them for that opposition. There were others who waited on the fence to see how it would come out. There were a few—a few who came in and said, "We support you."

I remember the Commander of the American Legion 4 days after the decision was made. He came to Washington, and that was as soon as he could get here. He came in to see me. He said to me very simply—Com-

mander Milton Patrick did—as I recall, something like this: He said, "Members of the American Legion, Mr. President, know what it means to look down the barrel of a gun, and we support the Commander in Chief in his efforts to see to it that the barrels of those guns in Cambodia are spiked so that they will not be killing our men in Vietnam."

And that kind of support at that time, which could have been delayed, which could have even been withheld, support that was given at a time when many were not sure as to how the operation would come out, was support that was most welcome to the President of the United States, I can assure you, clearly apart from the personalities involved, and support that I will always remember.

The fact that the operation did succeed; the fact that, as you know, our casualties since Cambodia have been reduced by two-thirds; that 100,000 Americans have come home since that time and are continuing to come home; the fact that as a result of that operation the South Vietnamese have developed the confidence and the ability that they now can undertake on the ground by themselves as far as the ground action is concerned in operation to cut the Communist supply line coming down the Ho Chi Minh Trail—all of this, it seems to me, indicates how the American Legion, in the person of its Commander, at a time when it would have been easy not to stand up, did stand up.

I am grateful for that, and I express my appreciation to all the members of the American Legion for that support in that period.

And now we are fortunate as we meet here tonight to be at a time when we can look at this very difficult war in Vietnam, when we can see that Americans are continuing to come home, when we can see the end of the American involvement in Vietnam, but an end of that involvement in a way that it will discourage that kind of war in the future and that it will allow the South Vietnamese to have the strength which they need to defend themselves and to give their people a chance to make their own choice with regard to the kind of government they want rather than to have that imposed upon them by force from the Communists in the North.

And as we look at that situation, the end of the longest war in America's history, and as we look at the time after that, I want to say to the members of the American Legion, to those representing, as you do, the leadership of this great organization throughout the country, that when we come into a period when, we trust, America will be at peace with all nations in the world, at peace not just for the next few years but perhaps for a whole generation, this is a time when it will be vitally important for the American Legion to continue to stand for the strong national defense for which it has always stood.

Let's look at the record: There are a few here who are veterans of World War I. All of you will remember that after World War I the United States became too weak and, as a result, the United States was unable to play the role, the peace-keeping role, which it could and should have played in that period between the two great wars.

We remember that after World War II the same thing happened, and the United States was unable to have the strength that it should have had at the time that the Korean War began.

And now we come to another period, a period when we will end a war, when we will be at peace with the rest of the world, and when the decision will have to be made by the American people as to whether we maintain the adequate national defense that we need.

I will simply say this: That until the United States obtains an arms control limitation between the two great superpowers, one that we can rely upon and that they

can rely upon, it is essential that the United States maintain an adequate armed force. We maintain that—[Applause].

And we must maintain that force not because we want war but because in the truest sense of the word in peacetime the Armed Forces of the United States all over this world are truly peace forces.

Let us remember whether it was World War I, whether it was World War II, whether it was Korea, or whether it was Vietnam, the United States has not started a war anywhere.

The United States has fought in defense of freedom and we must maintain those defense and free forces.

So, Commander Chamie, all of our distinguished guests this evening, I simply want you to know that having received this award as President of the United States, as a member of the American Legion and proud of that membership, I urge you to continue to support whoever is the President of the United States, whatever his party, in the cause of the United States maintaining the strength that we must maintain to play the role that must be played by the strongest free world nation if we're to have peace for the balance of this century. I believe we can do it and with your help we will do it.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO ASSIST THE STATES IN ALLEVIATING THE CRIME PROBLEM

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

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, today the President has made a proposal to the Congress to assist the States in their great burden of alleviating the crime problem throughout the country.

In the 90th Congress, we enacted legislation to create the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration within the Department of Justice. This important legislation has meant much to those responsible for law enforcement across the Nation. It has provided the means for States and local communities to receive funds for the formulation of comprehensive plans for attacking their problems, and for carrying out programs and projects outlined in those plans. We have, indeed, made real progress through this cooperative action.

Now we have been asked to go forward by enacting a plan for special revenue sharing for law enforcement purposes. This plan, while retaining the structure and many of the major aspects of LEAA, would amend the law to provide Federal funding for up to 100 percent of the costs of programs and projects to be carried out by the States and local governments. While each State would still be required to design plans for the use of Federal revenues, LEAA approval of the plans would not be a prerequisite for the receipt of funds.

I believe that the President's proposal is a significant one. It represents a changing concept of Federal-State cooperation that has been long awaited by many of us—Federal assistance without Federal domination. On February 4, when the President announced that his general revenue-sharing plan would be supplemented by sharing for special purposes, he stated:

There is too much to be done in America today for the Federal Government to try to do it all.

