

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 17), 1971:

## U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Robert V. Denney, of Nebraska, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Nebraska.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

H. Brooks Phillips of Mississippi to be U.S. marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of 4 years.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 4, 1971

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

*And you shall do what is right and good in the sight of the Lord, that it may go well with thee.* Deuteronomy 6: 18.

Eternal God, who art the author of life and the companion of our pilgrim ways, awaken within us the realization that Thou art ever with us, that Thou hast a purpose for each one, and that life consists in finding Thee and in walking with Thee in Thy way. Before Thee we stand seeking guidance for this day, wisdom to make wise decisions, and strength with which to serve our people as best we can.

We commend our Nation to Thee. Bless all who govern that they may lead our people in the paths of peace, freedom, and good will. Bless all who are governed that, following wise leadership, they may not shrink from the disciplines that accompany liberty. Remove from us all narrowness and all pettiness that in a passion for what is right and good for all we may keep ourselves dedicated to Thee and to our beloved country. Bless our returning Congressmen and may our fellowship be an experience of abounding joy.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## THE LOW AND HIGH INTEREST FORCES ARE NOW ON PUBLIC RECORD

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last November, the Republican Party spent lots of campaign funds trying to convince the American people that they were not the high-interest-rate party.

Yesterday, we had a vote—the first recorded teller vote—and the high interest forces were plainly separated from the low interest group in the House. The vote was on a motion to strike section 3 of H.R. 4690—a bill which

allows the Treasury Department to market \$10 billion of long-term Government obligations without regard to the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling. For all intents and purposes, this was a backdoor scheme to destroy congressional control over interest rates and to reimpose a high interest policy on the American people.

On the vote to strike this provision—and thus retain the 4¼-percent ceiling—the low-interest forces lost on a 212-to-180 vote.

Of the Republicans voting, 91 percent voted on the high interest side of this issue. On the other side, 73 percent of the Democrats voted to retain the 4¼-percent ceiling. They voted for low interest rates.

Of the 212 Members on the high interest side of this issue, there were 151 Republicans and only 61 Democrats. Voting for low interest were 166 Democrats and 14 Republicans. Only 9 percent of the Republicans cast a vote for low interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Democratic leadership and the solid group of Democrats that stood with their party on this issue yesterday. We have not heard the end of this issue and we now have 180 Members who are willing to resist the pressures that are always present when this House tries to defend the public interest on monetary policy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the news media will carry out the full purpose of the recorded teller vote and publish the results so that the public may make their own judgments.

## SOVIET JEWS RELIEF ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Soviet Jews Relief Act of 1971.

This is a simple bill, but behind it stands a noble American principle—that this Nation has always been and should always remain a haven for the oppressed of other lands. The bill authorizes 30,000 special visas outside the regular immigration quota system for Soviet Jews who are permitted to leave the Soviet Union and wish to come to this country.

Up through the earlier part of this century, the United States had no restrictions on immigration, and every schoolchild can recite the successive waves of persecuted minorities who sought our shores and enriched our national life—Pilgrims, Huguenots, Catholics, Quakers, Germans, Italians, Irish, Slavs, and so many other national groups. Even with our immigration laws we have, to our credit, preserved this tradition. Special legislation permitted

more than 30,000 Hungarian refugees to settle here after the suppression of their 1956 revolution. Similarly since 1968 over 10,000 Czechoslovakian refugees were assisted in coming to the United States. It should be remembered that more than 565,000 Cubans have made the United States their new home through exemptions from the immigration laws.

I think it is important to enact a bill for the relief of Soviet Jews at this time, even though I recognize that they may be prevented from availing themselves of it. Soviet leaders, and the Jews behind their guarded borders, must be told that Americans of all faiths, acting through their elected Congress, deplore Soviet treatment of a proud minority and will make them welcome here. Enactment of this bill, then, is both a real invitation and an expression of conscience. And in a real sense it is a challenge to the Soviet Union to open wide her doors and permit the Jews who are vilified there to leave. It will contrast sharply with the neglect of the Jews by mankind 30 years ago when so many countries, ours included, refused sanctuary to many of those Jews who escaped or would have been permitted to leave Nazi Germany through negotiations had visas been available.

The adoption of this bill will be more than just an American gesture. I hope it will spark men in other nations—Great Britain, France, Italy, Australia, and for reasons of history, West Germany—to enact similar legislation. Such a worldwide movement will have practical value in encouraging the Soviet Union to permit Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union of those Jews who wish to leave and the symbolic value of this offer of sanctuary will hopefully not go unheeded in Moscow.

The special refugee quota of 10,200 available under present law for refugees from the Eastern Hemisphere has been oversubscribed for the past 2 years and would not meet the need if the Soviet Union were to open her doors and permit the emigration of Soviet Jews on any modest scale.

Of course many Soviet Jews who are permitted to leave will choose to go to Israel. This will be their choice but the enactment of this bill at this crucial time will remain always an act of American generosity in a time of need.

## JAPANESE LOBBY

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the powerful Japanese textile industry and its Washington lobby obviously are calling the tune in textile import negotiations. Mr. Speaker, the American textile indus-

try and its 2½ million employees deserve from our Government the same consideration as the Japanese lobby receives. We are only seeking equal treatment and "equal time."

During consideration of the textile quota bill in the last Congress we were subjected to a barrage of propaganda and misleading statements from the Japanese Washington lobby. They opposed legislation at every turn. Finally, the House passed the legislation over their powerful opposition. But when legislation was again introduced on January 22, they quickly followed with phony proposals to again undermine negotiations and forestall the legislation. The Japanese textile industry controls the Japanese Government on this issue. The Japanese negotiators and the Japanese Government act merely as spokesmen for the industry. Furthermore, the Japanese Government is actually in partnership with their textile industry. Their Government will cover losses sustained in penetrating foreign markets and will guarantee the availability of venture capital. The American textile community and its employees justifiably demand an ironclad agreement which contains ceilings on imports of specific categories instead of the absurd voluntary limitation offered by the Japanese lobby. The best possible solution, however, remains the fair and mutually advantageous Mills trade bill which is now before the Ways and Means Committee.

#### SANITATION STANDARDS NEEDED FOR FOREIGN DAIRY PRODUCTS

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill in this House today which will provide for the inspection of imported dairy products and require such products to meet certain minimum standards for quality and wholesomeness.

I am doing so both to protect the consumer from foreign food products which have not been manufactured with the same care as that taken by American producers of similar products, and to make foreign producers share the burden of American dairy producers who must comply with tough domestic sanitation standards.

Figures from the Food and Drug Administration have indicated that almost 10 percent of the dairy products imported into this country are rejected because they are contaminated or otherwise unfit for consumption. Even more frightening is the fact that often less than 10 percent of all incoming foreign dairy products are inspected at all, leaving a great quantity of potentially inferior or dangerous products available to the American consumer.

Two examples of contaminated shipments, which have been blocked by the Food and Drug Administration, help us to appreciate the full impact of these figures. A shipment of cheese from West Germany, for example, was detained for

containing such unappetizing contaminants as insect larva. Another shipment, this one from France, was detained because it contained benzene hexachloride, an unsafe chemical substance.

American manufacturers of dairy products are compelled by law to meet certain standards set by the Department of Agriculture concerning levels of pesticide residue, and other health hazards. It seems quite unfair, therefore, that foreign producers are allowed to send inferior and possibly dangerous products to this country, while our own manufacturers are subject to penalties for even the slightest overstep of the required standards.

The fact remains, therefore, that unless this country imposes standards on foreign dairy products entering our ports which are at least as stringent as those imposed on American products, there will continue to exist a potential danger to the health of the American people. And the importance of standards for imported products is certainly increased with the realization that dairy imports on a milk equivalent basis have increased from 923 million pounds to 1.9 billion pounds in the last 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we enact legislation which will alleviate the financial burden now on our farmers and processors because they are required to spend and invest many thousands of dollars for equipment and buildings in order to meet the rigid requirements of Federal, State, and local health standards.

Dairy farmers, for example, make investments worth thousands of dollars in pipeline milkers, bulk tanks, coolers, and milkhouses. In addition to this large investment in their milking systems, farmers and processors pay thousands of dollars annually for inspections of these systems to make sure they meet State, local, and Federal sanitation standards. We have no assurance at all that producers of dairy products in other countries operate their facilities under comparable sanitary conditions.

The bill I am proposing today will give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to set standards for imported products for which no Federal standards have been established. Also in my bill is a provision which gives the Secretary the authority to require the destruction of dairy products refused admission to this country unless the dairy products in question are sent back or brought into compliance with the Secretary's regulations within a specified period of time.

I think it is time for this country to strengthen its protection of the American consumer and the American dairy producer by strengthening its regulations on foreign dairy products, certainly as long as we require our own manufacturers to meet stringent regulations.

In addition to regulations for domestic trade, our country has kept stringent quality control programs for all American dairy products, designated for export under governmental supported export programs. This Nation then, in its various food aid programs, has been protecting the health of the Nation to which these products have been sent. Unfor-

tunately, other countries have not been applying the same safeguards to the products which they send to this country. And this has to change.

I submit a copy of the bill to be placed in the RECORD, and a partial list of seizures of foreign dairy products by the Food and Drug Administration last year:

H.R. 5642

A bill to protect the public health and welfare by providing for the inspection of imported dairy products and by requiring that such products comply with certain minimum standards for quality and wholesomeness

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

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other business unit.

(3) The terms "dairy products" and "milk products" mean those food products derived from milk, including milk, such as butter; cheese (whether natural or processed); dry, evaporated, stabilized, condensed, or otherwise processed milk, cream, whey, and buttermilk; edible casein; frozen desserts; and any other food product which is prepared in whole or in part from any of the aforesaid products as the Secretary may hereafter designate.

(4) The term "wholesome" means sound, healthful, clean, and otherwise fit for human food.

(5) The term "labeling" means labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter on or attached to the container of any dairy product.

(6) The term "purity" means free from poisonous or deleterious substances which may render the product injurious to health.

(7) The term "quality" means the minimum quality standards defined by the Secretary in accordance with this Act.

(8) The term "administration and supervision" means the administrative review of foreign country laws, regulations, and enforcement procedures offered as being comparable to United States laws, regulations, and enforcement procedures, under the provisions of this Act, and the supervision of inspection personnel both here and abroad.

(9) The term "inspection" means the official service rendered by the Department of Agriculture, under the administration and supervision of the Secretary, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) No dairy product shall be imported into the United States unless it has been inspected and found to be wholesome and unless the foreign farms and plants in which such products were produced, manufactured, or processed comply with all the inspection, grading, and other standards prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(b) The standards established by the Secretary for any imported dairy product and for the establishments in which such imported dairy product is produced, manufactured, or processed shall be comparable to those standards prescribed by the Secretary for the same kind of dairy product produced, manufactured, or processed in the United States and for establishments in the United States in which the same kind of product is produced, manufactured, or processed whenever the Secretary, in connection with any dairy product program carried out by the Department of Agriculture has established standards for such product and for the establishments in which such product is produced, manufactured, or processed. The Secretary

shall establish standards with respect to those kinds of imported dairy products (and the establishments in which they are produced, manufactured, or processed) for which no Federal standards have been established, and such standards shall be equivalent to those standards heretofore established for other kinds of dairy products and the establishments in which such other kinds of dairy products are produced, manufactured, or processed.

(c) The labeling of imported dairy products shall comply with the requirements of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act and shall be otherwise marked as the Secretary may require.

Sec. 4. (a) For the purpose of establishing comparable inspection requirements and preventing the importation of dairy products produced, manufactured, or processed in foreign dairy farms or plants not approved for inspection by the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary shall, where and to the extent necessary, require such products to be accompanied by a certificate of compliance issued by the exporting country in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary establishing minimum standards as to the quality of the milk, farms and plant facilities, equipment, and procedures used in the production, manufacture, and processing of such products.

(b) The Secretary shall cause to be in-

spected, in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, all dairy products imported into the United States.

Sec. 5. (a) All imported dairy products shall, after entry into the United States, be subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and other Acts providing for the inspection, testing, or grading of dairy products to insure their purity and to insure that they are wholesome in the same manner and to the same extent as if such products were produced in the United States.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act, and such rules and regulations shall provide for the destruction of dairy products offered for entry and refused admission into the United States, unless such dairy products are reexported or brought into compliance within the time fixed therefor in such rules and regulations.

(c) All charges for storage, cartage, and labor with respect to any article which is imported contrary to this Act shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against such article and any other article thereafter imported under this Act by or for such owner or consignee.

Sec. 6. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary may cooperate with foreign governments, other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and

with appropriate State agencies, and may conduct such examinations, investigations, and inspections as he determines necessary or appropriate through any officer or employee of the United States, of any State, or of any foreign government, who is licensed by the Secretary for such purpose.

Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary may prescribe such assessments and collect such fees as he determines necessary to cover the cost of the inspection services rendered under the provisions of this Act.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the cost of administering and supervising the provisions of this Act shall be borne by the United States.

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the administration and supervision of the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 9. Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 and imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 10. If any provisions of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 11. This Act shall take effect one hundred and eighty days after enactment.

## FDA SEIZURES IN 1970

Sample No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date, 1970
B7270	Cheese, 250 loaves	Italy	Ditta Brunelli Remo, Roma	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 22
B7235	Cheese, 75 ctns.	do	F. Noordhoek & Zoon Bodegraven, Netherlands	do	do	Jan. 6
BU6673	Cheese, Asiago, 5,775 lbs.	United States	National Cheese, Ltd., Maple, Ontario, Canada	Insect infested	Buffalo, N.Y.	Jan. 28
SE8840	Cheese, Blue, 1,246 lbs.	Norway	Norwegian Dairies Sales Association, Kristiansand	Mandatory labeling omitted	Seattle, Wash.	Jan. 14
B7222	Cheese, Camembert, 900 ctns.	France	Fromageries Gerard, Le Tholy, Vosges	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 7
B7238	Cheese, Camembert, 160 ctns.	do	do	do	do	Jan. 16
LA17034	Cheese, Camembert, and Brie, 25 cs.	do	Societe Auxiliaire de L'Agriculture, Paris	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Jan. 15
BA3923	Cheese, Gouda Spiced, 3,612 lbs.	Netherlands	De Louvers, N. V., Rotterdam	Inaccurate contents statement	Baltimore, Md.	Jan. 8
NY90357	Cheese, Kasserli Kashkaval, 6,349 lbs.	Yugoslavia	Agroexport, Export-Import, M. Tita, Beograd	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Jan. 16
NY90114	Cheese, Parmesano, 1,856 lbs.	Italy	Unione Casearia Italiana, Milano	do	do	Jan. 8
B7247	Cheese, Parmigiano Reggiano, 50 ctns.	do	Ditta Filii Perciu, Genoa	do	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 12
SF7877	Cheese, Parmigiano Reggiano, 5,780 lbs.	do	Fanticini, Reggih nell'Emilia	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Jan. 7
B7241	Cheese, Parmigiano Reggiano, 2,980 lbs.	do	Ditta Filii Perciu, Genoa	do	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 8
B7234	Cheese, Pecorino, 100 loaves	do	F. Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands	do	do	Jan. 6
NY90112	Cheese, Pecorino, 21,091 lbs.	do	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milano	do	New York, N.Y.	Jan. 8
NY90492	Cheese, Pecorino, 6,411 lbs.	do	P. Tonda Bureos, Sassari, Porto Torres	do	do	Jan. 22
LA16827	Cheese, Pecorino, 50 ctns.	Yugoslavia	Agroexport, Export-Import, M. Tita, Beograd	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Jan. (2)
NY90502	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 15,995 lbs.	Italy	B.D.R., S.P.A., Roma	do	New York, N.Y.	Jan. 22
NY90293	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 11,218 lbs.	do	Ditta Fratelli Perico Fu Sebastiano, Ozieri	do	do	Jan. 13
NY90493	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 11,692 lbs.	do	F. Noordhoek & Bodegraven, Netherlands	do	do	Jan. 21
NY90494	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 17,133 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
B7279	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 100 loaves	do	do	do	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 29
P6466	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 15,576 lbs.	do	Locatelli, S. P. A., Milano	do	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 8
NY90483	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 7,278 lbs.	do	M. Di Trani, Macomer	do	New York, N.Y.	Jan. 22
B7265	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 23,100 lbs.	do	Prodotti Caesari Filii Pina, Thiesi	do	Boston, Mass.	Do.
P6467	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 2,482 lbs.	do	Unione Caseari Esportatori, Milano	do	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 8
P6468	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 2,551 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
P6470	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 2,260 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
P6471	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 2,590 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
NY90219	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano Sardo, 5,543 lbs.	do	Rodolfo Ronconi, S. P. I. Nepi	do	New York, N.Y.	Jan. 20
AT7115	Cheese, Provolone, 70 ctns.	do	Giovanni G. C. Carobonelli, Cremons	do	Miami, Fla.	Jan. 14
LA16763	Cheese, Provolone, 15 cs.	do	Societe Cooperative R. L. Latteria Soresinese, Soresina	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	(1)
B7280	Cheese, Sardo, 2,100 lbs.	Argentina	S. A. Victoria Y Esteban de Lorenzi, Ltd., Buenos Aires	do	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 29
	Cheese, 8,100 lbs.	Italy	B. D. R. Industrie Casearie E Agricole, S.A., Rome	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Feb. 13
	Cheese, 246 ctns.	Netherlands	J. N. Bakker Kaasexport, Koogaan de Zaan	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Jan. 28
	Cheese, Grana, 3,074 lbs.	Italy	Ziliotti DeMetrio & Figli, Parma	Contains unsafe food additives, Benzene Hexachloride, Dieldrin and DDT.	New York, N.Y.	Feb. 10
	Cheese, Hallouni, 2,190 lbs.	Greece	George L. Theodruan Aradippon, Cyprus	Contains an unsafe food additive, Benzene Hexachloride.	do	Jan. 29
	Cheese, Parmesan, 11,754 lbs.	Italy	Ditta Adeudato Ferrari, Porto Torres	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride and dieldrin.	do	Feb. 10

Footnote at end of table.

Sample No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date, 1970
B7280	Cheese, Pecorino, 31,595 lbs.	Italy	Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 18
	Cheese, Pecorino, Pepato, Manca, 8,385 lbs.	do	Manca Musinu Thiesi, Porto Torres	do	New York, N.Y.	Feb. 10
	Cheese, Pecorino, Romano, 5,915 lbs.	do	Ditta Fratelli Pericu Fu Sebastiano, Ozieri Porto Torres	do	do	Feb. 6
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 42,279 lbs.	do	Hochland-Kasewerk, Allgau, West Germany	do	do	Feb. 18
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 41,364 lbs.	do	Remo Brunelli, Rome	do	Utica, N.Y.	Feb. 4
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 4,824 lbs.	do	R. Ronconi, Nepi	do	New York, N.Y.	Do.
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano Sardo, 200 cs.	do	Hochland-Summer & Co., Allgau	do	do	Feb. 19
	Cheese, Provolone, 4,738 lbs.	do	Latteria Soresinese Lombardia, Genoa	Contains an unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and hexachlorobenzene	do	Jan. 29
	Cheese, Provolone, 3,413 lbs.	do	do	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Do.
	Cheese, Romano, 13,461 lbs.	Netherlands	Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Rotterdam	do	do	Feb. 10
	Cheese spread, 30 cs.	France	Etablissement Avinel, Chalons-sur-Marne	do	do	Feb. 11
	Cream Cheese, Bavarian and Delicado, 15 ctns.	West Germany	Milch-Fett-und Eier-Kontor, G. M. B. H., Hamburg	Contains an unsafe food additive, inaccurate contents statement.	Seattle, Wash.	Do.
	Cheese, 92 ctns.	France	Entremont, S.A., Balmettes	Contains an unsafe food additive, Benzene Hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif.	Mar. 17
	Cheese, Belletoile, 204 lbs.	do	Leon Loeuenbruck, Meuse	do	New York, N.Y.	Feb. 20
	Cheese, Brie, 2,585 lbs.	do	U.P.P.L.A., Paris	do	do	Feb. 19
	Cheese: Caerphilly, Leicester, Cheshire, Wensleydale, 49 ctns.	England	Crowson & Son, Ltd., London	Decomposed	Los Angeles, Calif.	Mar. 4
	Cheese, Camembert, 3,646 lbs.	France	Etablissements Avenel, Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Mar. 2
	Cheese: Camembert Bonbray, Valdieue and Belletoile, 696 pkgs.	do	Paul Renard Le Havre	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Mar. 26
	Cheese, Feta, 200 cs.	Hungary	Terimpex Exporters and Importers, Budapest	do	New York, N.Y.	Feb. 19
	Cheese, Feta and Kashkaval, 29,982 lbs.	do	H. C. Hertwig, Coyana	do	do	do.
	Cheese, Feta and Kashkaval, 31,419 lbs.	do	Terimpex Exporters and Importers, Budapest	do	do	Mar. 4
	Cheese, Fromage A. Tartiner, 15 ctns.	France	Anco France, S.A., Le Havre	do	do	Mar. 13
	Cheese, Grana, 60 loaves	Italy	Ditta Michael Tavella, Cremona	do	Boston, Mass.	Mar. 27
	Cheese, Kashkaval, 22,348 lbs.	Yugoslavia	Stokapromet, Skopje	Contains an unsafe food additive, lindane.	New York, N.Y.	Mar. 24
	Cheese: La Pet te and Supreme, 45 ctns.	France	Paul Renard, Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles Calif.	Mar. 30
	Cheese, Monrovian and Emmenthaler, 8,816 lbs.	Czechoslovakia	Origina P zza Crust Co. of Canada, Ltd., Cooksville, Ontario, Canada.	Mandatory labeling omitted.	New York N.Y.	Mar. 19
	Cheese, Montasio, 13,410 lbs.	Italy and Belgium	Fa. D. M. Vonk & Zoon, Rotterdam, Netherlands	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Feb. 20
	Cheese, Nec Plus Ultra, 775 lbs.	France	Union De Producteurs En Produits Laitiero & Avicoles, Paris.	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Pecorino Pepato, 4,268 lbs.	Italy	Filli Manca Musinu, Thiesi	do	do	Mar. 4
	Cheese, Pecorino Pepato, 11,072 lbs.	do	Musco & Co., Santo Stefano Camastra	do	do	Mar. 23
	Cheese, Pecorino Ricotta, 8,288 lbs.	Rumania	Prodelexport, Bucharest	do	do	Feb. 19
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 7,275 lbs.	Italy	Ditta Fratelli Gorididi, Olbia	do	do	Mar. 19
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 13,715 lbs.	do	Ditta M. Di Trani, Macomer	do	do	Feb. 27
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 8,340 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Mar. 4
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 7,065 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 200 loaves	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 4,042 lbs.	do	Fa. D. M. Vonk & Zoon, Rotterdam, Netherlands	do	Boston, Mass.	Mar. 12
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano 75 ctns.	do	F illi Manca Musinu, Thiesi	do	New York, N.Y.	Mar. 4
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 17,471 lbs.	do	Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands	do	do	Mar. 19
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 22,254 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Mar. 13
	Cheese, Pecor no Romano, 12,654 lbs.	do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa.	Mar. 16
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 5,011 lbs.	do	Unione Caseari Esportator., Milano	do	do	Mar. 27
	Cheese, Pecorino Sardo, 18,925 lbs.	do	Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands	do	New York, N.Y.	Mar. 5
	Cheese, Picollo Asiago, 1,104 lbs.	do	Fa. D. M. Vonk & Sons, Stolwijk, Netherlands	do	do	Mar. 23
	Cheese, Provolone, 962 lbs.	do	Liap Zazzera, S.P.A., Rottofreno	do	do	Mar. 17
	Cheese, Provolone, 20,050 lbs.	do	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milano	do	do	Feb. 19
	Cheese, Romano, 22,613 lbs.	do	Fa. D. M. Vonk & Zoon, Stolwijk, Netherlands	do	do	Mar. 17
	Cheese, Romano, 16,996 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Mar. 27
	Cheese spread, 1,800 lbs.	France	U.P.P.L.A., Paris	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Mar. 26
	Cheese spread, 360 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese spread, 1,139 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese spread, pasteurized process, 30 cs.	do	Entremont Ancey, Hantke, Savoie	do	New York, N.Y.	Mar. 23
	Cheese, St. Paulin, 1,118 lbs.	Belgium	Fa. D. M. Vonk & Zoon, Stolwijk, Netherlands	Contains an unsafe food additive, dieldrin.	do	Mar. 19
LA17482	Cheese: Bonbray, Camembert, and Normandie Belletoile, 68 cs.	France	Ellas Etablissements, Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif.	Apr. 10
NY91690	Cheese, Brie, 1,700 pkgs.	do	Fromageries Henri Hutin, Lacroix Sur-Meuse	do	New York, N.Y.	Apr. 16
LA17484	Cheese, Brie (extra), 287 lbs.	do	Etablissement Robert Labie, Paris	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Apr. 10
NY91692	Cheese, Camembert, 40 cs.	do	Anco France, S. A., Fromagerie de Corneville and Laiterie Durand, Thiaucourt	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and heptachlor epoxide.	New York, N.Y.	Apr. 23
NY91693	Cheese, Camembert, 40 cs.	do	Societe Roquefortoise, Roquefort; Anco France, S. A., Fromagerie de Corneville and Laiterie Durand, Thiaucourt	do	do	Do.
C530	Cheese, Feta, 12,500 kilos.	Italy	S. Albano & Co., Macomer	Filthy, unfit for food	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 29
LA17690	Cheese: Grape, Fontenoy cheese spread, and Big Marc, 75 cs.	France	Entremont, S. A., Faubourg des Balmettes	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif.	Do.
NY91691	Cheese, La Nouvelll Vache, 200 cs.	do	Fromageries Henri Hutin, S. A., Fromageries Picon, Entremont Etablissements, Laiterie Saint-Hubert, Union Laiterie Vittelloise, and Etablissement Leon Loevenbruck, Le Havre	Deceptive packaging	New York, N.Y.	Apr. 13
NY91737	Cheese, Magnum, 20 bxs.	do	Etablissements Avenel, Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Apr. 22
NY91433	Cheese, Parmesan, 7,241 lbs.	Italy	Fratelli Pericu Fu Sebastrano, Genoa	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride, hexachlorobenzene and dieldrin.	do	Apr. 1
NY91441	Cheese, Parmigiano Reggiano, 4,863 lbs.	do	Tavella, S.A., Genoa	Contains an unsafe additive, dieldrin.	do	Apr. 13