On the other hand, he recognized that financially, at least, it is very difficult for the States to carry out their responsibilities alone.

Certainly, in the area of crime prevention and control, the great responsibility is upon those units of government which can least support it financially. Therefore, it is fitting and it is encouraging that the President has made this a matter for special revenue sharing.

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BLOCK GRANTS AND SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let nobody else make the same mistake as a Washington Evening Star columnist—that there is no difference between block grants and special revenue sharing.

As President Nixon clearly spells out in his message received by the Congress today, there are vital and distinct ways in which special revenue sharing differs from block grants.

Special revenue sharing differs from block grants in that it would require no matching funds, no demonstration of maintenance of effort, and no prior project approval.

Special revenue-sharing proposals are not a threat to the adoption of general revenue sharing. Special revenue sharing fits in with the same philosophy in which general revenue sharing is rooted—that no program or project strings will govern the use of revenue-sharing funds.

Special revenue-sharing funds would be spent under six broad headings—law enforcement, manpower training, urban development, rural development, transportation, and education. State and local governments would enjoy great freedom and flexibility with the use of funds allocated for those general purposes.

The Nation has reached a critical juncture in the development of our federal system.

Revenue sharing—general and special—represents an historic opportunity to restore fiscal balance to the system and to markedly strengthen State and local government. It is an act of faith in the local political process. It is sorely needed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS), to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. POFF, today, for 10 minutes.
- Mr. PRICE of Texas, today, for 10 minutes.
- Mr. MICHEL, today, for 3 minutes.
- Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, today, for 3 minutes.
- Mr. KEMP, on March 9, for 1 hour.
- Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

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

- Mr. MITCHELL, today, for 10 minutes.
- Mr. RARICK, today, for 15 minutes.
- Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

- Mr. CORBETT and to include a newspaper article.
- Mr. HOLIFIELD in five instances and to include extraneous matter.
- Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. BOLLING).

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

- Mr. FOLEY.
- Mr. EDWARDS of California.
- Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in four instances.
- Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
- Mr. PEPPER.
- Mr. MOLLOHAN in five instances.
- Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.
- Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.
- Mr. ROBINO in four instances.
- Mr. RARICK in three instances.
- Mr. PICKLE.
- Mr. JOHNSON of California.
- Mr. FLOOD.
- Mr. POBELL.
- Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.
- Mr. PATMAN.
- Mr. JACOBS in three instances.
- Mr. NIX.
- Mr. FOUNTAIN.
- Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
- Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in four instances.

- Mr. ROONEY of New York.
- Mr. CABELL in two instances.
- Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

- Mr. WOLFF in two instances.
- Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.
- Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.
- Mr. GONZALEZ.
- Mr. GALLAGHER.
- Mr. SARBANES.
- Mr. HAGAN.
- Mr. ROUSH in three instances.

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

- Mr. SPRINGER.
- Mr. ZION.
- Mr. BROWN of Ohio in two instances.
- Mr. PRICE of Texas in three instances.
- Mr. KEATING.
- Mr. HALPERN.
- Mr. BAKER.
- Mr. McKEVITT.

- Mr. ZWACH.
- Mr. WIGGINS
- Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
- Mr. BROTZMAN.
- Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
- Mr. LUJAN.
- Mr. HALL.
- Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.
- Mr. BLACKBURN.
- Mr. SNYDER in two instances.
- Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in four instances.
- Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.
- Mr. WHITEHURST.
- Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
- Mr. LANDGREBE.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1970, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C. February 25, 1971.
HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The following information is submitted pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-804, approved August 28, 1958, and to the implementing instructions as contained in the Federal Procurement Regulations 1-17,000 which establishes regulations for entering into and amending or modifying contracts to facilitate the national defense under the extraordinary emergency authority granted by this Act.

The Act provides that each agency shall, by March 15 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of all actions taken under the authority of the Act during the preceding calendar year. For the calendar year ending December 31, 1970, the Atomic Energy Commission took the following actions under the subject Act.

ACTIONS APPROVED

(1) Authorized the modification of a prime contract to correct a mutual mistake as to a material fact. As a result of this modification, a subcontract termination claim was settled for \$7,000.

(2) A Determination dated October 12, 1970, was issued for the Nevada Test Site (NTS) (including Nuclear Rocket Development Station (NRDS) Nevada and Tonopah Test Range (TTR)), and provides that a clause be included in all AEC contracts, and subcontracts thereunder, which are made subject to the Davis-Bacon Act at NTS-NRDS-TTR requiring the contractors and subcontractors thereunder to adhere to the money provisions of labor agreements between Reynolds Electrical and Engineering Co., Inc. and Catalytic, Inc., and various construction crafts in the Nevada area. Such a requirement is deemed to promote labor stability, efficiency, and economy in the performance of contracts and subcontracts at the sites which directly affect the national defense and security.