## FDA SEIZURES IN 1970—Continued

Sample No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date, 1970
NY91576	Cheese, Pecorino, 13,603 lbs	do	Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodengraven, Netherlands	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Apr. 6
NY91575	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 5,823 lbs	do	Ditta Fratelli Pecigo Fu Sebastiano, Ozieri	do	do	Apr. 3
NY89974	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 14,122 lbs	do	Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodengraven, Netherlands	do	do	Do.
NY89975	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 13,702 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
NY91487	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 14,558 lbs	do	do	do	do	Apr. 6
NY91485	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 14,111 lbs	do	do	do	do	May 15
NY91584	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 17,324 lbs	do	F. Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodengraven, Netherlands	do	do	Apr. 15
NY91622	Cheese Pecorino Romano, 200 ctns	do	Vanderama, N.V., Herengracht, Amsterdam, Netherlands	do	do	Apr. 16
NY91475	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 24,069 lbs	Netherlands	Vanderama, N.V., Herengracht, Amsterdam	do	do	Apr. 3
NY91491	Cheese, Pecorino Sardo, 250 ctns	do	Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodengraven	do	do	Apr. 13
C531	Cheese, Pecorino Zeta, and Pecorino Ricotta, 16,536 lbs	Italy	S. Albano & Co., Macomer	Filthy, unfit for food	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 29
NY91483	Cheese, Petit Brie Babette, 50 cs	France	Etablissements Avenel, Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, Benzene Hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Apr. 15
NY91743	Cheese, Petit Villedron, 30 ctns	do	do	Contains an unsafe food additive, Benzene Hexachlorophene.	do	Apr. 24
NY91717	Cheese, Provolone Salami, 5,833 lbs	Italy	Ditta Michele Tavella via Bordigallo, Cremona	Contains an unsafe food additive, Benzene Hexachloride.	do	Apr. 21
NY91136	Cheese, Reggiano, 10,631 lbs	do	Fratelli Peirger Fu Sebastiano, Genoa	do	do	Apr. 3
LA17489	Cheese Spread, 20 pkgs	France	Desailly-Choviere Roy & Cie., Le Havre	do	Los Angeles, Calif	Apr. 27
LA17509	Cheese Spread, 600 lbs	do	do	do	do	Apr. 10
NY89976	Cheese Spread, pasteurized process, 548 cs	do	Societe Roquefortoise, Roquefort	do	New York, N.Y.	Apr. 17
NY91624	Cheese Spread, Ultra Kirsch, 160 cs	do	U.P.P.L.A., M.I.N., Paris, Rungis	do	do	Apr. 16
LA17705	Cheese, 129 pkgs	do	De Sailyl Chauviere Roy Clog, Le Havre	do	Los Angeles, Calif	May 12
NY92009	Cheese, 2,523 lbs	do	Etablissements Avenel, Le Havre	do	New York, N.Y.	May 14
SF8454	Cheese, 400 pkgs	do	Framageries F. Paul-Renard, Paris	do	San Francisco, Calif	May 12
LA17769	Cheese, Abbey Port Sault, 260 cs	do	Societe Auxiliare de l'Agriculture et de l'Industrie, Le Havre	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and heptachlor epoxide.	Los Angeles, Calif	May 15
NY92016	Cheese, Boursalt, 7,899 lbs	do	Anco France, S.A., Pont-Audemer	do	New York, N.Y.	May 13
	Cheese, Feta, 15,271 lbs	Greece	G. Katsicogiannis, Agia, Ethimia	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	June 2
	Cheese, Feta, 55,155 lbs	Italy	Manca Musinu, Thiesi, Sardinia	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and hexachlorobenzene.	do	June 29
	Cheese, Fondue, 17 cs	France	Union Laitiere Vittellaise, Buigneville Vosges	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	June 24
	Cheese, Grana, 2,030 lbs	Italy	Dott, Garancini Lorenzo, Milano	do	San Francisco, Calif	June 4
	Cheese, Grana, 2,135 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Grana, 4,766 lbs	do	Lattiva Teresense, Milano	do	New York, N.Y.	June 3
	Cheese, Haloumi, 3,600 lbs	Cyprus	P. Theoderou & Sons, Famagusta	do	do	June 2
	Cheese, Kefalotyri and Graviera, 30,210 lbs	Greece	G. Katsicogiannis, Agia, Ethimia	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Manchego, 581 lbs	Spain	Cooperative Odeneka Manchego La Sarua Cruz, Valencia	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride, hexachlorobenzene, and DDT.	do	June 29
	Cheese, Nec Plus Ultra Kirsch, 100 cs	France	U.P.P.L.A., Paris	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	June 3
	Cheese, Parmegiano, 50 ctns	Italy	Ditta Michele Tavella, Via Bordigallo	do	Los Angeles, Calif	Do.
	Cheese, Parmesan, 605 lbs	do	F. W. Hartman Co., Genoa	Contains an unsafe food additive, DDT.	New York, N.Y.	June 29
	Cheese, Parmesan, 30 ctns	do	Locatelli, Inc., Milano	Contains unsafe food additives, dieldrin, DDT, DDE, and TDE.	do	June 25
	do	do	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milano	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Parmesan, 2,651 lbs	do	Unione Casaria Italiana, Via Dogana, Milan	Contains an unsafe food additive, dieldrin.	do	June 22
	Cheese, Pecorino 85 ctns	do	Ditta R. Ronconi, Milano	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif	June 18
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 6,843 lbs	do	Ditaa M. Di Trani, Macomer	do	New York, N.Y.	June 2
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 12,260 lbs	do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 10
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 12,501 lbs	do	Vanderama, N.V., Amsterdam, Netherlands	do	New York, N.Y.	June 2
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 3,122 lbs	do	do	do	do	June 3
	Cheese, Poivre, 10 cs	France	Boyannais, Le Havre	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Port Salut, 50 cs	do	Societe Auxiliare de l'Agriculture et del Industries, Paris	Contains unsafe food additives, dieldrin, heptachlor epoxide and benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif	May 15
	Cheese, Provolone, 13,696 lbs	Italy	Locatelli, S. P. A., Milano	Contains unsafe food additives, DDT, DDE, TDE, and benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	June 25
	Cheese, Ricotta and Feta, 25 ctns and 73 bbls	do	Kapatsoui Cheese, Olbia	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	June 24
	Cheese, soft ripened, 40 cs	France	Dervieu & Delahais, Le Havre	do	Los Angeles, Calif	June 5
	Cheese, Brie, 3,500 lbs	do	Laiterie, Saint-Hubert, Nancy	do	New York, N.Y.	July 1
	Cheese, Coulommiers, 340 lbs	do	Anco France, S.A., Pont-Audemer	Contains an unsafe food additive, heptachlor epoxide.	do	July 15
	Cheese, Coulommiers, 560 lbs	do	do	do	do	July 17
	Cheese, Emmenthaler, 600 lbs	do	Chateau De Flamboin, Gouaux-de-Luchon	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	San Francisco, Calif	July 8
	Cheese, Emmenthaler, 480 lbs	do	Fernand-Reignier, Annecy	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Feta, 11,519 lbs	Greece	Gerasimos D. Kapatosoris, Piraeus	do	New York, N.Y.	July 14
	Cheese, Feta, 2,500 lbs	do	Geras D. Dapatsoria, Piraeus	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachlorobenzene.	Boston, Mass	July 21
	Cheese, Gouda, 4 ctns	Netherlands	Koster's Kaas Industrie en Handel, Herengracht, Amsterdam	Inconspicuous labeling	Detroit, Mich	July 29
	Cheese, Grana, 7,267 lbs	Italy	Latteria Soresinese, Lombardia	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	July 14
	Cheese, Grana, Parmesan, 40 cs	do	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milan	Contains unsafe food additives, DDT, DDE, TDE and dieldrin.	do	July 15
	Cheese, Kirsch, 100 ctns	France	Renault Framagerie, Victor Renault & Fils, Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	July 17
	Cheese, Manchego, 581 lbs	Spain	La Laberca de Zancara, Cuena	do	do	July 16
	Cheese, Monterey, 9,960 lbs	New Zealand	New Zealand Dairy Board, Wellington	False labeling; identity of product misrepresented.	do	July 31

Sample No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date, 1970
NY92016 (Cont.)	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Monterey, 77,000 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Monterey, 9,960 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Parmesan, 100 ctns.	Italy	Unione Casearia Italiana, Guido Zanetti & Figli, S.P.A., Milano.	Contains an unsafe food additive, dieldrin.	do	July 20
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 100 ctns.	do	F. Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	July 7
	do	do	do	do	do	July 8
	do	do	S. Albano & Co., Macomer.	do	do	July 24
	Cheese, Provolone, 3,520 lbs.	do	Aldo Parodi, Lodi.	do	Boston, Mass.	July 1
	Cheese, Provolone, 12,272 lbs.	do	S.P.A. Locatelli, Milan.	Contains unsafe food additives, DDT, DDE, DDD and benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	July 14
	Cheese, Ste. Maure, 15 ctns.	France	R. L. P. Etablissements Robert Labie, Le Havre.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	July 16
	Cheese Spread, 306 lbs.	do	Anco France, S.A., Fromagerie de Corneville, Thiaucourt.	do	do	July 22
	Cheese Spread, pasteurized process, 3 ctns.	Netherlands	C.V. VE-Bo', Leeuwarden.	Inconspicuous labeling.	Detroit, Mich.	July 29
	Cheese: Tilsit, Gammelost, et al., 260 lbs.	Norway	Norwegian Dairies Sales Association, Oslo.	Decomposed, held under insanitary conditions.	Chicago, Ill.	Do.
	Cheese, 160 ctns.	Italy	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milano.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif.	June 3
	Cheese (dock accumulation), 62 ctns.	do	do	Unfit for food.	New York, N.Y.	June 18
	Cheese, Boursin, 15 cs.	France	Fromageries Henri Hutin, S.A., La-Croix.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	June 10
	Cheese, Boursin Herbes, 25 cans.	do	Fromageries Henri Hutin, S.A., La Croix-sur-Meuse.	do	do	June 12
	Cheese: Brie, Camembert, and Le Tartare, et al., 54 cs.	do	Etablissement Robert Labie, Paris.	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and DDT.	Los Angeles, Calif.	June 17
	Cheese, Camembert, 34 cs.	do	Anco, S.A., Le Havre.	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and heptachlor epoxide.	New York, N.Y.	June 29
	Cheese, Camembert, 40 cs.	do	Anco France, S.A., Society Roguefortoise, Le Havre.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	June 11
	Cheese, Coulommiers, 30 cs.	do	Anco France, S.A., Le Havre.	Contains an unsafe food additive, heptachlor epoxide.	do	June 19
	do	do	do	do	do	June 29
NY92141	Cheese, Boursin Herbes, 4,072 lbs.	do	Henri Hutin, S.A., Le Havre.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif.	May 13
LA17746	Cheese, Camembert, 11 cs.	do	Etablissement Robert Labie, Paris.	do	do	Do.
LA17456	Cheese, Camembert, 15 cs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
LA17815	Cheese: Camembert, Brie, and Boursin, 44 cs.	do	do	do	do	May 27
NY92172	Cheese, Famagusta, 4,828 lbs.	Greece	Nicos Elides, Pano Lefkara, Cyprus.	do	New York, N.Y.	May 25
NY92170	Cheese, Feta, 50 kegs.	do	Lekas & Drivas, Inc., Piraeus.	do	do	May 22
B7505	Cheese, Feta, 2,778 lbs.	Italy	Filli Mannoni Fu Paolo, Thiesi.	do	Boston, Mass.	May 13
NY91735	Cheese, Feta, 13,000 lbs.	Greece	Pouliatus Co., Ltd., Athens.	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and hexachlorobenzene.	New York, N.Y.	May 14
NY92162	Cheese, Feta, 14,306 lbs.	do	Union of Agriculture Cooperatives, Patras.	do	do	May 12
LA17424	Cheese, Gorgonzola and Romano, 45 ctns.	Italy	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milano.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif.	Apr. 30
B7513	Cheese, Grana Padano, 100 loaves.	do	Michella Tavella Casearia Industria, Cremona.	do	Boston, Mass.	May 21
NY92155	Cheese, Grana Reggiano, 6,687 lbs.	do	Ditta Michele Tavella, Cremona.	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride, hexachlorobenzene, and heptachlor epoxide.	New York, N.Y.	May 14
NY91695	Cheese, Haloumi, 3,638 lbs.	Greece	P. Theodorou & Sons, Larnaca, Cyprus.	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride and DDT.	do	May 12
NY91877	Cheese: Haloumi and Famagusta, 22 blts. and 7 cs.	do	Mr. Nicos Elides Pano Lefkara, Cyprus.	Contains unsafe food additives, benzene hexachloride, hexachlorobenzene, DDT, DDE, and TDE.	do	Do.
SF8509	Cheese, Hansen, 900 lbs.	El Salvador	Cremeria Standard, San Salvador.	Contains unsafe food additives, DDT and DDE.	San Francisco, Calif.	May 1
NY92009	Cheese Le Pet i Villedieu, 30 cs.	France	Etablissements Avenel, Le Havre.	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	May 14
NY92136	Cheese, Nec Plus Ultra Kirsch, 29 cs.	do	do	do	do	May 21
LA17779	Cheese, Pecorino and Sardo, 100 ctns.	Italy	Ditta R. Ronconi, S.A. R. L., Nepi.	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	May 13
NY92153	Cheese, Pecorino Pepato, 4,268 lbs.	do	F Ili Manca Musinu, Thiesi.	do	New York, N.Y.	May 14
NY91317	Cheese, Pecorino Ricotta, 2,872 lbs.	do	Filli Fadda Manca & Fadda Pinna, S.N.C., Thiesi.	do	do	May 12
B7506	Cheese, Pecorino Ricotta, 2,412 lbs.	do	Filli Mannoni Fu Paolo, Thiesi.	do	Boston, Mass.	May 13
CN1023	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 9,081 lbs.	do	Ditta Michele Di Trani, Macomer.	do	Cleveland, Ohio.	Do.
CN1025	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 9,150 lbs.	do	do	do	do	May 21
CN1026	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 25 cs.	do	do	do	do	Do.
NY92167	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 27,425 lbs.	do	Filli Mannoni Fu Paolo, Thiesi.	do	New York, N.Y.	May 15
NY92079	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 9,390 lbs.	do	F. Noorhoek & Zoon, Bodengraven, Netherlands.	do	do	May 14
NY92322	Cheese, Provolone, 10,302 lbs.	do	Lattreia Loresinese, Genoa.	Contains unsafe food additives, DDD, DDT, and DDE.	do	May 2
NY92000	Cheese, Provolone, 100 cs.	do	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milano.	Contains unsafe food additives, DDT and benzene hexachloride.	do	May 1
3F8448	Cheese, Provolone, 60 lbs.	do	Ditta Michele Tavella, Genoa.	Contains unsafe food additives, hexachloride and heptachlor epoxide.	San Francisco, Calif.	Do.
BUG387	Cheese, Provolone, 3,355½ lbs.	United States	Venetian Meat & Salami Co., Ltd., Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.	Mite infested, musty and moldy.	Buffalo, N.Y.	May 2
SE9023	Cheese, Sardo, 408 loaves.	Argentina	Ratto-delfino y cia., S.A.R.L., Buenos Aires.	Inaccurate contents statement.	Seattle, Wash.	May 5
NY92010	Cheese spread, Big Marc, 35 pkgs.	France	Elisa Dieve Meuse, Le Havre.	Contains an unsafe food additive, Benzene Hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	May 14
SF8523	Cheese spread, 180 lbs.	do	U.P.P.L.A., Paris.	do	San Francisco, Calif.	May 12
SE9036	Cheese, Swiss (pasteurized process slices), 2,400 lbs.	West Germany	Hochland Kaserwerk Reich, Summer & Co., Frankfurt am Main.	Contains mold, inconspicuous labeling.	Seattle, Wash.	May 28

## FDA SEIZURES IN 1970—Continued

Sample No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date, 1970
	Cheese, Boursault, 21 cs.	France	Anco France, S.A., Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, heptachlor epoxide.	New York, N.Y.	Aug. 11
	Cheese Boursault, 60 cs	do	U.P.P.L.A., Paris	do	do	Aug. 10
	Cheese, Coulommiers, 25 cs	do	Anco France, S.A., Le Havre	Contains unsafe food additives, heptachlor epoxide and dieldrin.	do	Aug. 11
	Cheese, Feta, 2,420 lbs	Greece	Union of Agriculture of Republic of Greece, Piraeus	Decomposed	do	Aug. 27
	Cheese, Feta, 2,754 lbs	United States	Diana Wholesale, Toronto, Ontario	Contains ants and cat hair	Buffalo, N.Y.	Aug. 13
	Cheese, Fontal, 714 lbs	France	Etablissements Ripoz, S.A., Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Aug. 10
	Cheese, Kefalotyri, 49,652 lbs	Greece	G. Katsicogiannis, Agia	do	do	Aug. 4
	Cheese, Monterey, 19,980 lbs	New Zealand	New Zealand Dairy Board, Wellington	False labeling: identity of product misrepresented.	do	Aug. 11
	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Monterey, 40,080 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, Nec Plus Ultra, Kirsch 8 cs	France	Anco France, S.A., Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Do.
	Cheese, Parmesan, 100 cs	Italy	Unione Casaria Italiana, Midland	Contains an unsafe food additive, dieldrin.	do	Aug. 19
	Cheese, Pecorino, 1,315 lbs	do	Pepino Importers, Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada	Contains unsafe food additives, pesticides.	Buffalo, N.Y.	Aug. 7
	Cheese, Pecorino Kafalotiri, 84 ctns	do	Kapatsoris Cheeses, Olbia	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Aug. 20
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 6,823 lbs	do	Ditta Paolo Tanda, Burgos	do	Philadelphia, Pa	Aug. 24
	Cheese Pecorino Romano, 200 ctns	do	F. Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands	do	New York, N.Y.	Aug. 11
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 13,685 lbs	do	Locatelli, S.P.A., Milano	do	Philadelphia, Pa	Aug. 4
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 23,985 lbs	do	do	do	do	Aug. 17
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 100 ctns	do	Societe S. Albano & Co., Macomer	do	New York, N.Y.	Aug. 5
	Cheese, Pecorino Sardo, 1,673 lbs	do	F. Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands	do	do	Aug. 27
	Cheese, process, 85 pkgs	West Germany	Milch-Fett-und Eier-Kontor, G.m.b.H., Hamburg	do	Los Angeles, Calif.	Aug. 14
	Cheese, Provolone, 60 loaves	Italy	Aldo Parodi, Genoa	Contains unsafe food additives, Benzene hexachloride, DDT, DDE, and TDE.	Boston, Mass	Aug. 19
	Cheese, Provolone, 5,694 lbs	do	Travella Ditta Michele Tavella, Genoa	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Aug. 27
	Cheese, semi-soft, 2,472 pkgs	Scotland	Caithness Cheese Co., Ltd., Lybster	do	Boston, Mass	Aug. 19
	Milk, canned (chocolate flavored) 9,600 tins.	Netherlands	N.V. Fabriek Van Nelk producten Der Vereenigde Zuiv, Rotterdam.	False labeling: identity of product misrepresented, inaccurate contents statement, mandatory labeling omitted.	San Juan, Puerto Rico	Aug. 4
	Milk, canned (chocolate flavored) 4,800 tins.	do	do	Short volume, mandatory labeling omitted, inconspicuous labeling.	do	Aug. 24
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 17,900 lbs	Italy	F. Noordhoek & Zoon, Bodegraven, Netherlands	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Sept. 3.
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 25,348 lbs	do	do	do	do	Aug. 27
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 100 loaves	do	Manco Musinu, Thiesi	do	Boston, Mass	Sept. 15
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 4,884 lbs	do	Rodifo Ronconi, Napoli	do	Philadelphia, Pa	Sept. 23
	Cheese, Process Gruyere (smoked), 1,025 lbs.	West Germany	Froche, Ltd., Montreal, Quebec, Canada	Deviates from standard of identity.	New York, N.Y.	Sept. 1
	Cheese, Ricotta, 50 ctns	Italy	Fumera Armando & Figli, Chiaramonti	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Tampa, Fla	Sept. 29
	Cheese, Romano, 5,245 lbs	do	Industrie Casaria El Agricole, S.P.A., Rome	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Sept. 11
	Cheese, St. Paulin, 450 cs	Denmark	Rasmus Hamson, Copenhagen	Decomposed	Boston, Mass	Sept. 15
	Cheese, St. Paulin, 600 pkgs	do	do	do	do	Sept. 15
	Cheese, Swiss, 348 lbs	Austria	Alpenkase Hendelsges, M.B.H., Bregnez	Inconspicuous labeling	Houston, Tex.	Sept. 25
	Cheese Spread, Nec plus Ultra Kirsch, 376 lbs.	France	U.P.P.L.A., Paris	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Sept. 23
	Cheese Spread, Nec plus Ultra Kirsch, 228 lbs.	do	do	do	do	Sept. 25
	Cheese, 360 lbs	do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Sept. 21
	Cheese, Beau Pasteur Herbes, 760 lbs.	do	Union De Producteurs En Produits Laitiers & Avicoles, Paris.	do	New York, N.Y.	Sept. 8
	Cheese, Boursault Affine, 1,058 lbs	do	Union De Producteurs Laitiers & Avicoles, La Havre	Contains a pesticide chemical, heptachlor epoxide.	do	Do.
	Cheese, Coulommier, 25 cs	do	Anco France S.A., B. P., Pont-Audemer	Contains an unsafe food additive, heptachlor epoxide.	do	Sept. 3
	Cheese, Delicado Cream, 2,751 lbs	West Germany	Milch-Fett-und Eier-Kontor, Frankfurt am Main	Contains an unsafe food additive, hexachlorobenzene.	Seattle, Wash	Sept. 8
	Cheese, Feta, 28,490 lbs	Greece	Gerasimos Kapatsoris, Piraeus	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	New York, N.Y.	Sept. 16
	Cheese, Grana, 9,259 lbs	Italy	Vonk's Kaamaatschappij, Rotterdam, Netherlands	do	do	Sept. 25
	Cheese, Granular, 6,360 lbs	New Zealand	New Zealand Dairy Board, Wellington	False labeling: identity of product misrepresented.	do	Sept. 24
	Cheese, Kashraval, 28,076 lbs	Yugoslavia	Agro Export-Import, Beograd	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Sept. 28
	Cheese, Mozzarella, 41,405 lbs	West Germany	Alltrade Co., Ltd., Montreal, Quebec, Canada	Inaccurate contents statement.	do	Sept. 14
	Cheese, Parmigiano Reggiano, 7,232 lbs.	Italy	Polenghi Lombardo Lodi, S.P.A., C.C.I.A., Milano	Contains an unsafe food additive, dieldrin.	do	Sept. 3
	Cheese, Parmigiano Reggiano, 721 lbs.	do	Societa 'di Esportazione Polenghi Lombardo, Milan	do	do	Sept. 10
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 3,904 lbs	do	Armando Fumera & Figli, Chiaramonti	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Boston, Mass	Sept. 10
	Cheese, Pecorino Romana, 3,849 lbs	do	do	do	do	Sept. 10
	Cheese, 180 lbs	France	U.P.P.L.A., Paris	do	San Francisco, Calif.	Oct. 16
	Cheese, 40 wheels	do	do	do	do	Oct. 16
	Cheese, 120 lbs	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Cheese, 140 wheels	France	do	Contains unsafe food additives, heptachlor epox- and benzene hexachloride.	do	Oct. 26
	Cheese, Hand, 1,350 lbs	West Germany	Harder & De Voss, Hamburg	Contains mold	do	Oct. 8
	Cheese, Letartare, 600 pkgs	France	J. Bongrain & Cie., Le Havre	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	Los Angeles, Calif.	Oct. 9

Sample No.	Product and amount	Country of origin	Manufacturer or shipper	Reason for detention	Port of entry	Date, 1970
SE9036	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 200 loaves	Italy	Remo Brunelli Industria Casaeria, Roma	do	Boston, Mass.	Do.
	Cheese, Pecorino Romano, 200 ctns	do	Unione Caseari Esportatori, Milano	do	New York, N.Y.	Oct. 29
	Cheese, Pecorino Ricotta (salted), 2,754 lbs.	do	Fumera Armando & Figli, Firenze	do	do	Oct. 7
	Cheese, Ricotta, 5,919 lbs.	Rumania	Prodexport, Bucharest	Mandatory labeling omitted	do	Oct. 20
	Cheese, Ricotta (hard white), 4,134 lbs.	Greece	Ger S. Vryonis & Brothers, Piraeus	Contains an unsafe food additive, benzene hexachloride.	do	Oct. 7

Dec. 19, 1969.

**EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER NATIONWIDE**

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1971, I introduced a bill to amend the Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide funds for the equipping, establishing, and operating of emergency communications facilities to help implement the "911" nationwide, emergency telephone number.

Today I am introducing a similar bill, with 40 cosponsors. The intent of this bill is exactly the same and it also is an amendment to the Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide funds to communities to help them implement "911" by renovating or coordinating, improving their communications facilities. The language in the bill has been changed to more completely and precisely convey the legislative intent.

I believe that this legislation and the assistance provided is extremely important and I am hopeful that the committee to which this bill is assigned will take action as soon as possible.

**HOUSE MAKES TRAGIC MISTAKE IN SUPPORTING HIGH INTEREST RATES**

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this body made a tragic mistake when it voted 180 to 212 to defeat Chairman PATMAN's amendment that would have prohibited the Treasury Department from selling \$10 billion in long-term Government obligations without regard to the 4 1/4-percent legislative ceiling.

The vote means that this country will be faced with an extended period of high interest rates and it comes at a time when, for the first time in many years, interest rates were on a downward swing.

Mr. Speaker, for years the Nation's news media has pushed for congressional reorganization, and a reorganization plan was adopted at the end of the last Congress. One of the reorganizational features was the recording of teller votes. Yesterday marked the first time that the record teller vote was used, and it is up to the news media to publish the teller lists so that those Members of this body who are for low interest rates can be distinguished from the Members who favor high interest rates.

The plan to sell a long-term, high-interest-rate bonds is merely another gimmick and in the long run will prove unsuccessful in combating inflation. Members of this body will recall that in 1968 the interest rate ceiling on Government-insured home mortgages was removed. The reason behind this move, it was argued, was to make more homes available because current market conditions were not favorable for home mortgages at low interest rates. I submit that that plan, like the \$10 billion high interest sale, was a failure. We did not get more housing; but what we did get was an artificial method of keeping interest rates at high levels.

We have now compounded that mistake with another, and I am afraid that we have not heard the last of this issue.

**CUT IN COLLABORATIVE PERINATAL STUDY WILL HAMPER RESEARCH**

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

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the administration recently ordered a 25-percent cut in the collaborative perinatal study, a program directed by the National Institutes of Health. Simply stated, this is a long-term study aimed at finding the causes of mental retardation, nervous system disorders, and behavioral problems in children. It is considered the best and most comprehensive study of early childhood diseases ever undertaken, and has involved 12 years of intensive research which is just now reaching fruition. This study has already produced substantial data on childhood disease.

The budget cut, according to the doctors involved, will hamper the research at the stage at which the most important gains are to be made.

In his state of the Union address the President declared that this would be health year. A welcome phrase, but a hollow phrase made even less meaningful by this cut in a program of proven need and value.

In a unanimous gesture in this same address the President announced a \$100 million increase in cancer research funding. It is now clear where this additional money will be found. It will be taken from other important health research programs. This is robbing Peter to pay Paul and serves no useful purpose other than to redirect existing funds where the political pressure is greatest at the moment.

It is welcome news that the President plans to increase cancer funds. I am disturbed, however, that his methods are so counterproductive.

I had hoped that there would have been recognition for the need to reorder our national priorities. Surely this transparent fiscal sleight of hand which transfers funds within the health field in order to give the illusion of progress hardly makes the ideal a reality.

Mr. Speaker, this country cannot afford these illusions. This study is but one of the many programs that have been cut by the fiscal restraints placed on the National Institutes of Health. Post doctoral programs have been cut, the leukemia program is short staffed, with highly qualified young doctors forced to spend much time on clerical chores to the detriment of their patients.

These are but a few of the problems. The perinatal study deserves special mention, however, as it is believed to be the largest of its kind ever attempted. It has become the model for other, smaller studies, in other countries.

Because of its size and complexity, experts consider it unlikely that anything comparable will be attempted again in the foreseeable future. This puts extra demands on the research in terms of accuracy and quality.

Some of the project directors feel that the fund limitation will make it extremely difficult to both maintain the quality of the on-going programs and insure the completion of the study in a form that will be of sufficient value in terms of the time and money already spent and the importance of the subject.

As I have stated, this program is in its 12th year. Over \$100 million has already been expended. Aside from the obvious medical benefits to be gained from full funding of the completion, it is senseless to jeopardize the results due to a saving of less than \$2 million.

I ask that the Office of Management and Budget and the officials of the National Institutes of Health reconsider their position and rescind this cutback in funds.

**BROKERED FUNDS: NO PLACE IN WELL-RUN BANK**

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the August 1970 issue of the Independent Banker, which I believe points out the need for legislation prohibiting the use of brokered funds as



an acceptable banking instrument. On February 2, 1971, I introduced such legislation, H.R. 3242, and I believe that the article which I mentioned supports my call to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for prompt hearings.

The article explains in detail the circumstances surrounding the closing of the Peoples State Savings Bank of Auburn, Mich., which prompted my interest in this serious problem. You will note from the biography on the author of this article that he is not unfamiliar with the problems of small banks. His cautions certainly should be heeded and I hope that the Congress will see fit to act promptly on my legislation.

Mr. Brooks comes to the conclusion that:

We can start by recognizing that brokered funds and irrevocable letters of credit, . . . have no place in our banks.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, and I insert the article at this point in the RECORD.

**BROKERED FUNDS: NO PLACE IN  
A WELL-RUN BANK**  
(By Fred T. Brooks)

(NOTE.—Fred T. Brooks, 43, is president of the Merchants State Bank of Dallas, Texas, a \$38 million deposit bank. He is also chairman of the IBAA's Competing Financial Institutions Committee. Mr. Brooks joined Merchants State 19 years ago and became its executive vice president when he was only 31 years old. He was named president five years later. Now entering his 25th year in banking, Mr. Brooks started his career at age 17 as a clerk at the Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Kaufman, Texas. He has been a leader in the fight for independent banking and the dual banking system in Texas. He has also worked for legislation to revise the state banking code, and heads a committee that is writing a history of state banking in Texas in conjunction with the University of Texas. Mr. Brooks attended the IBAA's Senior Bank Officers Seminar on the Harvard campus and also is a graduate of the AIB and the Southwest Banking School at Southern Methodist.)

When deposits in unprecedented amounts began pouring into the little State Bank of Prairie City, Iowa, not long ago, it appeared to be a happy situation for everyone concerned. Thanks to deposits generated by a money broker, the \$2.5 million bank was able to swing a set of loans totaling \$850,000. The broker received a nice fee. Investors earned interest on the deposits. The bank set up an interest schedule on the loans. And the borrowers, a group of about 30 companies and individuals who had secured the deposits through the broker, were able to get their loans.

In short, it seemed to be a tidy, imaginative transaction, except for one thing: Iowa banking officials had to close the bank.

Collin Fritz, the state banking superintendent, said loans which were classified as unsound exceeded the little bank's capital by many times. Without the brokered funds, the bank could not have considered making one set of loans for \$850,000.

The closing of the Prairie City bank was one of eight bank failures in 18 months linked to loans and deposits generated by money brokers. This record provides ample evidence that the brokered funds have no place in a well-run bank.

Also, since bank problems or failures tarnish the public image of banking generally, bankers should take action to eliminate unsound practices in the industry as they arise rather than to wait for Congress or the supervisory authorities to do the job.

**WARY OF QUICK MONEY**

As president of a small bank, I know how tempting it might be to have my accounts quickly and substantially beefed up through deposits obtained by a broker who would control where the money is lent. But I also have a basic wariness about quick, hot money from any source.

As banks in Michigan, Utah, Kentucky, Georgia, Texas and Iowa have recently discovered, such transactions do not always go according to plan. The failures of these eight banks resulted from similar causes related to brokered certificates of deposit or irrevocable letters of credit.

In each of the cases large borrowers defaulted on loans or were on the verge of doing so. The loans were of a size that would be considered imprudent for a small bank to make. Most of the borrowers in each of the banks were from outside the bank's normal business area. And in each case money brokers had generated deposits that backed some of the loans.

A typical situation might involve a prospective borrower who wants to borrow a substantial sum—say \$150,000—but the bank either does not have that much to loan or has it committed elsewhere. The borrower is told that the bank will make the loan if he can generate deposits of \$150,000. Since the prospective borrower can't find that kind of money elsewhere, he talks to a money broker who finds the depositors and the bank makes the loan.

The broker's fee for arranging the deal may be 3 to 5 per cent of the loan. The broker, in turn, may pay the depositors 2 per cent of his fee to encourage them, which is in addition to what they will get from the bank on their certificates of deposit, say 5½ per cent.

**SERIOUS TROUBLE POSSIBLE**

Not all transactions of this type end in disaster, of course. *The Wall Street Journal* estimates that about \$750 million is channeled through brokers in the course of a year. The largest money broker is Seaboard Corporation of Los Angeles, which says it will place deposits of \$130 million to \$150 million this year, compared to \$50 million in 1968.

But if the broker is unethical or the third party defaults on the loan, the bank may find itself in serious trouble. This is particularly true for smaller banks that are left with insufficient capital to carry on if the borrower defaults. In some cases the borrower has been an incompetent business manager, or has poured the money into some ill-conceived venture that failed. Some borrowers have also been involved in a conspiracy to defraud the bank.

I have discussed the problem with a number of state banking commissioners and top officials of the FDIC, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve. They have advised their member banks "to be alert to schemes which would expose depositors' and shareholders' funds to the risks involved in loans based on broker 'deposits.'"

**BEWARE OF OUT-OF-TERRITORY LOANS**

The federal regulatory agencies have all advised banks to be especially wary of related out-of-territory loans which may appear attractive because of the amount of brokered money that will be placed with the bank if the loan is made. The policy statement of the agencies continues:

"The advertisement of excessive yields on deposits solicited for federally supervised banks (whether the premium is provided by the bank or by others), moreover, is prohibited by substantially identical regulations issued by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. To the extent that a bank takes any part in these transactions it is considered to be evading the purposes of the interest rate regulations.

Where the bank pays a fee to a broker and knows or has reason to know that the fee is being shared with the depositor, the bank is also in violation of the interest rate regulations to the extent the yield to the depositor exceeds the maximum permissible rate."

**PLACED IN CHECKING ACCOUNT**

The FDIC is a litigant in one of the most tangled and complex arrangements to date involving a closed bank having brokered funds.

It all started when three prospective borrowers—a schoolteacher from Detroit, an auto dealer from New Jersey, and the head of a leasing firm in Birmingham, Alabama—worked out a deal with a money broker to get \$3 million from Peoples State Savings Bank of Auburn, Michigan. The Detroit borrower, who wanted to develop a lake resort near Auburn, was to get \$1.5 million before fees. The other two were to receive \$750,000 each.

The broker agreed to get deposits of \$3 million to match the loans.

Two other brokers were brought into the deal to help round up the deposits.

The little bank received deposits of \$2.7 million from 545 investors around the country during an eight-week period last spring. However, the money was not put into certificates of deposit in the names of individual depositors, but instead was placed into a checking account of the money broker. He had withdrawn about \$2.3 million by the time the bank was closed by state officials. Those who had placed their deposit money with the brokers were given irrevocable letters of credit instead of CDs. The credit letters were signed by the bank's president and its cashier for the amounts they put up. The broker who had withdrawn the money from the Auburn bank said he had disbursed a total of \$1,537,800 among the three borrowers and had given \$116,500 as fees to "others who helped arrange the loan." The remaining \$675,000 he kept for his own fee or put into an escrow account to pay the interest to depositors. He said his role as disbursing agent for the funds was taken to protect his fees, adding that this was part of the loan agreement.

However, it appears that no loan arrangements were spelled out and no collateral put up.

The FDIC is suing two of the borrowers and the broker for the money they received. Several stockholders and directors of the bank have brought suit against the president and the cashier of the bank, contending that the letters of credit were issued without proper authority and thus are not obligations of the bank. The FDIC may not have to pay off the depositors secured by the brokers if the letters of credit do not represent valid deposit obligations of the bank.

**ADDITIONAL BANKS IN TROUBLE**

In addition to the most recent series of bank failures linked to brokered funds, the practice has been involved to some degree in at least 15 of about 30 bank closings that have occurred since 1963. One government regulator says many other banks may be in trouble. He said 10 banks having considerable amounts of brokered deposits are being closely watched.

A Texas bank failed when its purchases of federal funds, brokered loans and commercial paper sold, totaled more than its deposits.

What is the answer to the problem?

One suggestion is to withhold deposit insurance from banks that do not receive deposits in the ordinary course of their business. This would exempt brokered funds from FDIC insurance, since they are not obtained from the ordinary course of a bank's business.

The exemption no doubt also would apply to national advertising schemes, such as the

offer by a Louisiana bank to pay all the interest in cash on the day a depositor invests in a five-year certificate. The bank, which has a total capital of only \$200,000, made the offer in ads which ran in *The Wall Street Journal* and in newspapers throughout the Southwest.

All the depositor had to do was clip a coupon, enter the amount of his deposit, and indicate whether he wanted the interest money in cash or used to purchase a car, boat or television set.

The Comptroller's office says the offer does not violate any regulations. However, the ads fail to mention that the customer incurs a tax liability in receiving the interest in a lump sum.

Comptroller of the Currency William B. Camp favors making it a criminal violation for a banker to accept brokered funds where tie-in loans must be made as a condition for the deposit of such funds.

The Iowa banking superintendent, Collin Fritz, has asked all banks in the state to notify him if they are approached to accept brokered deposits.

In the absence of legislation, however, these agencies are limited in the amount of supervision they can give to brokered money deals.

#### UNFAIR COMPETITION

This lack of regulation and supervision of money brokers also implies an unfair competitive advantage over banks. Money brokers act as bankers without being subject to banking regulations. They are successful partly because the general public is not aware of the problems and dangers of brokered transactions.

The conscientious banker who is dedicated to sound banking principles is thus at a disadvantage in competing for deposits and loans.

But the use of brokered funds by a bank would seem to me to be more than an unsound banking practice. Using depositors' money to shore up a marginal loan borders on being a criminal act.

The money brokers argue that they are not to blame for the problem, and that they are just performing a service. However, the fact remains that without money brokers there would be no brokered funds. The problem simply did not exist before money brokers came on the scene.

The independent banks of our nation have an outstanding record for customer and community service. They are run by dedicated, honest individuals who value their reputations as careful custodians of the public's money.

If we are to retain this reputation, it is up to us to do what we can to correct the problems in our industry ourselves. We can wait for Congress or the supervisory agencies to do it for us, but in the meantime, great damage may be done.

We can start by recognizing that brokered funds and irrevocable letters of credit, as mentioned above, have no place in our banks.

#### WHITE MOTOR TERMINATES DEAL

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, termination of the merger agreement between White Motor Corp. and White Consolidated Industries announced last week once again points up the prohibitive effect of the Department of Justice's current antitrust policy. It appears to be aimed solely at curtailing mergers on the basis of bigness alone.

The two firms ended their merger plans after a District Court granted the Department of Justice a preliminary in-

junction which would have kept the two firms tied up for years in legal procedures. They felt neither company could afford to wait a full trial on the merits of the case, even though they considered their merger action fully within the law.

Richard McLaren, Assistant Attorney General of the Antitrust Division, has made the statement several times that these suits being brought against large corporations are designed to halt the merger movement. In this case, he has done so without the merits of the case being fully explored. I believe this is the wrong way for the Justice Department to handle these matters.

A number of serious questions have been raised regarding this basic law under which such cases are being brought. Many legal and business experts have questioned whether current law even applies to mergers of this type. In fact, Mr. McLaren himself has indicated they may not. Yet he has pursued this unwise course rather than coming to Congress to seek enactment of proper law. I suspect one reason for taking this course is that he suspects his own theories and attacks on bigness would not be sustained by Congress. They have, in fact, been consistently rejected not only by Congress but by the courts as well.

I am, therefore, today introducing legislation calling for establishment of a blue ribbon panel to thoroughly study our antitrust laws and policies. I urge Congress to give this legislation its immediate consideration before other companies find themselves in the same situation as White Motors-White Industries.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the February 26, 1971, New York Times, announcing the termination of the merger between these two companies.

#### WHITE MOTOR TERMINATES WHITE CONSOLIDATED DEAL

(By Alexander R. Hammer)

The White Motor Corporation yesterday terminated its merger with White Consolidated Industries, Inc., because of the preliminary injunction granted against the merger on Wednesday in Federal District Court in Cleveland.

If the two companies had merged, the new company would have been the 57th largest in sales in the nation. Under the merger plan, White Consolidated would have acquired White Motor.

In granting the injunction, Judge Frank J. Battlari ruled that the proposed merger might act to lessen competition. The injunction was granted at the request of the Justice Department which contended that the merger would give the new company, White Inc., a steel-purchasing power equal to that of its three closest competitors combined.

#### GOVERNMENT POSITION

The Justice Department said that the merger would encourage reciprocal trading in violation of the Clayton anti-trust act.

In terminating the merger yesterday, Henry J. Nave, president and chief executive officer of White Motor, said that the granting of the injunction "prevents the merger from being consummated because neither company can afford to await a full trial on the merits."

Mr. Nave said that White Motor will immediately move ahead on its own to achieve growth in sales and profit. Earlier this month officials of both companies had said that the merger would be dropped if an injunction was granted.

#### BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—AN ALL-AMERICA CITY

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Birmingham, Ala., which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, has today been selected as an All-America City for 1970 by Look magazine and the National Municipal League.

The city of Birmingham has made tremendous strides in virtually every area. A mayor and city council form of government replaced the old commission system in 1963 and, in recent years, Birmingham's dynamic Mayor George Seibels and the city council have given progressive leadership toward broadening the services of the city government to all of its people.

Through the leadership of such organizations as Operation New Birmingham, a biracial organization of community leaders, the chamber of commerce and the downtown action committee, the city is continuing to develop for all her citizens.

New skyscrapers, a multimillion dollar postal facility, and a vast civic center complex now under construction bear witness to the city's growing prosperity.

The University of Alabama Medical Center is expanding physically and educationally and promises to become one of the Nation's most outstanding medical complexes. The advances in medical technology achieved there have already received worldwide acclaim.

Birmingham is a city of tomorrow. It is a symbol of the strength and hope of this Republic.

The All-America City award, Mr. Speaker, is a recognition of what Birmingham has accomplished in recent years and of her plans for the future. I am delighted that the efforts of so many concerned individuals and groups in Birmingham, Ala. are being recognized on a national level and I am proud to represent Birmingham in the Congress.

#### REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS HIGH RATE OF INTEREST IN LOGICAL ECONOMIC POLICY

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has just referred to the Republican Party as the high interest rate party. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that we are the party with a high rate of interest in policies of fiscal responsibility and with a high rate of concern about the irresponsible policies which brought this Nation to a point of economic disaster from the New Deal, to the Fair Deal, to the New Frontier, and finally to "the great insanity"—I believe it was called the Great Society.

I would say we are concerned about doing what is logical and sensible in economic policy.

The action taken to take the interest ceiling off long-term Government obligations was simply logical and sensible, not a high interest rate policy. Under the

former policy the Treasury was forced to borrow heavily in the short-term securities market, where there was no limit. This change will simplify the management of the debt, and should reduce its disruptive and inflationary impact.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans have a high rate of interest in and concern for the people of this country, including the old, the poor, the infirm, who have been hurt worst of all by the ravages of inflation; and we have a high rate of interest in the future generations who will pay the bill for our profligate spending in this generation.

#### THE INTEREST RATE POLICY OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my friend—and he is my friend—has expressed the great interest of the Republican Party in the fiscal policies of this Nation. Let me just make a comment.

In the first 2 years of the Nixon administration, all the brakes were taken off of interest rates and the average rates in the banks for commercial loans were around 9½ to 10 percent. I know this from a personal experience in California, when one of the great banking chains charged 9½ percent for a 30-day commercial loan that was well secured.

The record will show that the banks in the past 2 years have made the greatest net profits in the history of the United States. Now, after this high interest rate crunch came upon the economy and we saw inflation go rampant and we saw unemployment go up and up and up, we suddenly find the President advocating what he calls the full employment budget. I will explain that. If one is working for \$100 a week and suddenly goes on half time and makes \$50 a week, the full employment budget would say he could spend at the rate of \$100 a week because if he were working he would be earning \$100 a week. That is the full employment budget.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman knows, I am sure, that in Los Angeles County, Calif., 235,000 people are unemployed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is the highest rate of unemployment in Los Angeles County, running a little better than 7 percent, that we have had in the past 12 years. It is growing. It is not going down; it is growing. And the cost of living is still going up. So if that is the interest the Republican Party has in the people, as evidenced by the results of their fiscal policies, I do not think it is very good interest for the people.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I con-

gratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) on his remarks, and I wish to make an additional point in which I am sure he will join me.

It is not just that we have 7 percent unemployment as a national average. Part of that 7 percent is composed of white married males over 21 years of age. We have an unemployment rate of perhaps 2½ or 3 percent for those.

Another element in this unemployment rate is the unemployment rate not for married white males over 21 but for single black males under 21, the teenagers who in the ghettos of America have an unemployment rate upward of 35 percent, and in some cases—for example, my congressional district in the South Bronx—over 40 percent unemployment.

This is not just a painful situation. It is not a question of where the shoe is simply pinching. This is a situation of economic disaster and catastrophe.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to the colloquy and I would point out that the great interest the Republican Party has had in the welfare of America is evidenced by the figures which he has quoted.

#### CAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) will listen for a moment.

As I understand it, the State of California traditionally has had and still does have a high percentage of our defense business. Now, if my recollection is accurate, a sizable percentage of the unemployment in California and in Los Angeles results from a cutback in defense appropriations and a reduction in funds for weapons procurement.

The facts are that in the last 2 years most of the effort to reduce the defense budget and to cause the unemployment in California has come from the gentleman's side of the aisle. So the finger is on them for a substantial part of unemployment that currently exists in Los Angeles and in the State of California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me add one more observation.

I do want to exclude the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) from that effort, if my recollection is correct, but he knows as well as I do that most of the effort to cut back on defense expenditures has come from his side of the aisle, which has contributed substantially to the unemployment in the State of California.

Now I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for giving me a special dispensation on that particular matter. However, the percentage that I quoted is a national percentage. It actually runs in Orange County about 7.7 percent unemployed, because there is an aerospace industry there which is a very heavy contributor

to it. Also it laps over into Los Angeles County. However, the figure that I gave of 7 percent applies to the whole Nation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But the fact is that the gentleman was complaining about the specifics of unemployment in the Los Angeles area, as I understand it, and because of Los Angeles and California having a high percentage of defense production the cutbacks made by the Democrats primarily in the defense budget are responsible for a substantial part of that unemployment.

#### HIGH INTEREST RATES AND UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this colloquy with great interest. I have heard the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD) make the statement so many times that unemployment is a result of defense cutbacks that I think the time has come to correct the record.