In addition to this Determination, there are currently in effect two similar determi-

nations covering (1) drilling work and (2) tunnel and tunnel shaft construction at NTS-NRDS-TTR. Both of these determinations were issued in July 1968.

Sincerely,

E. J. BLOCH,
Deputy General Manager.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

341. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure of the United States District Courts, to the Rules of Criminal Procedure of the United States District Courts, and to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, adopted by the U.S. Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 and 2075 and 18 U.S.C. 3771 and 3772; and the report of the Judicial Conference of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331 (H. Doc. No. 92-57); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

342. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the number of members of the Armed Forces authorized to receive special pay for duty subject to hostile fire during calendar year 1970, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 310; to the Committee on Armed Services.

343. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the number of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps above the grade of lieutenant commander or major, by grade and age group, entitled to receive incentive pay under 37 U.S.C. 301(a) (1), and the average monthly incentive pay authorized for those officers during the 6 months ended March 1, 1971, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 301(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

344. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone and President of the Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company for calendar year 1970, pursuant to 63 Stat. 398; to the Committee on Government Operations.

345. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

346. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

347. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the U.S. Government Printing Office for fiscal year 1970, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 309; to the Committee on Government Operations.

348. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that substantial improvements are needed in the financial management of the Virgin Islands government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABOUREZK:

H.R. 5327. 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. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5328. A bill; Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 5329. A bill relating to the construction, rehabilitation, operation, and maintenance of Indian irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5330. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1932, relating to the cancellation of debts owed by Indians and Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5331. A bill to repeal a statute relating to the supervision of blacksmiths, mechanics, teachers, farmers, and other persons employed on Indian reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5332. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5333. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 5334. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to continue a program of research, development, and demonstration of processes for the conversion of saline and other chemically contaminated water for beneficial use and for the treatment of saline and other chemically contaminated waste water to maintain or improve the quality of natural waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. BARING, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 5335. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry on public, Indian, and other lands within the United States and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of industry and national defense; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 5336. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. BROTZMAN, and Mr. McKEVITT):

H.R. 5337. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the closed basin division, San Luis Valley project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5338. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5339. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. WYATT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 5340. A bill to incorporate the Navy Wives Clubs of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 5341. A bill to provide for the pro-

urement of voluntary military manpower; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 5342. A bill to authorize insurance in connection with loans to finance improvements to mobile homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 5343. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5344. A bill to make it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duties when the offender travels in interstate commerce or uses any facility of interstate commerce for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5345. 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.

H.R. 5346. A bill to prohibit common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5347. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to establish a method for settling labor disputes in transportation industries subject to that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 5348. 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. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 5349. 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. 5350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax-exempt status of, and the deductibility of contributions to, certain private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5351. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

H.R. 5352. A bill to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 5353. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5354. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the exemption of certain persons from the limitations on the right to receive compensation for injuries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5355. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional preference to veterans with service-connected disabilities for purposes of retention in reductions in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5356. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Gov-

ernment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GUDE, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.R. 5357. 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. KEE (for himself, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GRAY, Mr. NIX, Mr. YATRON, Mr. DENT, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HAYS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. EDMONDSON, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 5358. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide medicare benefits (financed from general revenues) for disabled coal miners without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 5359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for dependents, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCLURE:

H.R. 5360. A bill to prohibit the manufacture or importation of coin replicas unless such replicas are manufactured in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5361. A bill to prohibit the alteration of coins in use and circulation for any purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself and Mr. SHOUP):

H.R. 5362. A bill to provide for division and for the disposition of the funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., and the Gros Ventre Tribe of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 279-A, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 5363. A bill to facilitate the transportation of cargo by barges specifically designed for carriage aboard a vessel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5364. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 5365. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5366. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in San Bernardino County in the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 5367. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 5368. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices, condemned by that act to consumers

through civil actions, and to provide for class actions for acts in fraud of consumers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5369. 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. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 5370. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5371. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 5372. A bill to amend section 5042(a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals who are not heads of families to produce wine for personal consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend section 1402 (a) of title 10, United States Code, to revise the rule for recomputation of retired or retainer pay to reflect later active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 5374. A bill to provide for appropriation of civil supersonic transport program termination costs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARING (for himself, Mr. SAYLOB, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. HALEY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 5375. A bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DORN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. KEE, Mr. ROE, and Mr. McFALL):

H.R. 5376. A bill to extend the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 5377. A bill to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the transportation industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 5378. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Big Thicket National Monument in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CELLER, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. KOCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. Dow):