Here are the facts. For the first time in 12 years in 1970 our Gross National Product did not grow.

At the same time the GNP's of Japan, the Common Market of Mexico and many other countries were showing substantial growth.

The economic policies of this administration have thrown 3 million people out of work, and most of them are not in defense plants. At the same time unused industrial capacity rose to 27 percent.

Think of that; 27 percent of the industrial capacity of this country today is not being utilized.

With all of the things that need doing throughout our country.

The economic policies of the Nixon administration have been so disastrous that we are now employing only 73 percent of our capacity and we have 5 million unemployed Americans.

The other day, led by the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. BELCHER), a group of our colleagues pointed out the equally distressing situation existing in rural America.

For as long as I have been in public life, reference has been made to the "farm problem." I have long felt that this is an unfortunate misnomer. Our concern is not for the problems of farms; our concern is for the day-to-day, human problems of the men and women who till them. The American farmer built this country: he settled it, he made it productive, and he sustains it. Today, however, he is caught up in a fast-changing society which, instead of making his life easier, is making it more difficult. Since 1950, the rate of change in our society has been accelerating, and there has been a corresponding increase in the farmer's adversities.

One of the most significant of these changes has been in the distribution of our population. Since 1950, we have witnessed a flight from the land, a movement of Americans away from the farm to urban centers. Between 1950 and 1960, approximately one-half of the counties

of the United States lost population. The returns of the latest census indicate that this trend has been continuing and that the final results will mark another substantial move off the farm to urban life. One can see this by simply driving across our land. One can see it in the consolidation of small farms into large agricultural corporations. The land remains cultivated, but by fewer and fewer farmers. Farmers were once the largest single segment of our population. Today, about one in 20 Americans is a member of our farm population.

The shift of our population from the farm to the city reflects the growing problems of the small farmer in America. He is caught between rapid socio-economic change and governmental neglect. By personal income, by standard of living, or by almost any other yardstick, it is apparent that the American farmer is not an equal partner in our national life.

The economic report of the President reflects the changes and inequities confronting the American farmer. Between 1950 and 1970, the number of American farms declined 32 percent and the size of our farm population decreased 58 percent. During the same period, however, investment in farms rose 240 percent and farmers debts increased 500 percent. In 1970, according to the President's economic report, farmers produced 30 percent more food and were paid \$800 million less than in 1950. It is not difficult to see why people are leaving the farms.

To reverse this flight from the land to our overcrowded urban areas—to restore a balance between rural and urban America—we must realize the importance of developing our rural areas. We must redirect many government programs—in education, housing, and manpower—to solve the problems of rural America.

In summary, we must see to it that a fair share of our attention and energies go to these areas in the interests of rural and urban America alike.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the minority leader, please.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight Friday, March 5, 1971, to file a report on H.R. 4246, to extend until March 31, 1973, certain provisions of the law relating to interest rates, mortgage credit controls, and cost-of-living stabilization.

This morning we reported the bill out. I think it was a unanimous vote. Anyway, it was nearly unanimous, and we agreed to ask for this for Saturday night on the theory that we could take it up on Wednesday.

We find it has to be Friday night in order to take it up Wednesday.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent with the understanding that if anyone feels strongly about it they will have an opportunity to ask for

a reconsideration of it and, certainly, if anyone objects to it, I would ask that my unanimous-consent request be rescinded.

But, in view of the fact that the committee understood it would be filed Saturday night and taken up Wednesday, but since we have found it could not be done, I ask unanimous consent for it to be filed on Friday night.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to simply add one further comment to the comments made by the distinguished majority leader.

Within the next 10 days or 2 weeks we are going to have to vote on the floor of the House as to whether or not we will extend a program initiated by the late President Kennedy, the SST program, and we will find out how much support we get on that side of the aisle to extend that program which will save approximately 150,000 jobs in the aerospace industry.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. I support the SST program. Is the gentleman indicating that the SST program is a defense program?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. No; I would simply say that the continuation of the SST program would save these jobs.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is talking about defense expenditures.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am delighted that the gentleman from Louisiana is going to support the SST program.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### TOWNSEND HOOPES REPLIES TO THE CHARGE HE LEAKED TOP SECRET INFORMATION TO THE NEW YORK TIMES; BUT IS THIS REALLY A DENIAL?

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I brought to the attention of this House a report in the Baltimore Sun that Townsend Hoopes, former Under Secretary of the Air Force, was responsible for the leak of very classified information in February 1968, that Gen. William C. Westmoreland had requested 206,000 more troops for Vietnam, to Edwin F. Dale, Jr., of the New York Times. At that time I announced that I had written Mr. Hoopes to confirm or deny this report, had written the Department of Defense to determine the classification of this information, and the Department of Justice to determine what, if any action they were taking to follow up on these allegations.

Since then, I have received a reply from Mr. Hoopes, which purports to be a denial of these allegations, and one from the Department of Defense indicating that the information in question bore

a classification of "top secret" and that the penalty for unauthorized disclosure of such information was a fine of \$10,000, or 10 years in jail, or both.

I am, however, deeply disappointed that I have not yet received any reply from Attorney General John Mitchell inquiring what, if anything, the Department of Justice was doing to track down this published allegation regarding top secret leaks within the Pentagon.

I am glad to have Mr. Hoopes' letter acknowledging his conversations on Vietnam policy with Mr. Dale at the dinner party in question. I frankly query whether the Hoopes statement really does represent a denial of the charges. After all, the record is clear that he had just come from top level Pentagon discussions, in which he participated as Acting Secretary of the Air Force, of several proposed alternatives for dealing with the Tet offensive, discussions which, according to a directive quoted in the Baltimore Sun, were to be treated with the highest possible degree of security up to the moment when the President's decision on these matters is announced.

Yet Mr. Hoopes admits his discussions with Mr. Dale involved the fact:

That the Viet Nam war was about to move to still higher and more costly levels. We touched—

He continues:

On the widely recognized fact that a serious debate over further escalation was developing in both the Congress and the administration, and that it appeared to involve a more vigorous opposition than had been manifested at any earlier stage of the war.

Even though Mr. Hoopes says:

There was no discussion by me or anyone else of the dimensions or details of any troop request.

The fact is that if top civilian officials in the Pentagon feel free to discuss top secret strategy discussions with members of the press and other witnesses present, even if they do not mention certain particular figures, security is already gravely compromised. After all, this is an old newspaper trick. All you need is one tip from somebody really in the know, and a good reporter can always zero in on specific figures from some knowledgeable subordinate by telling him he has already gotten some other figure from his superior.

In my judgment the leak of top secret material from the Pentagon in recent years has been nothing short of disgraceful, and I believe that Congress has a heavy responsibility to find out to what extent high ranking civilians have been responsible for these improper, illegal, and damaging actions.

I intend to get to the bottom of this matter, Mr. Speaker, as one member of the House Armed Services Committee.

I now insert in the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues, the reply from the Department of Defense, and the reply from Mr. Hoopes:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D.C., February 26, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. STRATTON: In your letter of February 23 to Secretary Laird concerning the

problem of further deployments to Vietnam in February 1968, you request answers to the following two questions:

1. What was the actual degree of classification assigned to the information that General Westmoreland had proposed 206,000 more American troops for Vietnam?

A. The report in question was classified Top Secret.

2. What is the penalty established by law for the improper and unauthorized disclosure of security information bearing the particular degree of classification referred to in paragraph 1 above?

A. Section 793 of the Federal Criminal Code (18 USC 793) provides as penalty for conviction thereof a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 10 years, or both.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. FROEHLKE.

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 1, 1971.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STRATTON: I have your letter of February 23, and of course recognize the legitimacy of your concern. It seemed to me that the best way to set the record straight on this matter was to write identical letters to the *Washington Post* and the *Baltimore Sun*. This I have done. The *Post* printed my reply on February 28, and I assume the *Sun* will follow suit.

I enclose a copy of the letter, which constitutes also a reply to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

TOWNSEND HOOPES.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
February 26, 1971.

The Editor,  
*The Washington Post*.  
The Editor,  
*The Baltimore Sun*.

An article of February 10, 1971 in the *Baltimore Sun* under the byline of Philip Potter alleges that I disclosed to the press the fact of a Wheeler-Westmoreland request for 206,000 additional troops for Vietnam in early March of 1968. The article asserts that the disclosure was made to Edwin F. Dale of *The New York Times* during dinner at the home of Congressman William Moorhead. The substance of the allegation, drawing on the Potter dispatch, was repeated in an article of February 23, 1971 in the *Washington Post* under the byline of Kenneth Crawford.

The allegation is false and without foundation. I did attend a dinner at Congressman Moorhead's on March 4, 1968. Mr. Dale was present. We had a brief discussion of the threatening gold crisis which was being fed by European anticipation that the Vietnam war was about to move to still higher and more costly levels. We touched on the widely recognized fact that a serious debate over further escalation was developing in both the Congress and the Administration, and that it appeared to involve a more vigorous opposition than had been manifest at any earlier stage of the war. There was no disclosure by me or anyone else of the dimensions or details of any troop request. I have dealt officially with military and foreign affairs for ten years; I do not handle classified information with indiscretion. The quotation in the Potter article, purporting to describe what I said to Mr. Dale, is thus a fabrication. A routine check with Mr. Dale would have made that fact quite clear.

What the Potter article treats passingly as an alleged indiscretion the Crawford article raises to the level of an alleged violation of "a specific presidential order of secrecy." His reference is to a directive addressed to some members of the Vietnam Task Force on February 28, 1968, asking for a reappraisal of Vietnam policy. Many facts

surrounding the issuance and status of that directive remain enshrouded in fog. It was, for example, unknown to most members of the task force, was never placed on the task force agenda, and was not reflected in the recommendations submitted by that group. However, the central point to be made here is that I never saw the directive in 1968, and have never seen it to this date. The first time I (and many others) heard of its existence was when President Johnson attempted to describe it to Walter Cronkite during his postmortem television interview of February 6, 1970.

TOWNSEND HOOPES.

CHARLES W. ENGELHARD, JR.

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey and the Nation lost a good friend in the untimely death on March 2 of Charles W. Engelhard, Jr.

As a businessman, Charles Engelhard was the hard-driving head of one of the largest family owned enterprises in the world. On a personal level, he was the gregarious good friend of all who knew him and the benefactor of thousands of orphans in "Boystown" of Kearny, N.J. He was a man who conducted his business and enjoyed his life on a grand scale yet found the time to visit the boys in Boystown several times a year.

In addition to his international enterprises, which might have afforded him the opportunity to ignore the problems of his home State, he remained active in New Jersey as well as in national politics. He contributed \$1¼ million to Rutgers University. Using the strength of Engelhard Minerals & Chemicals Corp., he prevailed upon the Government of South Africa during his dealings with officials of that Government, to end the oppressive apartheid racism. He said:

For world acceptance [South Africa] must begin to realize the dignity of man as a basic concept.

We shall all miss Charles Engelhard very much. To his wife, his daughters, to his mother, and family, Mrs. Daniels and I extend our deepest sympathy and join them in their sorrow.

#### WHAT IS WRONG WITH WRITING?

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members of the House realize that the postal law passed last year mark's you as a possible violator of the law? Did you realize that if you wrote to the Post Office Department in recommendation of any person for any position, whether they were a Democrat or Republican; whether they were to be an interim or permanent employee; regardless of whether they were the only person left to be promoted, no matter what, if you recommended an individual to the Post Office Department, your letter would be stamped in boldface letters across the front of it "In violation of Public Law

91-375." In other words, a Congressman of a half million people, recommending any person, even a career employee of the opposing party, your file would be stamped "In violation of the United States Law".

Now, you can write to the Postmaster General and be so bold as to say that you understand an individual has good character, has integrity, and so far as you know, has violated no law, but if you are not careful in how you say it, you could be the "criminal" recommending a career employee. Mr. Speaker, that is a ridiculous provision of the postal law, if that is indeed the language and intent of our new law.

Of course, you all know that the Postmaster General has put out a mailing to all post offices that they are, in effect, to have no contact with U.S. Congressmen. They further say that if a U.S. Congressman writes asking about any policy of the Post Office Department that your letter is immediately forwarded to a regional office and probably to the national office for reply. This means that only one person in the United States can interpret policy of the Post Office Department and that is the congressional liaison office. The net of all this asinine tomfoolery is that the postmasters throughout the United States are literally scared to death for their own position and are distressed to know how to answer inquiries from either the public or their Congressmen. This new law has literally cut off nearly all contact of the post office employees with their U.S. Congressmen. Surely that was not the intent of the law, which this House passed. I say that this law or interpretation of the law is overkill and ridiculous. If it is not Gestapo tactics, it is a scare tactic. Worst of all, the impression is that an employee of the U.S. Government should be careful not to write his Congressman about any postal regulation. The very idea of this position is repugnant and this must be corrected. Postal employees must not be afraid to write their Congressman, just as no individual on any subject should be afraid to write their Congressman. I am asking my postal employees to continue to write me. I am putting out a letter encouraging them to let me know how the mail service is going, and so forth.

Not to do this is unthinkable. To cut off all contact with Congress—and that is the end result—is I think unconstitutional. Suppose every Government agency advised its employees likewise not to contact any Member of Congress? How ridiculous can we be?

Mr. Speaker, I am today or Monday introducing a bill that will allow Members of Congress to exercise their responsibility to their constituents. Last year Congress attempted to do something that is impossible—wash their hands of the postal system. Postal service provided as a service to the citizens by the Government has been and still is a fundamental responsibility of the U.S. Government. However, the Postal Reorganization Act has completely isolated the postal service from the control of the people's elected representatives. Congress no longer has any control over such a basic item as

the rates charged for the public service of delivering mail.

The rates under the new law are controlled by a five-man Commission appointed for terms of 6 years by the President. Even the power of approving these appointments was not given to the Senate. Under the present law the Postal Service recommends to the Postal Rate Commission rate increases. The Rate Commission has the authority to recommend changes different from those proposed by the Postal Service. The Rate Commission has 90 days after they have received proposed rate increases to make a decision. If they do not make a decision, temporary increases can be put into effect. By using this temporary increase the Postal Service can in effect force the Commission to agree to a rate increase.

This system may or may not lead to an efficient postal service. Regardless of the result, I am concerned that there is no opportunity for the users of the postal service to disapprove an increase. The Postal Service is not like a private operation where if the customer does not like the price he can go somewhere else. There is only one postal system. There is no competitor across the street.

I firmly believe that the first duty of the Postal Service is to serve the people. Because of this belief I am introducing today a bill that will provide that by a vote of three-fifths of either the House or Senate a rate increase may be vetoed. My proposal would not interfere with the Postal Service originating rate increases. That has been a problem in the past because Congress is generally hesitant to initiate the increase.

All my bill would do is to give the elected representative of the people, the users of this postal system, an opportunity to say that this increase is not equitable, or that the increase is being placed on the wrong class of user. My bill would only be a check on the Postal Service's power. If an increase was needed and this could be shown, then it would not be likely that Congress veto such an increase. My bill will give the people a chance to voice their disapproval. My bill would also repeal the provisions allowing temporary rate increases, as this would be inconsistent with the right of Congress to veto. My bill is essentially the same approach that was contained in the Postal Reform Act as it passed the House. It was changed in conference.

#### PROBLEMS WITH THE NEW POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE), I suggest to the gentleman that he take up the complaint he has made about the new postal service with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), the father of the wonderful postal reform bill.

Members were told what they could expect when the bill was on the House floor last year. I was one of those who opposed it, and tried to tell the Members with what they would be faced.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Texas has called this to the attention of the House. But I would, as I said before, suggest that he go to the point of origin, and that is to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I know that the gentleman from Iowa did holler "wolf," and that we sometimes ought to listen, perhaps, more carefully to the gentleman than we do, but the gentleman hollers "wolf" quite often, although I must say that I share in the gentleman's apprehensions.

However, I have brought this to the attention of the Post Office Department down the street, and I have also brought it to the attention of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) yesterday, and I believe that we will see some recommended changes that will give us some commonsense approach to this Department, and I am also hopeful that we might have a special order on this subject a little later.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. Although we still have much to do, we are making substantial progress in this country in terms of the way people are living. Today over one-half of the American families have incomes of at least \$9,750. The number of Americans living in poverty, as defined by the Government, has declined from nearly 40 million in 1960 to approximately 25 million today.

#### NEEDED CHANGE IN GUN LAW

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining many of my colleagues in reintroducing legislation which places .22-caliber rimfire ammunition on the list of other sporting ammunition presently exempt from the reporting requirements of the Gun Control Act of 1968. This measure passed the House last December 21, but the Senate failed to act upon it before the adjournment of the 91st Congress.

The bill provides that the sale of .22-caliber rimfire ammunition will not re-

quire the seller to report and make a record of any information about the purchaser.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the Gun Control Act of 1968 not lived up to the billing of its proponents as a crime deterrent, but it has created great inconveniences and problems for the rural resident and for the American sportsmen who abide by its regulations while the criminals simply ignore it.

Although in 1969 the Congress repealed restrictions on the sale of shotgun ammunition and other rifle ammunition, the exemption does not cover .22-caliber rimfire ammunition, the most popular ammunition for use in rifles today. I feel it unjustified to continue these restrictions which serve only to paralyze law-abiding sportsmen and rural residents.

Furthermore, registration requirements for sporting ammunition have created an excessive and unnecessary administrative burden on the Treasury Department, firearm dealers, and purchasers of this kind of ammunition. The use of these recordkeeping requirements including .22-caliber has not led to a single successful investigation and prosecution of a crime. In fact, the redtape involved has deterred law enforcement officials from more proper and appropriate activities, such as tracking down the criminal.

This bill will relieve sporting ammunition dealers, farmers, and sportsmen from the unreasonable harassment imposed by the requirements of the present antigun law.

#### AN ARTIFICIAL GAS AND OIL SHORTAGE?

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk about a gas and oil shortage. There may be a shortage, but it is a shocking and shameful fact that the public and Government have no real way of knowing for certain what constitute our fuel reserves. Those who say that we have a shortage may well have profit-motive reasons for saying so and for artificially maintaining that shortage.

It is a fact that the only source of reserve reporting is the oil and gas industry.

There may be many different reasons for concealing reserve estimates. For example:

First, for scheduling depletion and depreciation rates for corporate accounting and tax accounting purposes;

Second, for delaying State and local taxes;

Third, for depressing the value of discoveries for acquisition or royalty purposes; and

Fourth, for fixing prices and production rates for interstate sales.

The U.S. Geological Survey says that under the ground and coasts of America there are 3,600 trillion cubic feet of gas. Not all of this can be reached, of course.

The industry said in 1968 that only 287 trillion cubic feet of gas was proven or "sure." What is the true figure of gas that can be reached? The public has no way of knowing. Tremendous gas reserves have been reported in the Maritime provinces of Canada. Action should be instituted to bring these supplies to American consumers.

It is estimated that there are some 500 shut-in wells off the Louisiana coast that could be pumping oil and gas. Governor McKeithen of Louisiana is reported as saying that there are 1,100 of these wells closed down waiting for the Federal Power Commission to raise wellhead prices.

The Nation should not be held hostage to the winter cold and energy shortages artificially motivated by greed and unreasonable profit.

I am therefore introducing today legislation which would require that all mineral deposits eligible for a depletion allowance be reported to the Department of the Interior and the Federal Power Commission as soon as they are discovered. Failure to provide information on the quality, volume, and location of the mineral deposit would result in penalties.

**MANPOWER REVENUE SHARING—  
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT  
OF THE UNITED STATES (H.  
DOC. NO. 92-59)**

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Like the 1770s, which produced an American Revolution, the 1970s can be a decade of revolutionary change. We have an opportunity to build on the strengths of the federal system, and by so doing to forge a strong new partnership in which each level of government does what it does best, and in which each function of government is lodged at that level at which it can best be performed.

One of the keys to this reform is Revenue Sharing—General and Special, \$16 billion in all.

Four weeks ago I asked the Congress to enact a \$5 billion General Revenue Sharing program. It was essentially a proposal to take some of the tax dollars the Federal Government raises and use them as a transfusion for our hard-pressed States, counties and cities—to be spent as the people in each jurisdiction agree with their own elected officials makes the best sense.

Two days ago in my message on Law Enforcement Assistance, I presented to the Congress the first of six proposals that will account for a total of \$11 billion in Special Revenue Sharing programs. Unlike General Revenue Sharing, which is new money without project restrictions, Special Revenue Sharing consists of \$10 billion now going into present Federal grant programs, plus \$1 billion in new funds, rescued from a thicket of

narrow categories and earmarked for spending in six broad areas of national concern.

Today I am proposing legislation in the second major area of Special Revenue Sharing—Manpower. The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 would:

—Provide \$2 billion during the first full year of its operation—\$4 for every \$3 now being spent—to help move men and women into productive employment.

—Unify into one the many programs under which Federal manpower money is now channeled to State and local governments.

—Free city, county, and State budgets from matching and maintenance-of-effort encumbrances, and officials of those governments from intricate administrative procedures.

—Vest the power to shape local manpower assistance efforts in governments close to the people they assist.

**MANPOWER ASSISTANCE: IN WHOSE HANDS?**

Labor, like other economic resources, is allocated by the market under our system. But as the American economy has grown increasingly complex and technological, we have seen that the job market has imperfections—frictions, lags, slack in the gears—whose costs in unemployment, underemployment and inadequate incomes must be reduced. A degree of cautious intervention in the market process over the long term is clearly a human imperative and a matter of national interest—as the Congress recognized nine years ago this month with a substantial commitment of Federal money and attention under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. That Act and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, currently include more than a dozen categorical grant programs in the manpower field, funded in Fiscal 1971 at \$1.5 billion.

While these efforts proceed from the best of intentions, they are overcentralized, bureaucratic, remote from the people they mean to serve, overguided, and far less effective than they might be in helping the unskilled and the disadvantaged. The reason: by and large, their direction does not belong in Federal hands.

Designing a manpower program that can best deliver its intended services starts with the recognition, one, that the "job market" is really thousands of interacting but separate markets spread all over the economic and geographic map of the United States, and two, that the "labor force" is actually 87 million individual men and women with a wide diversity of training needs. Under the circumstances it makes little sense for Washington to dominate decisions on manpower assistance—not when 50 States and thousands of local government units, each in touch with its own territory and close to its own people, stand ready to apply their know-how if Washington will only help pay the bills.

**PENALIZING DIVERSITY AND SUBSIDIZING  
BUREAUCRACY**

I recognize that there are many Federal purposes for which categorical

grants are still the best available approach. My Special Revenue Sharing proposals are targeted specifically at those program areas in which I believe the case for local decision is overriding.

Manpower is an area in which the need to adapt to diverse and changing local conditions is especially compelling, and in which the advantages of local control are correspondingly great.

When nationwide categorical programs are applied to diverse job markets, some cities and States may find their needs met nicely—but many others, inevitably, will come off second best. They will, in effect, be penalized for differing from the models according to which Federal programs are designed. They find themselves forced into funding projects of low local priority ahead of those of higher priorities simply because Federal program inflexibilities mean funding the available ones or none at all. Those who suffer as a result are not governmental units in the abstract but real people with bills to pay and families to feed. The injury is compounded when local funds, scarce at best, must be set aside to match—in effect, to buy into—the Federal money, if the money is not to be lost.

In one respect only do all States and cities fare equally under a system of narrow categorical grants: officials of all must, as a matter of survival, learn their way through a bureaucratic jungle.

For example:

—Merely to describe one State's Federal manpower programs in 1970 required a jargon-heavy tome 1185 pages long.

—Last fall a businessmen's group attempting to list all the public manpower programs in New York City gave up after 44 entries, commenting that "attempting to unravel the intricate mass of detailed data on the individual programs has been an exhausting undertaking."

—Harried vocational school administrators must cope with a 930-page Labor Department manual and hundreds of pages more of Federal standards and conditions, to meet the requirements of a single program—MDTA institutional training.

In light of all this, Americans' discontent with government is no mystery. The Federal money put to low-priority uses, the captive local matching money, the waste of time by local officials in threading their way through Byzantine administrative tangles—all are unfair: to a Nation that deserves a healthy employment market, to people out of work who deserve effective job assistance, and to taxpayers who deserve a hundred cents worth of public benefits on every dollar government takes from them.

**TO MAKE GOOD ON A GOOD IDEA**

The active Federal commitment to manpower training and development was a good idea in 1962, when Congress in enacting MDTA expressed concern that "the problem of assuring sufficient employment opportunities will be compounded by the extraordinarily rapid growth of the labor force in the next decade." It is an even better idea today,

with the labor force already enlarged by 19 percent in the 9 years since, and with technological change still rapid. But one of the great lessons of the dramatic Federal Government growth in the 1960s is that even a good idea like this can fall short of its promise if the way in which it is carried out runs against the grain of the Federal system. By converting the Nation's manpower programs from categorical grants to Special Revenue Sharing, we can play to the strengths of the Federal partnership, teaming Federal dollars with State and local decision-making. This is the purpose of the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 which I am proposing today.

#### WHERE THE MONEY GOES

I have proposed that \$2 billion be provided for the first full year of the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act, which would replace the Manpower Development and Training Act and manpower provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act on January 1, 1972. This represents an increase of almost one-third over current levels of funding for the affected categorical grants. Since the need for job training and other manpower assistance expands as the Nation grows, the Act would set no ceiling on future appropriations.

Of this amount provided, 85 percent would be distributed to the States and to cities and counties with a population of 100,000 or more. Since jobs and workers cross city and county lines, bonus funds within the formula distribution would be awarded to consortia of local governments which embrace entire major labor market areas. Governments which can agree to act in concert in smaller urban areas would also qualify for funds. The remaining 15 percent would be made available to the Secretary of Labor to fund special activities.

The shared revenues would be allocated by statutory formula. Each State or local area's share would be determined by its proportionate number of workers, unemployed persons and low income adults.

#### WHAT ARE MANPOWER PROGRAMS?

Manpower programs develop job skills. They help the unemployed and underemployed, particularly welfare recipients and other disadvantaged persons, make the transition to better jobs, better pay and higher skill levels.

An effective program focuses on individual needs and available jobs. It embraces a wide range of manpower activities, providing combinations of services to move people toward their employment goals. Authorized manpower activities include:

- recruitment, counseling, testing, placement, and follow-up services;
- classroom instruction in both remedial education and occupational skills;
- training on the job with both public and private employers, aided by manpower subsidies;
- job opportunities, including work experience and short-term employment for special age groups and the temporary unemployed, and transitional public service employment at all levels of government;

—ancillary services like child care assistance, relocation assistance, and minor health services.

Decisions on the mix and specifics of State and local activities under this broad umbrella would be up to each government. However, payments and allowances for individuals would be limited to two consecutive years, in recognition of the fact that these manpower programs are designed not to provide long-term public support but rather to assist job seekers in making the transition to permanent or better jobs.

#### NEW FLEXIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

In keeping with the principles of Special Revenue Sharing, State and local governments would be given wide discretion in determining how the funds provided should be used.

This manpower program, unlike its predecessors, would have no exhaustive volumes of Federal standards to be met. There would be no towering piles of Federal program applications to complete and no frustrating delays at the Federal level. State and local money now tied down by matching requirements and maintenance of effort would be freed for spending elsewhere as community priorities might dictate.

Giving State and local officials full power to spend Federal manpower funds would sharply increase the citizen's ability to influence how the funds are spent. It would make government more responsive to legitimate demands for quality services.

To enhance public accountability for manpower programs, State and local governments would be required to publish a statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds each year, prior to receiving their shared revenues. These statements would include information on the area's economic and labor market conditions; targeted client groups; proposed activities; wages, allowances and other benefits; manpower agencies involved; and the positions and salaries of the program's administrators. In addition, the statements would review the previous year's programs.

Both State and local governments would be required to publish comments about each other's program statements. In particular, they would be responsible for coordinating and making full use of all other State and local manpower activities available. After full public disclosure and discussion they would be required to publish their final program statements for the coming year.

To increase the information available to the public, the Labor Department would publish evaluations of program effectiveness.

The people would have the hard facts needed to hold their public officials directly and readily accountable for the manner in which manpower programs are administered.

#### PROGRAMS AND PURPOSES

Manpower Revenue Sharing is a partnership. Washington puts up the purse and sets out the broad purposes of authorized spending, while program decisions are turned over to the statehouses,

county governments and city halls. My proposal neither mandates nor terminates any programs. It provides that the continuation, expansion, or modification of each program would be determined, as it ought to be, by the test of performance alone—and determined by the State or community which the program serves. Programs that have proved themselves in practice could be continued with the use of the Federal funds provided. Indeed many current categorical programs probably would continue and expand in response to local needs once arbitrary Federal restrictions were removed. On the other hand, programs whose past claims of effectiveness are not justified by the record deserve to be replaced by others more responsive to community needs. Vesting the program authority in governments close to the people will make it harder for programs to coast along on their momentum from year to year, and easier to tailor manpower assistance to on-the-scene realities.

#### THE FEDERAL ROLE

The special activities financed by the 15 percent of manpower funds retained for use by the Secretary of Labor would include support and assistance for State and local programs through staff training and technical aid, through research, and through experimental and demonstration programs to develop new manpower techniques.

The Department of Labor would also maintain a comprehensive system of labor market information and computerized job banks to facilitate exchange of information among different areas. It would monitor State and local programs for fiscal accountability and compile comparative data on all programs to help the Congress and the public assess their effectiveness.

In addition, the Labor Department would have funds to help support certain programs which operate most effectively across State and local boundaries.

This Act, like my other revenue sharing proposals, would include rigorous safeguards against all discrimination. The legislation I am recommending today stipulates that revenue shared and other funds expended by the Secretary of Labor under this Act would be considered Federal financial assistance within the meaning of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

#### MANPOWER POLICY AND PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

One of the most innovative features of my proposed Manpower Training Act of 1969 was an automatic "trigger" which provided more manpower funds when the national unemployment rate rose to 4.5 percent or more for three consecutive months.

The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act contains a similar feature. Triggered funds would be distributed by the Secretary of Labor to areas of high unemployment to provide additional training and employment opportunities.

Under such conditions many State and local governments might choose to use these funds to create temporary public



service jobs to offset the rise in unemployment.

This is an acceptable and appropriate use of triggered funds—and of regular shared revenues for manpower programs.

Transitional and short-term public employment can be a useful component of the Nation's manpower policies. But public employment not linked to real jobs or not devoted to equipping the individual to compete in the labor market is only a palliative, not a solution for manpower problems.

Thus, this Act would also provide permanent authority for public service job creation as part of an overall manpower program—but with the proviso that such jobs must constitute transitional opportunities. Within a two-year period participants must be enabled to move into the public employer's regular payroll, or helped to obtain other public or private employment.

Public jobs created through manpower funds would thus be used to develop skills and abilities, with participants moving through such positions into permanent opportunities.

Federal funds already support almost 2 million jobs in State and local government. When enacted, General Revenue Sharing may support tens of thousands more.

Furthermore, last week the administration requested Congressional approval for the creation of at least 200,000 new public jobs for welfare recipients. A part of my welfare reform proposals, these new jobs would lead to non-subsidized employment for welfare recipients for whom other jobs are not available.

#### FITTING PROGRAMS TO PEOPLE

This new reliance on local flexibility and local initiative should benefit citizens and communities across the country. For example:

—This Act would allow city governments to bring jobless ghetto residents onto city payrolls in education, health safety and anti-pollution work while preparing them to move into permanent jobs.

—This Act would allow State governments to reach out to isolated rural poor people with training and job programs shaped to their special needs.

—This Act would allow county governments to provide skill training and transitional employment to welfare recipients to move them toward self-support and new dignity.

It would, in short, allow each State or community to fit its programs to its people.

#### LOOKING AHEAD

In August 1969 I submitted the Manpower Training Act of 1969. It was one of three key proposals to begin reversing the tide of power which for a generation has flowed from the States and communities to Washington.

For over a year the Ninety-First Congress considered the proposed new manpower legislation, adding many new and creative ideas to our original proposals. Legislation was approved by both houses of Congress which entrusted important

new manpower responsibilities to State and local governments. Unfortunately, the final bill also contained serious flaws, and I was forced to withhold my approval from it last December. With this message I am fulfilling my pledge then to submit new manpower legislation in 1971.

This bill builds upon the foundation that was laid during the last Congress.

It responds to Governors' and Mayors' appeals for increased responsibility and increased flexibility.

It makes manpower programs more readily accountable to the clients they serve and the taxpayers who support them.

It recognizes that transitional public service employment is an integral part of manpower policy—and places no ceiling on its extent within the manpower program.

It triggers extra Federal funds to counteract periods of rising unemployment.

In summary, this proposal is designed to give more effective help to those who need it, and to give Americans full return for their tax dollars spent on manpower assistance in the years ahead—full return in the form of unemployment brought down and kept down, and in the form of new income and achievement opportunities for millions of deserving men and women.

And its effects could reach far beyond the field of manpower: As it gives State and local governments the resources and authority to deal with their problems in a single area, it can build the confidence and competence of those governments in all areas. As it cuts away the layers of bureaucracy that have separated the people from one specific exercise of their governing power, it can help restore the people's faith in the democratic process generally. Teamed with my other Special and General Revenue Sharing proposals, it can help to launch the United States on a new era of revolutionary change for the better.

RICHARD NIXON.

The WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1971.

#### MANPOWER REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential message on manpower revenue sharing received by the Congress today gives real cause for encouragement.

It offers aid in bringing down unemployment during this period of transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. It is also a building block in the constructing of a "New Federalism" which puts far more decisionmaking power in the hands of State and local governments.

I am heartened by the fact that the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 would provide permanent authority for public service job creation as part of our overall manpower program. Wisely, the

President has stipulated that such jobs be a transition to the public employer's regular payroll or to other public or private employment.

I would point up, too, the fact that the administration has proposed the creation of at least 200,000 transitional public jobs for welfare recipients as part of the Welfare Reform Act of 1971.

However, the focus on public service jobs should not eclipse the far-reaching changes in the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act in terms of freeing State and local governments for more effective manpower training action.

The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act would consolidate the multitude of existing federally assisted manpower programs and give local officials the power to shape their own programs. Significantly, it would provide nearly one-third more Federal dollars while erasing the obligation for local fund matching.

As the President has so aptly put it, the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act would team Federal dollars with local decisionmaking. This should be a winning combination—a far better system than bureaucratic dictation from Washington and the redtape of categorical manpower grants.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question of the distinguished minority leader, the program for the week of March 8, 1971, is as follows:

On Monday, which is District Day, there are no bills for consideration.

On Tuesday—House Resolution 115—to reconstitute the Select Committee on Crime, known as the Pepper committee. On Wednesday and the balance of the week—

H.R. 4246—the wage and price controls extension, subject to a rule being granted.

H.R. 5432—interest equalization tax extension, also subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. Speaker, any further program will be announced later.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that next week we have one bill?

Mr. BOGGS. No, we have three bills.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, you have three bills listed but you have only one bill which is in order. Rules must be granted for the other two bills, and if the committee does not grant the rules, we only have one bill.

Mr. BOGGS. I can assure the gentleman that the rules will be granted.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us when this House is going to get down to business rather than going into all-night sessions and late night sessions all this year and all that sort of thing. This is getting to be a little wearisome to see no business coming on.

Mr. BOGGS. I would suggest to the gentleman that the wage and price control legislation and the interest equalization bill are considerable business. I would also suggest to the gentleman that as soon as the committees expedite the legislation, it will be considered on the floor of the House.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY  
MARCH 8, 1971

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

"FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS"

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a little while ago a great, lovely, and gracious lady at 87 years of age passed away in Atlanta. She, for 52 years, was the wife of a distinguished attorney at the Florida bar and thereafter for many years at the Georgia bar, and a general counsel for the Coca-Cola Co. in Atlanta. Both Mr. Roy D. Stubbs and Mrs. Stubbs, since the 1930's, were my devoted friends. On Christmas Day the bereaved husband penned a tribute to his departed wife entitled, "For Whom the Bell Tolls." It is so beautiful and touching in the love and tribute it expresses that I wanted to incorporate it in the RECORD and give my colleagues a chance to know and to feel its moving beauty. I ask, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the tribute by Mr. Roy D. Stubbs, of Atlanta, be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

"FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS"

The garden of roses in the churchyard down the street marks your absence; their bursting buds saturate the air with a delicate fragrance, and their slender stems bend with the scented breeze. They don't understand why you have deserted them.

After you left your African Violets, sensi-

tive to the tender touch of the hand that fed them and watered them, wilted. Your other potted plants, lacking the constant caress of the one who loved them, shed their drooping leaves and faded blooms. We sought other homes for them among your flower-loving friends.

Now the window sills of our apartment are naked and bare; the place we called home is stark and bleak, but crowded with the memories of the lovely lady who but lately dwelt within these walls.

Sometimes the echo of footsteps in the hall startle me, sometimes half asleep in the groggy hours of the night, I dream I hear you calling. When I awake, I miss you so, tears trickle down my wrinkled face and I weep unashamedly, for I never knew I loved you so deeply until you were gone.

If forsooth you live again in the Great Beyond, as so many people of so many faiths so zealously believe; in those Elysian fields you may find another home where none but the pure in heart reside and peace reigns supreme.

Those who knew you best loved you most; those near and dear to you will hug your memory close to their hearts with a devotion immeasurable and a love everlasting for the great woman that you were.

Roy D. Stubbs,  
Christmas Day, 1970.

THE MERIT SELECTION OF JUDGES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the need for change in the administration of justice in America is an issue which my colleagues recognize as one of the most critical issues of our time. We are constantly reminded of the urgency of this need on the national level and on the State and local levels of Government. In order to achieve any success in improving our legal system, the legal profession must recognize that professional qualifications rather than political considerations must be established as the sole criteria for the selection of judges.

I was heartened, during a recent visit in my district, when I heard the Honorable Burton Young, president of the Florida Bar Association, speak before the regular meeting of the Dade County Bar Association on Monday January 25. Mr. Young is a distinguished member of the law firm, Snyder, Young & Stern of North Miami Beach and was graduated from the University of Miami Law School in 1950. In 1965 he served as Judge of the Moot Court of Appeals, Yale University.

Mr. Young, a most persuasive advocate of change in the legal profession, recalled for his colleagues the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson who believed:

The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of society, depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice, that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislature and the executive . . . The judges therefore should always be men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness and attention: their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests: they should not be dependent upon any man or body of men. . . .

It is with great pride as a member of the Florida Bar Association and the American Bar Association, and with great expectations for the State of Florida,

that I present the text of the remarks of my distinguished colleague, Mr. Burton Young:

SPEECH BEFORE DADE COUNTY BAR  
ASSOCIATION

The last seven months this new administration has been pounding away at this work of heading up the Florida Bar and giving it a new direction . . . one we would like to have remembered as a great experiment. It has very candidly engulfed our very being . . . personally, it goes with me everywhere and I feel the weight of its responsibility every conscious moment.

What greatly concerned most lawyers and judges of Florida about the operation of their Florida bar was something that can best be described as "detachment". Many of you looked upon the board of governors as a select group of lawyers who did their thing in their own mysterious way.

The great majority of the lawyers and judges of Florida thought of the board of governors as "them" and the lawyers with whom we practice and the judges with whom we judge daily as "us".

Many of you thought the organized bar didn't really give a damn about anything other than running an esoteric disciplinary program, a C.L.E. program publishing a magazine—which you sometimes read—sometimes not—and extracting \$37.50 as dues from you every year.

All of us recognized that the internal and public relations of the bar was terrible.

There was a dramatic communications gap.

There was a poor legislative policy. The board was precluded by rule from becoming involved in the legislative sense from participating in the proposal of any law which affected the great public interest. Thus, we as a bar, isolated ourselves from the hurricane of modern society.

The lawyers and judges of the bar we thought, resented all of this. We thought the lawyers of Florida wanted to become involved with critical issues of the day. We thought the lawyers and judges wanted to be communicated with and about the operation of the Florida bar.

We thought that there should be a new day for the Florida bar.

The overall make-up of the board of governors changed somewhat. A great majority of those deciding to remain on in this administration—with this new approach—agreed, and they agreed, as the events over these past months indicated by actions not just in words.

The Florida bar—as even a little newspaper in Clearwater recently commented editorially—has acquired a new vitality.

What will become of it? . . . I hope it will be remembered. . . . Indeed I pray it will be remembered, for adding a new dimension to the organized bar in Florida, one that addresses itself to the obligation of the lawyer and judge as well as to his welfare.

And it is our obligation to delve headlong into critical issues that have been so long overlooked. And then it is our obligation to speak out and spotlight—indeed expose wrongs when we see wrongs committed upon the public—with the corresponding obligation to be constructive and become pathfinders to justice and to light that path for the public we serve.

So we changed the rule that the Florida bar can not endorse or sponsor legislation that affects the great public interest. The board of governors now considers all types of legislation proposed by all types of Florida bar committees upon whom so many of you now serve.

The theme is "involvement"—and the lawyers and judges throughout Florida have responded magnificently to the call.

We as a bar have become involved not simply concerned about an antiquated penal system, and we have resolved to do something about it. We as a bar recognize our obligations regarding a judiciary that had its genesis in a revered constitution but was dragged into the political arena. We have resolved to do something about it.

We as a bar have recognized our obligation to the poor who are being denied competent legal services because they are poor. We have resolved to do something about it.

We as a bar recognize an obligation to be concerned about the radical left who by violence are seeking to destroy a government created for liberty and to throw us into the jaws of that type of government which the radical right is preparing for us, one which will suspend this liberty. We have resolved to do something about it.

We as a bar recognize an obligation to be concerned about the pollution plague that threatens mankind's survival. We have resolved, through law, to do something about it. There is so much more.

Florida bar committees are struggling with such problems that affect mankind and its survival. They are working on legislative proposals running the gamut from protecting the consumer against continued abuses, humanizing our penal system to laws that will help to insure the purity of the air we breathe.

Let's talk about our judges. In order for me to prove my point, indulge me while we use a personal identification approach—or better stated, "There but for the grace of God go I." Say you have been indicted for something you know you haven't done. . . . Say forgery of a client's name on a satisfaction of mortgage. You are arraigned and you are to go to court for trial in two weeks.

You are obviously upset, you found out as much about the charges as you can. . . . who the lawyer that opposes you will be, who the judge is, and all the rest. You are innocent and you wanted to make sure they realize that fact. The question is . . . who is the judge?

You find out and you are not pleased.

It just happens that it turns out to be the local campaign treasurer for the governor in his last campaign for office. He hasn't been there long and you, along with many others, have doubted his ability. None of you are sure, but you have doubted. The thing that bothers you the most is that you refused to give him a contribution for the governor's campaign.

You can't be judged for that, can you . . . ? Well, can you? Chances are it just might worry you. . . . And worry you a lot. Wouldn't it be absurd to wind up a felon—and an automatically suspended lawyer with its attendant disgrace for something you didn't do. . . . All because you didn't give to finance the gubernatorial efforts of someone you didn't believe in?

Granted this is a far fetched fairy tale type thing that probably hasn't ever happened, yet. But it can be a catalyst to your imagination, because it is a possibility. We then must ask ourselves: Are politically appointed judges really the best kind?

It has been said that over 75% of the judges in the state of Florida have gotten to the bench by appointment. Most do a good job . . . but some do just a mediocre job and some do a poor job. Let's face it, it is downright frightening in some cases.

Doubtless you are familiar with the recent governor's disregard for making use of the Florida bar's judicial screening process—to which he was committed. He wanted to name who he wanted . . . and he did. No holds barred. He just did it.

There is nothing written anywhere that says that he can't do otherwise. His only guide is his conscience. If he has none . . . or the pressure brought to bear from all of

his backers becomes too strong, then out goes any dedication to principle and commitments and in comes dedication to political longevity or political practicality. This just points up that political selection and merit selection are as far apart as heaven is from hell.

We need to change this system because it is wrong; and the administration has dedicated itself to bring forth that change. It is my hope that the board of governors at their next meeting in March will adopt a separate constitutional amendment dealing only with the merit selection of judges. We can't afford to run the risk of tying this all-important subject to an all-encompassing judicial article that, because of political expediency, will be picked at, kicked at, and spat at, by those who would resist change regardless of the need for a change.

A builder of this country's foundation, Thomas Jefferson put it this way:

The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of society, depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice, that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislature and the executive. . . . the judges therefore should always be men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness and attention: Their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests: They should not be dependent upon any man or body of men. . . ."

Nowhere did he make mention of selection of judges or in fact of appointment of judges. His comments would seem to obviate the need to stay exclusively away from those alternatives.

Yes, merit selection of some type is the best method. The election and appointment of judges is too political to give any credence to the man's qualifications as a judge as opposed to his capability as a politician.

What is the merit selection process? It is a non-partisan group or commission of lawyers and non-lawyers who go out and seek the best talent available for judicial appointment. They then recommend three names to the appointing authority—all of whom have been certified competent—and the appointing authority appoints one.

Some worry about what is to be done with those men that a commission has approved. Wouldn't they be in office till they die or get tired of the job? That isn't the solution.

With merit selection, we must build in a method of checks and balances that will authorize us to go back and re-evaluate the judges who are on the bench. They must be kept within the people's reach. If they aren't living up to the higher standards that I hope we can establish . . . then we will replace them with someone who can. In this way we are taking a political label from their candidacy. They are being judged on how they are doing their job. That is all they are being judged on.

Merit selection is the only way that we can assure the people of Florida that they have competent judges and this will go a long way towards improving the sanctity of the law.

The other half of the coin is overall judicial reform.

At the board of governor's meeting in Tampa ten days ago, we heard a proposal by a Florida bar committee regarding another article V. As expected, it did receive some batting around. We heard from the Speaker of the House, Richard Pettigrew, on his beliefs regarding judicial reform. He is in favor and said so. He wants us, the Florida bar, to get off our indecisions and do something . . . become leaders in the battle.

Bring it to the people. This we fully intend to do and we are going to continue

fighting this article V battle until we achieve some results.

I am confident that we will produce a judicial article that will improve our present system, I am just as confident that the Legislature will justify it, and if their surgery is not too dramatic to defeat its true purpose, we will bring to Floridians an opportunity to update our judicial system.

But even with the most up to date administrative procedures our population explosion will put us in trouble soon again with crowded dockets, and a resultant slow down of justice.

We must address ourselves to the whole problem. Simply, we are judging in areas that we have no business in.

Trained sociologists should be handling juvenile, marital, child custody, and adoption problems—not judges of the circuit court—the highest trial court in our state. If we just retained enforcement powers over these matters, just imagine the extent of the judicial manpower that would become available for pure judging.

In the criminal field, a judge should not be tinkering with a man's life past the conviction stage. It is an affront to society that we permit a person with perhaps not one course in psychology or sociology to merely look at a person's past record after conviction and then deciding how long a person should be jailed, if at all, for proper punishment and rehabilitation. This is not only archaic—it is darn silly. It is astonishing that society puts up with it.

Then, these are the things we must face up to. As judges and lawyers we cannot be content to rely upon precedent when the sands of time exposed the fallacies that gave rise to that precedent. We must accept reality and accommodate our thinking to cope with its problems.

We remember our noble past. Wasn't it so many of our professional forebearers who banded together one hot summer day in Philadelphia in 1776 and mutually pledged to each "our lives, our fortune, and our sacred honor." Because they believed that people had a right to co-exist with each other as free men. They believed that all men were created equal and had a right to life, liberty and to the pursuit of happiness which were described and indelibly inscribed by these lawyers as inalienable rights, rights that his government was bound to respect. Rights borne of oppression, but nourished by courage.

What of the Websters, the Henrys, the Marshalls, the Bryans, the Darrows, the Holmes, the Warrens who made the law, defended the law, or interpreted the law for peoples' rights as they saw it?

But the problem, my colleagues, is that some say times have changed. What they preached . . . we fail to follow. And the disparity is between those words, inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and fact. We have been challenged in this day as never before by our young, because they see that disparity, in what has become known as the establishment. They resent the establishment for a disease they don't care to inherit. The disease as they see it is hypocrisy.

We would do ourselves and our profession a great disservice if we were to dismiss this challenge as the irresponsible and immature activities of youth or of the radicals to the right or to the left. This is the time for our profession, we who are the disciples of a free and orderly society, law for and with justice to live up to our faith by giving of ourselves. We must give our full talents to the cause of improving but still preserving our cherished profession and this nation's democratic processes by deeds and not by words. This is our quest.

It is for our "sacred honor."

BURTON YOUNG, President,  
The Florida Bar.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Thursday, February 25, 1971, the Chair declares a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to receive the former Members of the House of Representatives.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The SPEAKER. On behalf of the Chair and of the Chamber, I consider it a high honor and a distinct personal privilege to have the opportunity of welcoming so many of our former Members and colleagues as may be present here for this occasion. We all pause to welcome them. This is a bipartisan affair, and in that spirit the Chair is going to recognize the floor leaders of both parties.

The Chair now recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, this is a happy duty for me. Today, we inaugurate a custom which I trust will become an annual event of recessing the proceedings of the House in order to extend a warm and a friendly welcome back to Members who have served in this great body.