H.R. 5379. A bill to place the various public assistance programs contained in the Social Security Act on a fully federalized basis so that they will be carried out in accordance with federally prescribed regulations and financed entirely with Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 5380. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 in order to make members of the Reserve and National Guard

ordered to active duty for training for periods of 30 days or more eligible for quarters allowances and to make allotments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5381. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration hospital in the Halifax area of Volusia County, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5382. 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. DINGELL:

H.R. 5383. A bill to establish a system for the distribution of certain Federal tax revenues to the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H.R. 5384. A bill to provide reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen, as well as allied sport fishing camps, as a result of restrictions imposed by a State or the Federal Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 5385. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prescribe health care cost-sharing arrangements for certain surviving dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 5386. A bill to authorize payment of \$25,000 reward for information which leads to the apprehension and conviction of the person or persons responsible for a bomb explosion in the U.S. Capitol Building on March 1, 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to preserve in certain cases the preference in employment and retention in the competitive service for remarried widows of certain veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 5388. A bill to control the generation and transmission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 5389. A bill to assure protection of environmental values while facilitating construction of needed electric power supply facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 5390. A bill to amend, the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5391. A bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the major ethnic groups in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5392. A bill to authorize a program to develop and demonstrate low-cost means of preventing shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself and Mr. McCORMACK):

H.R. 5393. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5394. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life of the Honorable Sam Rayburn and to assist in the support of the Sam Rayburn Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 5395. A bill to revise the eligibility criteria governing the payment of unemployment compensation based on Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 5396. A bill to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue of the Federal Government and to authorize Federal collection of State income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 5397. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5398. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide a penalty for persons who interfere with the conduct of judicial proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5399. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next of kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5400. A bill to restrict travel in violation of area restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5401. A bill to prohibit the use of channels of interstate or foreign commerce, including the mails, for the distribution of certain material which is harmful to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALFE:

H.R. 5402. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5403. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5404. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States a condition in a deed conveying certain lands to the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 5405. A bill to provide for the conveyance of retained mineral rights by the United States to private surface landowners who acquired their land from a Federal Land Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself and Mr. McEWEN):

H.R. 5406. A bill to provide for fiscal responsibility through the establishment of a limitation on budget expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELLY (by request):

H.R. 5407. A bill to provide members of the Colville Confederated Tribes with full citizenship and to provide for vesting each

tribal member with his equal cash share representing his equity in all reservation assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. McKEVITT):

H.R. 5408. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5409. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a survivor benefit plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 5410. A bill to provide for the humane disposition of military dogs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 5411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 5412. A bill to make available to certain organized tribes, bands, or groups of Indians residing on Indian reservations established under State law certain benefits, care, or assistance for which federally recognized Indian tribes qualify as recipients; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5413. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide refunds in the case of certain uses of tread rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. WYATT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.J. Res. 422. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of June 3 as "National Navy Wives Clubs of America Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 423. Joint resolution to provide for the resumption of trade with Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 424. 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. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.J. Res. 425. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of voluntary prayer or meditation in public schools and other public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 426. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 427. Joint resolution to provide for the flag of the United States of America to be displayed in schoolrooms and near every schoolhouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 428. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as

the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.J. Res. 429. 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. MINSHALL:

H.J. Res. 430. Joint resolution to establish a Special Joint Committee on the Security of the Capitol Building and of the Senate and House of Representatives Office Buildings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution regarding the powers of the Congress and the President to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 432. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.J. Res. 433. 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. GUDE:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the continued operation of Public Health Service facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. BOLAND):

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on the expanded use of the Model Cities program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 265. Resolution to limit the number of U.S. troops committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 266. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to abolish joint sponsorship of bills, memorials, or resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 267. Resolution calling for the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag by all teachers and pupils in elementary and secondary schools in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. Res. 268. Resolution condemning the persecution of any persons because of their religion in the Soviet Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 269. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Investigation of Pornographic Enterprises; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H. Res. 270. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to an international compact regarding the safety of persons entitled to diplomatic immunity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 5415. A bill for the relief of Mohinder Pal Singh Gill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 5416. A bill for the relief of Ossie Emmons and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 5417. A bill for the relief of Paulina Bustamante Bognot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5418. A bill for the relief of Fausto Pitetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5419. A bill for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5420. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5421. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5422. A bill for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 5423. A bill for the relief of Ghan Tehranchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Shirley C. Thorne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 5425. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Albert C. Omer, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 5426. A bill for the relief of Piedad V. Montesdeoca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 5427. A bill for the relief of Henry L. Trombley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5428. A bill for the relief of Boulos Stephan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 5429. A bill for the relief of Darrell G. Goodfellow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 5430. A bill for the relief of Pasqua Spedicali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 5431. A bill for the relief of Peltro Bracciale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

38. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of amending the U.S. Constitution relating to the sharing by State and local governments of revenues received by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to increasing certain social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

40. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a national health insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

37. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Phillip B. Anderson, Menard, Ill., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.