I am very happy that two very distinguished former Members, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hays, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Judd, have been instrumental in bringing together in a formal organization those Members who are still alive who at one time or another were our colleagues in this Chamber.

Mr. Rayburn, who served as Speaker longer than any man in the history of this Republic, said on many occasions that to be selected by one's constituents to serve one term in the House of Representatives was an honor that words were inadequate to describe. To be elected and reelected and reelected was an even greater honor.

And why? Because it comes to few men and few women to have the opportunity to participate in the affairs of this great country, to have some voice in the determination of the direction of and the preservation of the United States of America.

And, Mr. Speaker, since the First Congress convened in Philadelphia in 1789 to this very date, the number of men and women who have served in this Chamber is still very, very small. It is an honor and a distinction that has come to few men and few women.

I think I express the feeling of both my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues when I welcome back to be with us again the Members who have served here.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I remember when the late great General MacArthur addressed a joint session here he used the old saying that "Old Soldiers never die, they just fade away." Well, old Congressmen never die, they just fade away—

and fortunately some of them take a long time to fade away, because among those whom we welcome here today is the Honorable Earl H. Beshlin, of Pennsylvania, who served in this body in the First World War from the great State of Pennsylvania, and who on the 28th day of April of this year will celebrate his 101st birthday.

I hope all of our former Members and all of our present Members will equal that record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now pleased to recognize the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to welcome so many friends and former colleagues back to the Chamber. We hope and trust, as the gentleman from Louisiana, the distinguished majority leader, has said, that this will be an annual affair, and on each and every occasion you will be as welcome in the future as you are here today.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a somewhat eventful week in the Capitol Building. It started off with a big bang on the other side of the Capitol, but yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we tried out one of our new House rules—recorded teller voting. Instead of being Republicans and Democrats, we were reds and greens. The result was something like a professional ice hockey match with the players being blindfolded. The score was: Reds, 212; Greens, 179; injured, 44.

Now we have our first alumni day, Mr. Speaker, and I have been wondering who would show up. We have a great many distinguished alumni: The President of the United States, former President Lyndon Johnson, and a great many Members of the U.S. Senate, that group we affectionately call "the other body." We do welcome each and every one of you under the 5-minute rule.

Despite the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, you will find that things really have not changed a great deal. In most cases we disagree without being disagreeable. Democrats vote with Republicans, and Republicans vote with Democrats. You will find, as you sit here now, that Members sitting in the back of the Chamber seldom listen to the speaker who is making his remarks—I doubt if that will ever change. But, fundamentally, you will find this body is still the people's House.

In my opinion, this is a tradition that we must hold dear in the years ahead.

All of you who are alumni here today contributed your share to maintaining the integrity of this body as the people's House. Those of us here today and those who will be here tomorrow have a special obligation to make certain that tradition, that principle, is carried on forever.

I conclude by congratulating our most distinguished alumnus, the former Representative Mr. Beshlin, on being here on this auspicious occasion. The gentleman from Louisiana mentioned when he served. He did not, however, mention that he was a Democrat and a prohibitionist. I do not know what significance that is, but nevertheless despite his party

label or party labels we do consider him the most distinguished guest of all of the alumni here with us today.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair now directs the Clerk to call the roll of former Members of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk called the roll of former Members of the Congress, and the following former Members answered to their names:

- John G. Alexander, Minnesota.
- Miles Algood, Alabama.
- Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina.
- William H. Avery, Kansas.
- William H. Ayres, Ohio.
- Carl G. Bachmann, West Virginia.
- Joseph W. Barr, Indiana.
- Robert B. Barry, New York.
- Laurie Battle, Alabama.
- Marion T. Bennett, Missouri.
- Earl H. Beshlin, Pennsylvania.
- Frances P. Bolton, Ohio.
- James E. Bromwell, Iowa.
- Charles H. Brown, Missouri.
- Charles B. Brownson, Indiana.
- Maurice G. Burnside, West Virginia.
- Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky.
- Victor Christgau, Minnesota.
- Jeffrey Cohelan, California.
- W. Sterling Cole, New York.
- Frank Carlson, Kansas.
- Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska.
- Thomas D'Alesandro, Maryland.
- Lawrence Curtis, Massachusetts.
- Colgate W. Darden, Virginia.
- Vincent J. Dellay, New Jersey.
- Ken W. Dyal, California.
- Clyde T. Ellis, Arkansas.
- Phil Ferguson, Oklahoma.
- Homer Ferguson, Michigan.
- John Foley, Maryland.
- Ed Foreman, New Mexico.
- Ellsworth Foote, Connecticut.
- George M. Grant, Alabama.
- Robert Hale, Maine.
- George V. Hansen, Idaho.
- Porter Hardey, Jr., Virginia.
- William Henry Harrison, Wyoming.
- Brooks Hays, Arkansas.
- Don Hayworth, Michigan.
- William E. Hess, Ohio.
- Pat Hillings, California.
- Evan Howell, Illinois.
- Edouard V. Izac, California.
- Harry P. Jeffrey, Ohio.
- Edward H. Jenison, Illinois.
- W. Pat Jennings, Virginia.
- Calvin D. Johnson, Illinois.
- Glen D. Johnson, Oklahoma.
- Jed Johnson, Oklahoma.
- George Meader, Michigan.
- Walter H. Judd, Minnesota.
- Frank M. Karsten, Mississippi.
- Edna F. Kelly, New York.
- Eugene J. Keogh, New York.
- David S. King, Utah.
- Thomas S. Kleppe, North Dakota.
- Horace R. Kornegay, North Carolina.
- Melvin Laird, Wisconsin.
- Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota.
- Clifford G. McIntire, Maine.
- Hervey G. Machen, Maryland.
- John C. Mackie, Michigan.
- Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire.
- Walter H. Moeller, Ohio.
- Abraham J. Multer, New York.
- F. Jay Nintz, Indiana.
- Frank C. Osmer, Jr., New Jersey.
- Howard W. Pollock, Alaska.
- James Quigley, Pennsylvania.
- Robert Ramspeck, Georgia.
- Benjamin Reifel, South Dakota.
- John M. Robson, Jr., Kentucky.
- Byron G. Rogers, Colorado.
- J. T. Rutherford, Texas.
- Henry C. Schadeberg, Wisconsin.
- Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio.

Carlton R. Sickles, Maryland.  
 Alfred D. Stieminski, New Jersey.  
 James V. Smith, Oklahoma.  
 Lynn Stalbaum, Wisconsin.  
 Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey.  
 Anthony Tauriello, New York.  
 Clark Thompson, Texas.  
 James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania.  
 Harold H. Velde, Illinois.  
 Phillip H. Weaver, Nebraska.  
 Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina.  
 John Bell Williams, Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to announce that any Member whose name was not called may step to the well, and his name will be called.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, I was recorded as being absent. I am present and would like to be so recorded.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that I am present.

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. With the gentleman from Mississippi present a quorum is always present.

Mr. CLYDE ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce my presence.

Mr. BEN REIFEL. I am present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EDWARD H. JENISON. I am present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PAT HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I announce my presence.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce my presence.

Mr. CHELF. Present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Present, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that 83 former Members of the House of Representatives have answered to their names.

The Chair desires to announce now that it will be his purpose to recognize for 1 hour for the purpose of controlling time the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hays, on behalf of the majority and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Judd, on behalf of the minority.

Before recognizing the gentleman from Arkansas, the Chair desires to state that the Chair would like to recognize several Members whose names have been called but, unfortunately, they are not all present. However, I think it is significant that this is the anniversary of the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, March 4, 1789.

In that first Congress, the first person ever to be elected Speaker was the Honorable Frederick A. Muhlenberg, of Pennsylvania. In 1947, when the present occupant of the chair came to the Congress, Frederick A. Muhlenberg IV, a direct descendant of the original Speaker, was present.

The Chair would also, before recognizing the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hays, to call to the chair to represent from the chair former Members, a very distinguished former Member, the Honorable Colgate Darden, not only a former Member of the House but a former Governor of the great State of Virginia and a former president of the University of Virginia.

The Chair now recognizes for 1 hour the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hays.

Mr. BROOKS HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield one-half of the time to my dear, longtime friend and former colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Judd.

What one hears in conversations sometimes is very interesting, and is not always complimentary. Today in a conversation between two of my colleagues who served with me in the House, when it was announced that I had laryngitis and was unable to speak, one of them said, "It is too bad that ailment could not have been with him more often when he was a sitting Member of the House."

And then what I heard two farmers say when they walked away from my speech at Solgohachia, Conway County, one said, "Old Brooks could have done worse." And the other one said, "Yes, if he had had more time."

It would be impossible, Mr. Speaker, for me to thank everyone who has added to the enjoyment of this occasion, and to the conditions that make it auspicious. Just as the convening of the Congress nine score and two years ago today was historic, we believe, as was so well said by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs), that the meeting of this group today is historic. We come in a rather humble mood, I think, to greet those of you who still share responsibilities for legislative policy, not only to thank the majority and the minority leaders and the Speaker for the work they have done to make this possible, but to such leaders as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Schwengel), who is with the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, who has taken an avid interest in what we are doing, believing that this has real significance from the standpoint of history. We want to help to inform the people of the United States about our Congress. We will not be a propaganda agency. Our bylaws provide that we are to be completely nonpartisan and nonpolitical. We will not lobby. We are a tax-exempt organization. We will engage in research if the Congress asks us to, and make available to the Congress any information that we have, but our work will always be consistent with the policies of the Congress and with its purposes.

We believe it will be possible, Mr. Speaker, for us working in conjunction with George Washington University—and conversations have already been begun with some of the faculty to inaugurate an educational program to acquaint young people with the legislative process. These are some of the things that we have in mind.

I regard it as a special privilege to be able to speak to you today. I am not sure that I will have the privilege on this occasion, although I assume I will, of revising and extending my remarks. One of the things that I have cherished most is the recollection of how that improves one's addresses, to be able to rewrite speeches after you have delivered them.

I was recently invited to speak before a reunion of my college group and, warmed by the presence of loved friends of other days, I became poetic. I should

not have. I should have learned my lesson. I should have remembered the words of Walter Hines Page, who said:

Next to fried food, the South had suffered most from oratory.

But I became poetic.

I quoted the beautiful lines of Margaret Sangster:

The romance land of Yesterday—

It sometimes, almost, seems  
 As if our outstretched fingers may  
 Half touch its vanished dreams!  
 A broken song, a scrap of lace,  
 A faded rose, a sigh,  
 May bring us, swiftly, face to face  
 With all that has passed by!

Ain't that pretty!

I like it, and I thought it was appropriate. But you can imagine how I felt, not knowing that my speech was being reported for posterity, to pick up a magazine a few days later, and to see my speech reproduced, except that beautiful part: "The romance land of yesterday," did not read like that—it said, "The Romans landed yesterday."

So you can see why I have become nostalgic about the custom of and use of the Congress in giving us an opportunity to revise and extend remarks.

While I am in a nostalgic mood, I might recall the first speech I ever made in this Chamber. I had been here 6 months and I had not heard my voice. My people knowing my garrulosity thought I was ill. But after 6 months, I summoned up the courage to address the Speaker and I spoke for 5 minutes. I could hardly wait to get the RECORD the next morning to see how my maiden speech looked in print. There it was, exactly as I had delivered it—except that it was attributed not to Mr. Hays of Arkansas but to Mr. Harris of Arkansas.

I rushed in to the RECORD Clerk's office and gave him a scolding—a little out of character, I believe—but finally I apologized and I said, "Oh, my, we all make mistakes. I am terribly sorry I spoke like that to you in a moment of heat and indignation. Please forgive me." He said, "That is all right, Mr. Hays—you should have heard Mr. Harris!"

I want at this time to claim the privilege of reintroducing our oldest Member. He has been identified, but I want to supplement what the distinguished minority leader had to say. Longevity, much as we would like to claim that it is due to Democratic affiliations is not attributable to that. It might interest you to know that it is attributable to being a Member of the Congress. The mortality statistics do indicate that Members of Congress live longer than non-Members of Congress. But it can hardly be said, unless one wants to be technical, that Democrats live longer, because we also have as a Member of the Former Members of Congress a centenarian named Maurice Thatcher who is only 4 months younger than the distinguished gentleman who was introduced, and he is a Republican from Kentucky.

So I hope my Republican friends will rest at ease—that we are claiming no greater longevity.

I think at this point we should present him, because I fear in the confusion of the rollcall that he was not identified.

Yes, we do want to hear from the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Earl H. Beshlin of Pennsylvania, who is 101 years old.

Mr. BESHLIN. Mr. Speaker, to say that I am happy to be here is not a lie, but a very joyful and forceful truth.

It is more than 50 years since I have had the privilege of being a Member of this, the greatest legislative body in the world. I am reminded somewhat of what Carl Sandburg related, what Lincoln said to a friend of his, a neighbor, who called on him shortly after he entered the White House. He said, "Mr. President, how do you like being President?" "Well," he said, "You have heard the story about the man who was tarred and feathered and ridden out of town on a rail." "Well," he said, "I can assure you I would rather walk." That was the end of the incident.

I remember the days, and particularly the 8th day of January 1918, when the late lamented Woodrow Wilson then President of the United States spoke before this body and declared the efforts to make the world safe for democracy. I am one of those who is an optimist in these days of trouble at home and abroad.

Nevertheless, I have faith in the great body of American people, and that they eventually through their Representatives will handle and dispose of the troublesome questions that now confront us.

I am delighted to come back here. I will not say I will be here in the next 100 years, but I hope if I am not, most of you will be. I thank you again.

Mr. BROOKS HAYS. Mr. Speaker, now I feel like a mere stripling. But we all know that our ages are a matter of public record, and you only have to look at the record to see that I was born in 1898. I think sometimes the newspapers overdo it. Recently, the Raleigh, N.C., newspaper announced a Baptist meeting. The article stated, "The meeting will be addressed by Charles Warren, Ph. D., John Shoemaker, D.D., and Brooks Hays, 72." [Laughter.]

We are all heartened by this demonstration. I would like to claim the privilege of presenting to you Miles Allgood, who is 93 years of age, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ALLGOOD. If there is anybody here who is happier than I am today, it is somebody who is older than I am. I never once dreamed that I would be back here again when I left 36 years ago. So you can see why I am happy. I am in good health, I have a sweet wife, and I have plenty of friends.

I should like to tell you an incident that happened at a meeting of Methodists. The Methodists, of which I am a member, have a love feast at their annual conferences. This is a love feast today. In the love feast on the occasion of which I speak there was one old man, a very old man, who had not given his experience. The man who was in charge said, "Brother Slaughter, don't you love the Lord and have some experience to give?"

Old Dr. Slaughter raised up and said, "I love everybody. I love everybody. I haven't an enemy in the world, I haven't an enemy in the world."

The moderator said, "How do you know, Brother Slaughter, that you haven't an enemy in the world?"

He said, "I have outlived all the darn rascals." [Laughter.]

Mr. BROOKS HAYS. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Judd.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I come from a big family, and my father used to say, after we had gone away and were coming back for a family reunion, "I am always glad to have you come home for a short visit." And we are glad, believe me, that we have been invited back here for a short visit.

At the outset, I may say that several people have said, "What is this Former Members of Congress about? What are they trying to do?" I can see how somebody might think this organization was trying to set itself up as a fifth or a sixth wheel of the Congress to look over the shoulders of sitting Members and tell them what they should do or not do. Of course, that is not true. There may be some of our Members who plan to run again for office, but our bylaws require that, if a man runs for a national office, his membership will be suspended, and if he is elected and sworn in, the membership is terminated.

All former Members have learned that when you are moved from the center of things to the periphery, whether the shift is voluntary or involuntary, there is both a relief and a wrench. You do not have any direct responsibility for the legislative actions of the Congress, but your interest in your country and your love for it and concern for its well-being are no less. So we former Members have—if you wish to call it that—a certain nostalgia. It is good for us, I am sure, to have a chance once in a while to come back and renew friendships and associations with those with whom we worked formerly on enormously important issues—sometimes winning, sometimes losing. It was too bad not to have some means by which these fellowships and friendships could be continued and even enriched.

I heard—I cannot tell stories like Brooks Hays, nobody can—of a lady taking her first plane ride, and she was a little apprehensive, as almost everybody is on that first ride. After a while they came into a violent storm and the plane was tossed around. She turned to a clergyman sitting next to her and said: "You are a man of God. Can't you do something about this?" He replied, "Madam, I am in sales, not management."

We former Members of Congress are not in management, nor are we trying to be, but we are in sales of the Congress. We believe in this institution and we want to support it. We all know that throughout our country there are attacks upon our Government, and especially upon the Congress. If it does not do right away what somebody wants, they say the Congress is not listening. Yes, it is listening but it does not necessarily agree, and it must make its decisions on the basis of its judgment. Somehow some people have not understood the great achievement of our forefathers, which was that the people could elect their Government through the ballot box, that decisions would be made by their own representatives chosen by them, responsible to them, and replaceable by them every 2

years—or 6 years, in the case of the other body.

If they were denied the right to be heard, as our forefathers were denied the rights of other British citizens—sometimes revolution is necessary. But I do not know of anybody in this country who is being denied the right to be heard. If my ideas do not win a majority in the free market place of ideas, should they be accepted? We will fight for the right of dissident minorities to exercise their proper minority right to be heard and to try to become the majority. But some seem to think minority rights include minority rule. No. It is because we want to preserve the right to dissent that violence has to be repressed.

Frequently one runs into such misunderstandings. Sometimes I think we who have had experience in the Congress and have some knowledge of our legislative processes can do the explaining of our form of Government better than sitting Members. Perhaps we can help people to understand why what may look like cumbersome or clumsy ways of doing things in the Congress is one of the basic assurances that too great power is not concentrated in Government at the expense of the people.

When I, as a sitting Member, attempted to explain the Congress, many figured I had some personal ax to grind. There must be some ulterior objective that I was angling for like my own reelection.

That is not so much the case with us former Members. We have a hope that we can be helpful to this country by explaining the legislative process as it is, and by making ourselves available to students of Government, for example, to graduate students, who are writing a thesis on some particular piece of legislation. What scholars have to do generally is read each other's books or just read debates and votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But the things that really went on, who said what to whom, the actual way in which a democratic legislative body operates—that is not in the books. Only the Members who made the history know that.

Perhaps the most important function of Former Members of Congress which we hope to carry out if we can get funds, now that we have a tax exemption, is in the field of oral history. Consider, for example, the recorded memories of the late great Speaker Sam Rayburn. He played a vital role in some of the most important steps taken by our country in the last 50 years. We who knew him know he would not sit down to write out his knowledge of what happened, and how. How tragic it is that somebody who knew how to ask the right questions did not have the opportunity to sit down with him for 10 or 15 hours and get a tape recording of his memories, to be made available, at such times as he prescribed, for the historians, for the professors, for the students.

This sort of record could be especially valuable for the representatives of almost 70 newly independent countries which have come into existence since 1946. Most of them call themselves and want to be Republics. They come to the United States to learn, and what they read is "canned" stuff. Somewhere there ought to be available to them the personal rec-

ollections of how this or that really was accomplished—not by shenanigans or improper measures, but by person to person discussion, and persuasion. Sometimes pressures, too, are a part of it. We all know that is the way a free government operates.

The Library of Congress is greatly interested in this. It says it does not have the funds to finance taking of these oral histories, but of course it would like to be the repository of the oral histories, especially of key people like the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

The beloved former Speaker, John McCormack, is not going to write his recollections in detail, but almost certainly he would record them on tape. It will be too bad for history and for our country if all that is in his mind is not recorded and made available for those who study government in the decades ahead.

There are men like Carl Vinson and Carl Durham who played decisive roles in the development of our armed forces and of atomic energy. There is Howard Smith, who for many years was chairman of the Rules Committee. There was not much which took place here in some 30 years that he did not have a hand in.

Former Members of Congress are not trying to influence present-day legislation. Our bylaws forbid it from taking any position on any public issue or lobbying for or against any particular piece of legislation or any particular individual running for office. We just want to be helpful to some extent to the Congress and our country, in addition, of course to the personal benefits that come from keeping alive the associations and friendships with each other developed when we worked together in the Congress.

I want to express particular appreciation to Brooks Hays. He and I were sworn in here the same day, in January 1943. This organization is his brainchild. He knew it had to be bipartisan to be of any usefulness, so he came to me as a Republican friend to enlist my support. I want the record to show that it was he who saw the potential importance of this organization and made the original proposal for it.

It has been astonishing, too, that out of a little over 700 living former Members of Congress with whom we have been able to get in touch, 362 as of this morning have contributed \$25 initiation fee and \$25 annual dues, to enable former Members of Congress to establish a little office here, organize a board of directors and get out mailings.

I think you might be interested in some statistics. Of the 362 Members we had this morning, 42 were former Senators. They do not have as many former Members because they have less turnover than in the House.

Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona served longer in the U.S. Congress, both bodies, than any other person. We nominated him and John McCormack as honorary chairmen.

President Nixon and President Johnson have joined, and have been designated by the directors as honorary presidents.

Of the 37 Presidents of the United States, 22 served in one body or the

other and nine of them served in both bodies, for example, Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson. Of course, John Quincy Adams served first in the Senate and then in the House after he had been President.

It is interesting that our last three Presidents—President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon—all served in both Houses, with a great attachment to both bodies.

I want to read, if I may, a list of the former Members who sent regrets that they could not be here in person today.

At the head of that list, of course, are President Johnson and President Nixon. In addition to those who responded to the rollcall, are the following who sent their regrets that they could not be present today and sent their greetings:

Lew Douglas of Arizona.  
Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts.  
Frank J. Becker of New York.  
Leon Sacks who writes that he is disabled, I do not know for sure what State he is from.

Senator Joseph Tydings of Maryland.  
John W. Boehne, Jr., of Indiana.  
Senator William Benton of Connecticut.

Neil Staebler of Michigan.  
Helen Gahagan Douglas of California.  
Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts. He wrote a cordial letter saying that he could not be here because of the illness of his wife.

B. W. Kearney of New York.  
Ed Reinecke of California, now Lieutenant Governor of that State.  
E. Ross Adair of Indiana.  
Judge Louis B. Heller of New York.  
James Roosevelt of California.  
Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles, Calif.

David Dennison of Ohio.  
D. Emmert Brumbaugh of Pennsylvania.  
Judge Louis J. Capozzoli of New York.

Katharine Edgar Byron of Maryland.  
Dr. William T. Pfeiffer of New York.  
Mrs. Albert Thomas of Texas.  
C. W. "Runt" Bishop of Illinois.  
Albert M. Cole of Kansas.  
Rodney M. Love of Ohio.

Catherine D. Morrell of Arkansas.  
Charles B. Hoeven of Iowa.  
Carroll D. Kearns of Pennsylvania.  
Paul A. Fino of New York.  
J. Edgar Chenoweth of Colorado.  
Joseph L. Carrigg of Pennsylvania.  
Donald F. McGinley of Nebraska.  
Paul C. Jones of Missouri.  
Lindsay Warren of North Carolina.  
Senator Spessard Holland of Florida.  
Rogers Morton of Maryland.  
Lindley Beckworth of Texas.  
Senator John W. Bricker of Ohio.  
Augustus W. Bennet of New York.  
Albert L. Vreeland of New Jersey.  
Ranulf Compton of Connecticut.

These are all members of the organization or are interested in it and sent regrets that they could not be here today along with the 83 who responded to their names plus a few who have come into the Chamber since.

Sometimes we look at this as an alumni association. Every college in the world has an association of its alumni. They are loyal to it and want it to be successful

and want to do all they can to help their "alma mater."

When I first came here, I heard Sam Rayburn say, "I love the House of Representatives." I thought then that was a little sentimental. I know now what he meant.

Sometimes when you are away from your family or your work or your country, when you are abroad, you see it in better perspective than when you are here at home. You see its shortcomings but you also appreciate its greatneses. I think all of us would say with Sam Rayburn that we love the House of Representatives and want to be helpful if we can.

We want to introduce today someone to speak for each of the various Congresses. The oldest, our distinguished guest, Mr. Beshlin, is from the 65th Congress and has already spoken. The next oldest is from the 68th Congress, the Honorable Maurice Thatcher, who was Governor of Kentucky and Governor of the Panama Canal Zone. He is 100 years old, will be 101 in August—and planned to be here today but sent word this morning that he could not.

The following Members spoke as representatives of their respective Congress:

The 65th Congress: Earl H. Beshlin, of Pennsylvania.

The 69th Congress: Carl G. Bachmann, of West Virginia.

The 71st Congress: Robert Ramspeck of Georgia.

The 73rd Congress: Colgate W. Darden of Virginia.

The 74th Congress: Frank Carlson of Kansas.

The 75th Congress: Edward V. Izac of California.

The 76th Congress: Frances P. Bolton of Ohio.

The 77th Congress: Evan Howell of Illinois.

The 78th Congress: Robert Hale of Maine.

The 79th Congress: Frank Chelf of Kentucky.

The 80th Congress: John Bell Williams of Mississippi.

The 81st Congress: Edna F. Kelly of New York.

The 82nd Congress: Byron C. Rogers of Colorado.

The 83d Congress: Gordon H. Scherer of Ohio and Hon. Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense.

The 84th Congress: William H. Avery of Kansas.

The 85th Congress: Basil L. Whitener of North Carolina.

The 86th Congress: Joseph W. Barr of Indiana.

The 87th Congress: Benjamin Reifel of South Dakota.

The 88th Congress: Carlton R. Sickles of Maryland.

The 89th Congress: George V. Hansen of Idaho.

The 90th Congress: Thomas S. Kleppe of North Dakota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there is another person who ought to be mentioned, Congressman GEORGE ANDREWS of Alabama. It was he who first proposed that the House annually designate a day to receive the former Members of Congress. He could not be here today, but I think we ought to express officially our appreciation for his having done that.

Then we ought to express our appreciation to a former Member, Pat Jennings, of Virginia, who is presently the able Clerk of the House and also a mem-

ber of our organization. He has been of extraordinary help in making it possible for us to do what we have been able to accomplish.

Finally, I want to report action taken by former Members of Congress at their business meeting earlier today—before this Brooks Hays and I have been sort of ad hoc cochairmen. I am pleased to announce that the members by acclamation elected Brooks Hays to be the president of Former Members of Congress Inc., for the coming year. They also elected 12 to serve as the board of directors, as follows: E. Ross Adair, Homer Ferguson, Brooks Hays, Jed Johnson, Jr., Walter H. Judd, Edna F. Kelly, A. S. Mike Monroney, Howard W. Pollock, Robert Ramspeck, Benjamin Reifel, James E. Van Zandt, and Ralph W. Yarborough.

This organization is unique in that it has a guaranteed clientele of eligible new members every 2 years. Fifty-five retired from the Congress, voluntarily or involuntarily this last year, and are now eligible for membership in Former Members of Congress.

We hope, of course, that none of you sitting Members ever will be eligible to join, but if perchance you should be, we shall be happy indeed to welcome you.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank him for that.

I just wish to point out something rather humorous. I come from a small town, and I guarantee that when I get a mailing from you which says, "John Ashbrook, Former Member of Congress," it causes comment. I do not know whether all your mailings are like that, but mine happens to read, "Former Member of Congress." I am alive and still here. I hope in the future I will not be referred to as a former Member of Congress.

Mr. JUDD. I will see that the card index is corrected today. A lot of our work has been somewhat informal, as you can gather from the proceedings today.

Mr. BROOKS HAYS. Mr. Speaker, our time has elapsed, and I want to express again my thanks.

The distinguished former Member Pat Jennings should have a moment, if the Speaker will allow him that, to provide some information for the record.

I also wish to point out that our executive secretary is Warren I. Cikins, and we are grateful, on his behalf, for all the courtesies given to him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. As one of the new Members, relatively speaking, of the House, I believe it is fair to state that if we have any criticism to make of the former Members it would be twofold.

One of them is that we would all be very grateful if somehow you could get into our hands your home addresses, so that if we are passing through a town or constructing a Christmas list we will know how to contact you.

The only other point I believe it might be useful to make is that we think another valid criticism is that we simply do not see enough of you except on more formalized occasions like this. You helped to build this body. You have got more friends here than you would ever believe. Why in God's name do you not come back more often so we can say "Hello" to you and learn from your experiences?

Thank you very much.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole group when I tell the gentleman from California we appreciate those remarks. Certainly we shall attempt to get together a list of the addresses of all former Members.

I simply want to take this time to point out that there were a group of individuals—consisting of Brooks Hays, Dr. Walter Judd, Robert Hale, H. Carl Andersen, Frank Chelf, J. T. Rutherford and myself—who met about a year ago and discussed this possibility. Out of that discussion we now see the fruits.

We want especially to thank those present Members for the opportunity, and certainly all the former Members for being here.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair wishes to reiterate his own gratitude at the response our invitation has had from those of you who have come here and participated and lent your presence to this occasion. It has been a memorable one. We will expect to repeat it next year.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS AND PERMISSION TO REVISE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD and that all speakers have the privilege of revising their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

#### OUR URBAN CRISIS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BADILLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe it is fitting that, after listening to the former Members of Congress, I should have the opportunity, as a freshman Member, to speak on what I consider to be the most urgent domestic problem of this decade; that is, our urban crisis.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have listened to our colleagues discuss a wide range of proposals for alleviating the fiscal crisis of our cities and States. I have listened to those who support the administration's revenue-

sharing plan, and to those who oppose it. I have listened to the proponents of a Federal takeover of welfare—which I support—and to advocates of tax credits and other means of enabling the States and cities to provide the essential services their citizens need and deserve.

All of these proposals, aimed as they are at providing long-term assistance to our beleaguered local governments, deserve full and fair consideration. I can understand the feelings of those who are reluctant to rush into a new, multi-million-dollar program without some assurances that it will not be abused. Indeed, one of my own major concerns is that however we ultimately choose to attack this fiscal crisis, we do so in a manner which emphasizes the cities and their problems rather than through a method which serves merely to strengthen the grip of State governments which have held the cities in bondage over the years.

My main concern today, Mr. Speaker, is not so much with the development of a long-range solution to the fiscal crisis of our States and cities. I am confident that a sound approach will be worked out and enacted by this 92d Congress. But it seems clear from the discussion and debate which has already taken place that this is not likely to take place this year, and it may well come too late to be effective before 1973. My concern is that our cities cannot wait 2 years and what disturbs me most today is the apparent lack of urgency with which we in Congress are approaching the problem. I know that New York City cannot wait 2 years. If we can believe the reports from Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New Jersey, Michigan, and Florida, the plight of their cities is equally serious.

In New York, for example, it is clear to all of us who have been involved in the city and its problems that immediate, massive financial help is a matter of its very survival. Private enterprise long ago abandoned the city's slums, and it is now abandoning the city altogether. As business and industry and the white middle class flee the city for suburban sanctuaries, New York becomes more and more a ghetto of the poor and the disadvantaged—a city almost lacking all ability to govern itself—to provide the basic services of urban life.

As a matter of fact, it is clear that not a single department of the city's government is able to provide a satisfactory level of services. They do not have the manpower or the machinery to serve 8 million people, and I see no likelihood that the city's budget will find any new resources this year or the next.

In the light of this, we cannot afford to deal with our urban fiscal crisis on a business-as-usual basis. The lengthy, reasoned debate over revenue sharing and its alternatives will have all the appearance of Nero fiddling while Rome burned. I say to my colleagues in the House and the Senate—and I say to the American people—that if we are going to save our cities from destruction we must do it now and we must do it with a massive infusion of money if this Nation's cities are not to sink irretrievably into filth, decay, and crime.

I think we can provide that help—quickly and effectively. I propose that Congress authorize a \$20 billion Federal



bond issue at current market interest rates to finance \$10 billion in 50-year interest-free loans to our States and cities this year and an additional \$10 billion next year. I propose that these loans be apportioned according to the formula in the administration's general revenue-sharing plan and with the same pass-through provision.

Under this self-help, emergency loan program New York State would receive \$1,068 million in the fiscal year beginning July 1 of this year and the same amount the following July 1. Because of the pass-through provision, New York City would receive a desperately needed \$378,614,000 in fiscal year 1972 and a like amount for fiscal 1973. Hopefully, by the end of that fiscal year, a more permanent method of relieving our cities and States would be in effect.

Because this money is in the form of a loan rather than a grant, I believe we can avoid a long drawn out debate over restrictions, the earmarking of funds, and so forth. It seems to me that the only necessary proviso would be a non-discrimination clause. Perhaps the strongest safeguard against abuse of these funds is the cities and States awareness that Congress will be watching how the money is spent and weighing this experience in development of a long-range approach. Also, the repayment will tend to assure that the voters of the States and cities will hold their elected officials accountable. The repayment requirement also meets an objection presented by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; namely, that localities should not be responsible for spending money they are not responsible for raising.

Finally, by taking the immediate and severe financial pressures off our State and city governments, Congress would be dealing with the problem of a long-term solution in a reasoned, deliberate manner—not in an atmosphere of crisis nor in the partisan context of presidential politics.

At the same time, this massive infusion of funds would be a major stimulant to our sagging economy. It would help stem the tide of unemployment and speed the long-overdue recovery from the current recession.

The net costs involved in my proposal are relatively insignificant, both to the Federal Government and to the cities and the States. The interest charges which would be assumed by the Federal Government represent but a tiny fraction of the administration's proposed \$229 billion budget, and I am convinced that any State or city participating in the \$20 billion fund would have no difficulty in repaying its share over 50 years.

New York City, to again use the example that is most meaningful to me, would be paying back its \$760 million over 50 years for an average of about \$15,300,000 a year out of an \$8 billion budget. It would also be my intent that these loans be considered outside whatever existing debt limits may apply to State and local governments.

I have waited until today to formally present this proposal, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted time to discuss it with a

wide range of Government officials, financial experts, and community leaders. I recommend it to my colleagues now because I am convinced that it is both feasible and necessary.

The most urgent challenge we face today is whether our political institutions can cope with the demands society is placing upon them. The facts are clear for all to see:

Our cities are strangling in traffic congestion, noise, and poisonous air. The slums are spreading like a cancer, feeding the insidious growth of racial strife, violence, and crime. We hear demands for law and order, but our cities can barely meet police payrolls. The welfare rolls continue to grow but the cities are unable to find sources of revenue to keep pace. Our slumping economy and the flight of the white middle class to the suburbs exacerbate the crisis still further.

Many observers, including President Nixon, have pointed out correctly that we have helped create the crisis by our tendency to overcommit and underperform.

Time and again, we have made grand rhetorical flourishes, making national commitments to end poverty and hunger, assure equal opportunity in jobs and schools, provide decent housing for all Americans, and on and on.

Time and again, Congress has written these goals into the Nation's laws—the Employment Act of 1946, the historic housing bills of 1949 and 1968, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

We have heard Presidents publicly commit their administrations to achieving these goals—and then either fail to back up the commitment or be thwarted by insufficient appropriations from Congress.

Take housing, for example. The Housing Act of 1949 committed us to assure every American a decent home. The 1968 housing bill set a national housing goal of 26 million units in the following decade, an average of 2.6 million units a year.

Yet, the very year after that commitment was made, only 1.46 million units were built in the United States. We lag in housing production behind the Japanese, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Soviets, and the French. Just a year ago, President Nixon admitted that we face what he called a crisis situation in housing our people.

And how is the Federal Government meeting that crisis this year? The Department of Housing and Urban Development has asked in the new budget for funds to start 525,000 low- and moderate-income housing units in fiscal 1972, and this would be a record. But HUD is asking for \$50 million below the amounts authorized by Congress for the 235 and 236 programs and for \$93 million less than was authorized for rent supplements. HUD actually projects 5,000 fewer low-rent public housing unit starts in the new fiscal year.

This kind of performance is not likely to close the gap about which the President spoke in his state of the Union message. It is not likely to ease the frustration and despair of those Americans who suffered through that riot-torn sum-

mer of 1967—a summer which helped to spawn the Housing Act of 1968, the civil rights legislation of the same year, and the mobilization of private citizens and private resources through vehicles such as the Urban Coalition.

What is happening to us? Are we really that impotent? Is our commitment that empty? Or are we simply unwilling to assess our own shortfalls?

Scarcely have we settled down to the complex and difficult task of rebuilding our cities and breaking the cycle of poverty than we find ourselves embarking on a series of new crusades, involving a new round of priority goals, and escalating the rhetoric of crisis still further.

It should be clear to all of us that the American people will no longer stand for talk about new policies, or new legislation if all that represents is escapism from our responsibilities and obligations.

I speak now not in partisan terms, for it is an undeniable fact that Democratic administrations have had an excess of rhetoric and a dearth of results, and that some of our more urgent problems today stem from my own party's failures in the past.

The point now is for us to learn from those mistakes, and to take the action we have so long delayed.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BADILLO. I am glad to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CAREY of New York. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the gentleman from New York I may be allowed to enter in the RECORD a topical article on this subject which appeared in the New York Times recently.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from the State of New York who is now in the well for taking the time at this juncture of the 92d Congress to address this topic.

He did me the great service of discussing with me his approach to this critical matter on the issue of sharing in the revenues of the Federal Government. I read through it as thoroughly as possible in the intervening time since we discussed it, and I find it to be a most commendable and constructive alternative and one which addresses, as he has said, the immediacy of the problem of urban blight which deteriorates almost by the hour. It is something like a burning building. Unless we get in there quickly there will be nothing left to save. There is no better way to dramatize it more successfully than he has done. He has pointed out the fact that time is at issue here. He is addressing this in terms of its urgency. We all know by reason of our system of deliberative debate that it takes a great deal of time for us to agree on a proper solution. Yet this problem, unless we agree upon a solution, may become unmanageable in terms of what can be done for the people living in the cities right now.

So, his approach of doing it domesti-

cally for our Nation is in a sense like doing it in conjunction with other nations of the world for developing nations, and is both constructive and timely and practical.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this kind of discussion will bring to the floor ideas like this which will allow us to reach an alternative and a solution without delay so that our cities will not think we are just discussing things but are acting together in their best interest.

Mr. Speaker, I know the background of my colleague from New York. He is an ardent and very diligent student of city problems. He is one who has prepared himself for this both in the field of law and accounting and is one who has spent time as a city official and president of a borough in our city. He has applied himself not only to the problems, but to the solutions.

So, let us examine his suggestion today which I hope will be the basis for future legislation. His proposal is timely and is the kind of thing which we should not only be hoping for, but should act upon in the 92d Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my colleague is applying himself to the solution of this problem and those of us who have served with him certainly will lend our best efforts in his behalf.

Mr. BADILLO. I thank my colleague from New York. I know he shares my sense of urgency. I know he understands the problems of New York and the Nation's urban areas. I know that the gentleman recognizes that in the city of New York today there is not a single department that is able to provide a satisfactory level of services, not because they do not want to, but because they do not have the manpower or the machinery with which to serve 8 million people of the city of New York.

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

Mr. BADILLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, initially I would like to commend our distinguished colleague for his very resourceful and thought-provoking proposal. However, there are a few questions, if I may, that I would like to present to the gentleman.

Mr. BADILLO. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. What does the gentleman estimate the dollar costs to the Federal Government will be under your plan, assuming a \$20 billion figure is adopted?

Mr. BADILLO. The actual costs would be relatively slight, representing only the interest on the principal outstanding. The amount would be insignificant as part of a \$229 billion Federal budget.

Mr. BURTON. Many cities, perhaps most of them, have statutory debt ceilings established by the State legislature. Would it be the intention of the gentleman in the well that no State would be eligible to participate in the program that the gentleman has presented unless they are prepared to waive the cities' debt ceiling to the extent of the funds which are proposed in the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. BADILLO. I hope to introduce spe-

cific legislation in the next couple of weeks, and it would be my intention to provide as a matter of legislative intent that these funds be made available to the cities outside their debt limits, and that the States participating in the loan program waive their cities' debt limits to the extent that those cities would be eligible for these new funds.

This is, after all, an emergency infusion of funds to help resolve our very serious urban crisis while we are working toward a more permanent method of providing for aid to cities and States. I would expect not only that we would treat it as a matter of urgency here in Washington, but that all the State capitals would treat it in the same fashion.

Mr. BURTON. In that connection, this proposal is essentially an interim measure, as I understand it. Does the gentleman feel it could become a permanent mode of financing should the operating experience be successful?

Mr. BADILLO. Many of the people who are in doubt about the feasibility of revenue sharing want to have very special assurances that if the money is made available to the cities and States it would be spent properly. You cannot have such specific assurance until a bill is passed and we can evaluate their performance. I fear that, if this attitude of opposition hardens on the part of the Members of Congress, no bill will be passed at all. The advantage of having a loan program rather than a grant program is that we could use the experience of this year and next year as a basis for determining how, in fact, the cities and the States plan to spend the money.

Also, I think the cities and States would recognize that they are being closely supervised by the Congress and that their use of the money would be a measure of whether they would get additional funds for the future.

Mr. BURTON. Is it the intention of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, that his proposal operate basically the same way that the administration's revenue-sharing plan would function, except for the amount of funds involved and the fact that the money is in the form of loans rather than grants?

Mr. BADILLO. That is correct. The proposal is simple and direct. It should not require extensive hearings and debate. It operates on the same formula as the revenue-sharing legislation. The only change is that instead of \$5 billion, the amount would be \$10 billion each year for 2 years, and instead of a grant, the money would be made available as a loan.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) for this most resourceful and imaginative proposal. The pressing revenue needs of the States and of the local governments in this country are obvious to all of us. We have been fortunate to hear and others will be fortunate as well to read the proposal made by the gentleman from New York. I think all of us would share in the view that this is another avenue to be explored and perhaps highly useful and feasible route for this Congress to pursue before it attempts to meet this very im-

portant economic dilemma confronting all Americans—the entire Nation.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I have waited until today to formally present this proposal because I wanted the time to discuss it with a wide range of governmental officials and financial experts and community leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend it to my colleagues now because I am convinced it is both feasible and necessary.

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

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

Mr. RYAN. It is a particular pleasure for me to join in this special order with my distinguished colleague and friend from New York. I can attest to his ability and dedication, for the gentleman in the well and I have worked together for many years in an effort to stem the tide of urban decay and to make our cities viable places for all of our citizens. Now that he is a Member of this body, we can continue our efforts to meet the desperate needs of our city, State, and Nation.

The urban crisis which we are today addressing is of course no new-found disease. Its symptoms have been afflicting millions of the poor for years. They have been the downtrodden, laboring under conditions of slum housing, inadequate food, deficient educational facilities, inadequate medical care. Now the urban crisis is extending its blight, making life for the middle-income people increasingly bleak in our major cities. The result has been that those who can flee do so, leaving the cities to become centers for the affluent few—who can afford the minimum necessities, and much more—and the poor, who can afford neither.

Meanwhile, financial resources to meet the needs of the cities and the people who populate them are becoming increasingly strained. The causes for this are manifold. Many city governments are ineffective in marshaling their resources, and in using the resources which the Federal Government makes available. Only last year, for example, I uncovered the fact that New York City failed to obtain Federal funds for the school breakfast program—funds which were available, but simply not requested.

But another reason for the urban crisis stems from the fact that, even if the cities utilize all the resources available, the need for services is outstripping the funds to supply them. This is part a result of the flight of the middle class. With them depart the businesses which they own, or which they patronize. Property values decline. Buildings are abandoned. The tax yield becomes increasingly inadequate.

A third element in this equation is the failure of the Federal Government to establish reordered priorities. The maw of the Pentagon swallows billions upon billions—for a tragic, mistaken war; for unneeded armaments—while the cities languish and decline. Even when the rhetoric of reordered priorities is stated, the actual actions of the administration and the Congress fail to meet words with

dollars. The Congress passes my legislation creating a \$30 million program to combat lead-based paint poisoning—a disease of the slums—and the administration requests no money to fund the program. The Congress authorizes \$80 million for the bilingual education program. The administration only requests—and the Congress only appropriates—\$25 million.

The housing appropriations are far behind the amounts that could be provided. In this fiscal year alone, appropriations trail authorizations for the urban renewal program by over \$1 billion, for the model cities program by over \$800 million, for the rent supplement program by \$113 million; for the section 236 rental assistance program by \$25 million.

For all of these examples, I have introduced legislation to correct the failure. Hopefully, we will succeed in getting action by the Congress.

But, looking at the larger picture, when we speak of an urban crisis, we are not really talking about some crisis bred, raised, and nurtured just in the cities. We are talking about a disease of many causes, and the Congress and the administration bear a tremendous amount of the blame.

Nor are the symptoms which result from these causes just brooding presences which have been around for years. New symptoms are springing up almost daily. Right now, in New York City, the New York City Board of Education faces a deficit in this school year of some \$40 million to \$45 million. In order to close this gap, the Board of Education has proposed the elimination of essential services.

Some 6,500 teachers are to be laid off; some 10,000 substitute teachers are to receive the same treatment. The headquarters staff is to be cut by 20 percent. In addition, among the proposed cutbacks are a complete termination of all after-school activities; the immediate curtailment of all repairs and maintenance work, except for emergencies; and the curtailment of school transportation, eliminating transportation for some 75,000 pupils. Also included in the proposed cutbacks is a 10-percent reduction in the adult education programs.

Immediate steps are essential, as my distinguished colleague, Mr. BADILLO, has pointed out, to abate the urban crisis. One step involves emergency measures regarding the current school crisis. Seventeen members of the New York City delegation have written to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to this end, and my office has arranged an emergency meeting with Secretary Richardson, and Commissioner of Education Sidney Marland later today. Hopefully, some help can be arranged.

I know the gentleman from New York is very concerned about the critical situation with respect to education in New York City, and I wonder if he would like to comment upon the action this week of the New York City Board of Education.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

I think the action of the New York City Board of Education this week precisely dramatizes the need for urgency. The city of New York is in a situation

where it cannot even meet its payroll for this fiscal year, so even when we talk of providing help for the next fiscal year or the year following, we might be too late.

I know the gentleman from New York has been in the forefront in getting funds for New York City this year. He has arranged a meeting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare this afternoon in order to see what immediate help the Federal Government can provide New York City this year, but it is precisely this kind of problem we are going to have day after day in the Congress in the next 2 years unless we begin to take action now.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to commend the gentleman for his analysis of the financial crisis facing our cities, not only New York City, but every major city in this Nation.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BADILLO. I thank my colleague and good friend from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The people of our city and the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude for his efforts over the years. He is truly a champion of our cities and a leader in every sense of the word.

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

Mr. BADILLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow).

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York on his maiden speech and the fact that he selected such an important topic to discuss.

I come from upstate New York, as the gentleman knows, and historically that part of the State has been a kind of rival of the cities, especially New York City, in the political thinking of our electorate.

But actually, instead of being in an opposite position, I think we are all in the same boat. A great deal of what the gentleman says applies equally well to us up the river. I know we can harmonize with a great deal of his thinking, so I would like to commend him again for his thinking and for his fine statement.

Mr. BADILLO. I thank my friend and colleague from New York. I certainly agree that we in New York State and throughout all the States long have ceased to look to the State capitals for aid. We now recognize that the problems of the cities and States cannot be solved only at the local city hall, cannot be solved only at the State capital, but must be solved here in Washington. That is why those of us who come from upstate, who come from downstate, who come from different parts of the country are looking to Congress to get that help.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as the discussion of revenue sharing continues a number of interesting alternatives are being advanced. I submit the following article for printing in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1971]

#### AN ALTERNATIVE TO REVENUE SHARING

(By Charles M. Haar)

The recent treks to Washington by Mayor Lindsay, Governor Rockefeller, and other harassed leaders of states and cities underline

the severe financial crises of local governments. With 11.6 per cent being the annual rate of increase in expenditures of state and local government for recent years, little room remains for maneuver.

The need for some way to balance the resource supply with urban demand (for local problems are essentially urban ones) is increasingly accepted by both political parties—although differ they must, inevitably, on the conditions to be attached to such schemes as block grants and on the formulas of distribution within particular metropolitan areas.

President Nixon's proposal, "historic in scope and bold in concept," that \$5 billion in Federal revenues be turned over to states and localities, with an additional \$10 or \$11 billion channeled from existing programs for use in six broad areas, has made revenue sharing the rallying point for those converging on Mecca. The implications of the plan are now under the national spotlight.

Whatever its merits or final outcome, the plain fact is that it relies on the existence of substantial Federal funds. Taking into account, however, the taxpayer revolt and the fact that the Federal treasury is increasingly bare (with the "peace-and-growth dividend" stirring up far more claimants than resources) one realizes the urgency of supplementary or alternate resources. In the frenzied and inescapable scramble for funds, one possible source of rescue should not be overlooked—that of municipal borrowing. Since borrowing finances fully half of our cities' capital outlays, it becomes a natural focus for reappraisal. And those who have made such a reassessment have come up with a proposal for an Urban Development Bank.

The idea goes back to 1968. At that time President Johnson's Task Force on Suburban Problems, after toting up the enormous bill for urban development in this country (induced by population growth and its needs for housing, schools, streets, and other public facilities) concluded that the potential for major reform in the area of intergovernmental finance would be offered by a new lending institution.

The starting point for the new look at the borrowing mechanism is the present inefficiency of the municipal bond market. The amount of public subsidy represented by the current Federal (and state) tax forbearance on the bond interest is just not being passed on to the cities and states. By objective standards, the rates on municipals are high in light of their exemption from taxes; the cost is also not justified by their excellent debt service record. Yields on municipal securities are currently approximately 75 percent of those of top-grade corporate bonds—a lot more than the 50 percent one would expect. And translated into those dollars-and-cents carrying charges that are the lifeblood of municipal budgets, this means that cities and municipalities receive only one-half to two-thirds of the benefits that should flow from the exemption.

The Urban Development Bank offers a viable alternative. As formulated, it would be a partnership among the states, local governments, and private enterprise. The bank would raise capital by issuing and selling its own bonds, which, while indirectly guaranteed by the United States Government, would not be tax exempt. It would then lend money to communities for a wide range of capital improvements at an interest rate lower than that at which they can presently borrow—even with tax exemption. The interest differential between the cost of money to the bank and the interest received from the borrowers would be made up by an annual appropriation. To take an example, the bank would borrow a billion dollars at 7½ percent, and lend it to urban communities at 5½ percent; Congress would then be called on to pay \$20 million annually to finance this interest differential, which would make possible as much as a billion dollars of local

and state capital expenditure. The Treasury calculates that the cost to the nation of the interest differential would be more than offset by the increased receipts on the interest paid on the bank's bonds.

Of course, the use of the bank would be on a voluntary basis; local governments wishing to finance projects by selling their securities directly to the public, as in the past, would still have that option. But for municipalities in general it would mean a chance to borrow at a lower rate of interest and on longer terms, without the danger of flooding the existing bond market, and free from the present uncertainties of the rating system, the penalties for smallness, and the short maturities which follow from their current weak bargaining position.

Proponents of the bank point out that its prospects extend beyond the immediate and necessary tasks of providing money for urban needs. They argue that it can also be used as a mechanism to improve our inter-governmental system. Unlike revenue sharing, the specifics of which raise so many difficult legal, technical and drafting issues for the passthrough of funds to local governments, this system could encourage local governments to increase efficiencies and to improve the delivery of public services. It could be especially useful in dealing with those urban problems that are increasingly multijurisdictional; for example, important coordination of state and metropolitan plans could be implemented through financial planning and capital budgeting. This type of lending could thus be used to give high priority to regional projects, thereby turning metropolitan planning into an exercise in reality, and to help assure suburb-central city cooperation. Experience with the World Bank confirms that financial assistance and technical assistance can be merged effectively. The Urban Development Bank thus offers the possibility of a more viable money structure through which sound urban development can be financed—and perhaps even guided.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO EXEMPT COLLEGE TUITION LOANS FROM THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in his consumer message to Congress, read to the House of Representatives last Thursday, President Nixon said he was calling upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare "to promote the establishment of consumer education as a national educational concern" and to help "develop and design programs for the most effective dissemination of consumer information."

The following day, however, Secretary Richardson addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House transmitting a draft of an administration higher edu-

cation bill, and in that bill, I have just discovered, is a provision which would exempt NDEA and insured college tuition loans from the Truth-in-Lending Act. How this action would promote the dissemination of consumer education is a complete mystery to me. For it would remove the biggest single credit transaction any young man or woman in college has ever entered into, and the largest he or she will probably make until taking out a mortgage to buy a home, from the coverage of a law intended to teach the true cost of using credit.

I am truly amazed that the only proposal made during the past 2 years by the Nixon administration to amend the Truth-in-Lending Act in any respect whatsoever is one which would deprive college students of any benefits of this law as it applies to the biggest loan they have ever made in their lives. I am further amazed by the fact that the first Nixon administration proposal for a change in truth in lending has been proposed not to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over truth in lending and the other titles of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, but to the Committee on Education and Labor, which has great experience and knowledge in many fields of legislation but has no special expertise, I am sure, on truth in lending.

#### TRUTH-IN-LENDING EXEMPTION BURIED IN H.R. 5191

The draft of the administration bill on college loans apparently arrived on the Hill over the weekend, and was introduced Monday as H.R. 5191. Printed copies have not yet become available. The section amending truth in lending to exempt NDEA loans and insured tuition loans is buried as section 422. There was no inkling of the existence of this section in the two solid pages of fine print inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Monday giving the administration's explanation of, or justification for, the higher education bill, so we can only presume the administration did not consider the truth in lending exemption worth mentioning as a significant item in the bill.

Nevertheless, I had reason to look for it for I had a premonition it would be there. That is because I had discovered in some fine print on page 1697 of part 2 of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor last year on student aid legislation that an official of the Office of Education had made such a suggestion in a three-paragraph statement for the printed record expressing the view that the disclosures required under truth in lending has caused "problems" for the lending institutions making insured loans and for the colleges lending out Federal NDEA funds. Let me say that I do not doubt that there have been "problems" under truth in lending on these loans—as there have been, also, on many, many other types of transactions covered by truth-in-lending disclosure requirements.

But to use the argument of the "burden of the paperwork" to exempt college loans from the disclosure law is to ignore the

purpose of Truth in Lending. What is all of the "burdensome paperwork" supposed to show? It is supposed to show the true cost of the loan, in terms of an annual percentage rate, including any required charges for credit life insurance or other fees; it is supposed to give the method for computing any penalty for prepayment of the loan; it is supposed to show the amount or method of computing the amount of any penalty for late payments; and provide, to the extent this information is applicable or available, the terms and conditions of the repayments, the total of all such payments, and the total of the finance charge.

#### INFORMATION THE CONSUMER SHOULD HAVE

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Truth-in-Lending Act is intended to give to the consumer in any transaction covered by the law the full information on the scope of the obligation he is assuming by using some one else's money, in order, primarily, to enable him to shop for credit on the basis of the best terms, just as he is able to shop for quality or quantity of other items by price. There are some important protections for the consumer in the act, including both civil and criminal penalties for deception, omissions, or other violations, and protection against misleading advertising of credit terms. But basically, the act is intended to translate credit charges into comparative terms, through the annual percentage rate, so that the consumer can decide intelligently on the kind of credit terms he wants to accept.

I mention these facts because the position of the administration on this issue seems to be that since the terms of NDEA and insured tuition loans are "prescribed" by the Federal Government, the student borrower really does not need any further "protection." This same argument could be used, just as validly, to exempt all FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed housing loans, all Federal credit union loans, all Farmers Home Administration mortgages, all Production Credit Association agricultural loans, and so forth—and the lenders in those instances, I might say, are every bit as anxious to be free of Truth-in-Lending requirements as the banks extending tuition loans or the colleges extending NDEA loans.

Furthermore, there is hardly any consumer credit or residential mortgage credit transaction of any kind which is not regulated as to its maximum terms or other conditions by the various State laws. The fact that such regulation did not provide consumers with the true facts about the cost of credit, and that credit terms were deceptively expressed and advertised, was among the reasons that led us to decide 3 years ago that we had to enact a Federal Truth-in-Lending Act.

I am, as I said, amazed that an administration which on a Thursday says it wants to encourage the dissemination of consumer information as broadly as possible, the very next day sends up a bill containing a provision which would quietly eliminate truth-in-lending information on loans subsidized by the Government for college students. Are used cars to be next on the administration's

truth-in-lending repeal list, perhaps as a proposed amendment to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, to be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD MADE SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR COLLEGE LOANS IN TRUTH IN LENDING REGULATION Z

Mr. Speaker, it is admittedly impossible for the banks or colleges issuing subsidized loans to college students to comply with all of the requirements of the Federal Reserve Board's regulation Z as it applies to most other types of loans because of certain imponderables in the college loan contractual arrangement—for instance, uncertainties as to when the repayments will start, how many payments will be necessary, how long a period it will take to repay the loan, and thus what the total of the payments will be and the total amount of the finance charge. The Federal Reserve Board recognized these imponderables on the college loans in drafting regulation Z, and expressly waived the necessity for disclosing such information "on interim student loans made pursuant to federally insured student loan programs under Public Law 89-329, title IV, part B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended."

On June 10, 1969, 21 days before the Truth-in-Lending Act went into effect, the Board issued a special interpretation stating that the above waiver also applied to "other student loans of the same type, including those made to students under federally supported loan programs or programs of loan guarantee, administered by or under agreement with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare." The Board added:

In all of such cases, however, all disclosures must be made prior to the time the final note is executed or repayment schedule is agreed upon.

This assurance of eventual full disclosure to the student would be repealed by section 422 of the administration's new higher education bill. So would be repealed, also, the requirement that in advertising the availability of student loans, the lenders may not use the deceptively small "discount" rate as the "interest rate"—an abuse which was common throughout the consumer credit industry before Truth in Lending, and is still too common in oral statements made by bankers and other lenders when one first inquires about the cost of a loan.

No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not think that the cause of dissemination of consumer information would be advanced by repealing the coverage of Truth in Lending over college loans. Apparently, the Federal Reserve does not think so either, for despite criticisms made to the Fed by the Office of Education of the disclosure requirements, the Fed has not recommended to Congress any such change in the Truth-in-Lending Act. If a college student is to learn about the true costs of credit—and the Federal Reserve has recommended that courses in the use of credit and in understanding credit costs be included in the schools if these concepts are ever to be

well understood by the mass of the people—what better time to learn at first hand what credit really costs him than when taking out the biggest loan a student has ever assumed?

MANY COLLEGE LOANS MADE AT 18 PERCENT

I first became alerted to the Office of Education position on truth-in-lending disclosures on college loans when a constituent recently complained to me about his difficulties in straightening out his account with a commercial college loan firm operating as the Tuition Plan, Inc. These are not Government insured or subsidized loans; they are entered into privately, under arrangements made by or participated in or encouraged by some of the colleges. The annual percentage rate on such loans issued in 1968, according to the forms my constituent received in taking out a loan at that time, was 18 percent, compared to the 3- or 6-percent rate on NDEA loans and the 7 percent—plus subsidy to the banks—on federally insured tuition loans. I find it amazing that parents can be sold on college tuition loans of \$4,000 or \$6,000 at an annual percentage rate of 18 percent. In researching this issue, I went through the hearings of the Education Subcommittee in 1969 and 1970 to see if there was any reference to this type of very expensive student loan, and it was there that I found the brief comment from the Office of Education on the "problems" of compliance with truth in lending on the insured and NDEA loans.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS WILL STUDY ISSUE

If there are, in fact, such problems and they are serious, I am sure they can be worked out, either through amendment to the act, if that is necessary, or by administrative action by the Federal Reserve. It is my intention in the present session to arrange for hearings by the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs on the whole range of issues presented by the operation of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, now that the truth-in-lending title has been in operation for 1½ years, the restriction of garnishment title for more than half a year, and the extortionate extension of credit title for nearly 3 years. During such hearings, I am sure the members of the subcommittee which originated the Consumer Credit Protection Act will be more than willing to consider any problems called to our attention under the law. As with any law, this one, of course, requires periodic review and should be changed when the facts warrant.

Hence, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Education and Labor will agree to strike section 422 from the administration's higher education bill so that the committee with proper jurisdiction can look at the facts in connection with the Office of Education views on the applicability of truth in lending to college loans. I am sure all members of the Committee on Banking and Currency will join me in support of our jurisdictional rights on this issue.

In the meantime, I hope college students and their parents are looking at and profiting from the information now being made available to them on all types

of college loans under the Truth-in-Lending Act and I would like to hear from some of them whether they feel the information they receive on these loans under the law is of no importance or protection, as the administration has claimed.

DRUG-DEPENDENT PERSONS REHABILITATION ACT OF 1971

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide new procedures for the civil commitment of drug-dependent persons and to expand the scope of the provisions of titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code relating to the treatment of drug-dependent persons in criminal proceedings, and for other purposes; the Drug-Dependent Persons Rehabilitation Act of 1971.

This is the second in a series of crime bills I announced I would be introducing during the coming weeks.

In January of last year the Congress passed a strong law enforcement oriented drug bill which became the law of the land in October of 1970. I supported that bill because it was necessary to cope with the growing army of young drug users who are being arrested at the rate of one every 5 minutes in the United States.

However, I feel it is now time that the focus of Congress should be on legislation that is directed at the rehabilitation and treatment of the drug addict and the drug abuser.

That is the goal of the legislation I introduce today.

The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act was enacted in 1966 in response to the serious narcotic problem in America during the mid 1960's and represented the first major change in the attitude of the Federal Government toward the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

I was in agreement with the goals of that act and worked for its passage.

The act provided an alternative to imprisonment for heroin addicts either charged with or convicted of certain Federal offenses. It provided for their commitment to treatment and rehabilitation for extended periods of time. The addict was under custody while in a hospital or other institution and supervised aftercare was provided in the community after their release from custody.

In addition, the act established procedures for the voluntary civil commitment of narcotic addicts, who had neither been charged with nor convicted of offenses, but who were in need of treatment for their addiction and could be successfully treated and returned to their communities.

As the legislation was passed, however, it denied some or all of the treatment established under this law to large classes of addicts.

It excluded addicts charged with housebreaking or burglary.

It excluded addicts who had previously

failed under three or more civil commitments.

And it excluded addicts with two or more felony convictions.

The present bill broadens the coverage to include these categories of addicts who are, in the main, most in need of help.

Drugs, by their very nature, make an addict ineffectual and indifferent, unable to hold an honest job. Without legitimate resources he must seek money for his drugs through crime. Traditionally, his loss of drive led him to the easy way out—committing crimes of a nonviolent nature. And crime has always been the principal source of money for the addict and so most genuine addicts have a record of two or three felony convictions.

The trapped, the cornered, the panicked sick addict is one who may resort to violence. That is not to say heroin causes the addict to panic—it is rather the lack of the drug and the threat of withdrawal that causes him to sometimes strike out blindly, hysterically or in a deadly manner. And because there are more addicts today, there are more of them involved in serious crimes.

So it is not unusual for a 19- or 20-year-old addict to have two felony convictions.

Further, there is ample testimony that three prior civil commitments should not prevent an addict from benefiting from treatment the fourth or fifth time around.

Indeed, research shows that the more relapses an addict experiences, the closer he is to ultimate abstinence and rehabilitation.

Addiction is a chronic disease where relapse is the expected rather than the exceptional behavior. We know that every relapse may bring the addict closer to ultimate rehabilitation. And we know that with proper help, addicts tend to grow out of their dependence on drugs as they get older.

Even more important, however, since treatment programs for addicts differ throughout the country, both in nature and quality, and since all such programs can be expected to improve as we gain more experience, failure under any program in the past should not deny an addict the improved treatment methods of the future.

Now that the NARA has been in operation for a period of time, we have received increasingly more evidence that the original restrictions often exclude those very addicts who could obtain the greatest benefit from the treatment offered under the act.

Because of those early restrictions, the act has been called self-defeating and the criteria for eligibility has been termed "absurd" by recent witnesses before Congress.

Let me emphasize this by pointing out that during the first 21 months the act was in operation, only 74 addicts were civilly committed under title I in lieu of prosecution.

This is the record of a law that was hailed as a "breakthrough" in our efforts to treat addicts.

I think it is a sorry record when we consider the fact that there may be as many as 100,000 heroin addicts in the United States.

This revision of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act is of great significance. When the original act was passed, I was concerned over the features I have just described which I consider inimical to its success. After having reviewed the performance of this program and after discussing it with those who know its operation intimately, I think this is the appropriate time to replace it with a new progressive program.

I believe the changes contained in the bill I propose today will improve the treatment of narcotic addicts not only at the Federal level, but in the entire Nation.

It will do so because it will set an example for the States to follow.

As my colleagues will recall, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 contained four titles:

First. The first title provided for the civil commitment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in lieu of prosecution of the charges against the addict;

Second. The second title provided for sentencing to commitment for the treatment of addicts in lieu of sentencing to a penal institution;

Third. The third title provided for the voluntary civil commitment of addicts who were not charged with nor convicted of offenses; and

Fourth. The fourth title provided for rehabilitation and posthospitalization, aftercare programs, and for assistance to States and localities.

The legislation that I now offer would expand the scope of coverage of drug abusers by not only including narcotic addicts, that is, those addicted to the opiate drugs including heroin, but also persons dependent upon the depressant and stimulant drugs, including the pep pills—amphetamines—the goofballs—barbiturates—and the hallucinogens such as marijuana and LSD.

If this bill is adopted, persons either charged with or convicted of Federal offenses, or even persons not charged, would be eligible for Federal treatment and rehabilitation programs for their dependence upon the barbiturates—doctors at the Federal narcotic hospitals indicate that they have more problems with physical withdrawal of many barbiturate addicts than with those addicted to the opiates—or any one or a combination of the other drugs including the depressants, stimulants, and hallucinogens.

There is a myriad of drug abuse existing in the United States and persons not only become addicted to narcotics, but become physically and psychologically dependent upon a wide range of drugs.

It is only logical then to change the Federal law and to open up our programs of hospitalization, treatment and rehabilitation to those who have fallen victim to any of the various types of drug abuse, not just heroin or opiate addiction.

This is true because basically these individuals share the same deficiencies and problems.

Estimates of the abuse of these drugs vary, but if only 10 percent of the 12 million Americans who have tried marijuana become habituated to its use, then we have a serious problem. The same is

true with regard to the millions of individuals who are abusers of the depressant and stimulant drugs.

In any case, physical withdrawal can be achieved in a relatively short time. The far more serious problem is psychological or emotional dependence which is shared by all types of drug dependent persons.

It may be true that more property crimes are committed by hard narcotics abusers because of their intense craving for the drug, but such crimes are not unknown among other drug users. This means treating all drug users will reduce more crime than just treating one category of narcotic offenders.

I propose further to broaden the law's coverage to provide that persons with two prior felony convictions and three previous civil commitments could be eligible for treatment and rehabilitation under titles I and II of the act for the reasons I have outlined.

This means that hundreds of drug dependent persons presently excluded from coverage under this act would have medical treatment made possible.

I would delete from the definition of crime of violence, as in the current law, the offenses of housebreaking and burglary.

These are fundamentally property crimes which comprise the bulk of offenses committed by addicts.

Many Members of both Houses fought these exclusionary provisions when the statute was under consideration.

Subsequent events have proven that these provisions were mistakes. The amendments I introduce today are consistent with the medical view that many addicts who are treatable are eliminated from treatment.

A further desirable feature of my bill allows a person to be eligible for civil commitment in lieu of prosecution if he is charged with the sale of dependent drugs for his own personal use. This is completely in line with the provisions of the recently enacted Comprehensive Drug Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

There are compelling reasons for expanding the facilities for the treatment of drug dependent persons.

Recent testimony before Congress indicates that in the neighborhood of only 50 percent of the people committed under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act can be retained for treatment because of a shortage of staff and facilities.

Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, the former Director of the National Institute of Mental Health claims that the capabilities of the two main treatment centers at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex., are chronically overtaxed.

Yet, the estimates of the Institute show that increasingly more addicts will be committed to treatment in the years to come.

The total number of committed narcotic addicts alone is expected to surpass the 10,000 mark by 1975. This compares to only 2,438 patients committed under this law in 1970, the bulk of whom were non-offenders. The offender addicts were denied treatment because of the reasons I have just set forth.

That is why I have provided that not only facilities and programs of the Pub-

lic Health Service be utilized but that other facilities, either approved or established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, be used for the treatment of all drug dependent persons.

This law should reach the largest possible number of drug dependent persons in the Nation who can benefit from treatment.

That is why I want to make more people eligible.

And the facilities to treat them should be made available.

That is why I have provided for an expansion of the service available for such treatment.

Since supplying such a program for drug dependent offenders is the most effective approach to the drug problem, I hope this bill will receive strong support from my colleagues in both Houses.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS, today, for 15 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter in three instances.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in five instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona in two instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. SANDMAN in two instances.

Mr. MCCOLLISTER in three instances.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. CULVER in five instances.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. FOLEY in two instances.

Mr. GAYDOS in four instances.

Mr. ABOUREZK in three instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. SARBANES in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in four instances.

Mr. UDALL in 10 instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. O'NEILL in four instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 8, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

356. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. No. 92-60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

357. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the facts and justification for the proposed closure of Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, and Perrin Air Force Base, Tex., pursuant to section 613, Public Law 89-568; to the Committee on Armed Services.

358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application for a loan by the Roy Water Conservancy Subdistrict of Roy, Utah, pursuant to section 4(c) of the Small Reclamation Projects Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

359. A letter from the Secretary of Health Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for new health manpower educational initiatives, increase the level of financial assistance to health professions schools and other institutions training health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

360. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

361. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

362. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 5590. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 5591. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. HAYS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. POWELL, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. WYLLIE):

H.R. 5592. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and operate a National Museum and Repository of Negro History and Culture at or near Wilberforce, Ohio; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5593. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1902, to exempt certain common carriers of passengers from the District of Columbia mileage tax imposed by that act and from certain other District of Columbia taxes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5594. A bill to terminate the airlines mutual aid agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 5595. A bill to authorize the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky to hold court at Pineville, Ky; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 5596. A bill to assist school districts to meet special problems incident to desegregation, and to the elimination, reduction, or prevention of racial isolation, in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5597. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 5598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. RUFFE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as

amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 5600. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5601. A bill to clarify the application of section 1073 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5602. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with noncapital offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5603. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5604. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall not disclose to the public the names and addresses of certain persons licensed as collectors of firearms and ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5605. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 5606. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 5607. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to make its benefits available to certain areas of extra high unemployment, to authorize additional funds for such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 5609. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5610. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide for the establishment of a national comprehensive regional rehabilitation center for low (under) achieving deaf; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 5611. A bill to establish a commission to review U.S. antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 5612. A bill to provide new procedures for the civil commitment of drug-dependent persons and to expand the scope of the provisions of titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code relating to the treatment of drug-dependent persons in criminal proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5613. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to protect consumers against careless and unfair billing practices, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 5614. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for new health manpower educational initiatives, increase the level of financial assistance to health professions schools and other institutions training health personnel, improve the distribution and increase the supply of health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5615. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 5616. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide protection thereunder against losses resulting from earthquakes and earthslides; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself, Mr. GETTYS, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 5617. A bill to provide for a Federal ecological preserve in a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf in the Santa Barbara Channel and to provide for a moratorium on drilling operations pending the ability to control and prevent pollution by oil discharges and to improve the state of the art with respect to oil production from the submerged lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 5618. A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of the income of an individual who is over 65 years of age shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 5620. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain property to the city of Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5621. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the shipment at Government expense of motor vehicles owned by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5622. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State fish and wildlife agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5623. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5624. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Anchorage, Alaska, interests of the United States in certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5625. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5626. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Old Kodiak National Historic site in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5627. A bill to provide for the establishment of the post cemetery at Fort Richardson, Alaska, as a national cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 5628. A bill to provide for public ownership of the mass transit bus system operated by D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and other private but transit companies engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the Washington metropolitan area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 5629. A bill to establish a diversion program for burley tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 5630. A bill to provide implementation of the Federal Trade Commission Act to give increased protection to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MINISH, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KARTH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. REES, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 5631. A bill to provide implementation of the Federal Trade Commission Act to give increased protection to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. GRAY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mrs. CHISHOLM):

H.R. 5632. A bill to provide implementation of the Federal Trade Commission Act to give increased protection to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 5633. A bill to establish a national program of monthly children's allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5634. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 as it applies to public buildings for use by the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 5635. A bill to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to require the preparation of a proposal for a convention center-sports arena to be located within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 5636. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 5637. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited samples of cigarettes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5638. A bill to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on firemen, to provide criminal penalties for interfering with firemen in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5639. 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. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. ASPIN,

Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 5640. A bill to protect the political rights and privacy of individuals and organizations and to define the authority of the Armed Forces to collect, distribute, and store information about civilian political activity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr.

MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. YATES, and Mrs. ABZUG):

H.R. 5641. A bill to protect the political rights and privacy of individuals and organizations and to define the authority of the Armed Forces to collect, distribute, and store information about civilian political activity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 5642. A bill to protect the public health and welfare by providing for the inspection of imported dairy products and by requiring that such products comply with certain minimum standards for quality and wholesomeness; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 5643. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the county of Grayson, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr.

ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAM, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GIAMMO, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5644. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the purpose of developing and improving communication procedures and facilities with respect to the prompt and efficient dispatch of police, fire, rescue, and other emergency services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. HILLIS,

Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LINK, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MANN, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STEELE, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES H.

WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 5645. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the purpose of developing and improving communication procedures and facilities with respect to the prompt and efficient dispatch of police, fire, rescue, and other emergency services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself,

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BRADEMAM, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISHER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LENT, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 5646. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself,

Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SLACK, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THONE, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 5647. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 5648. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility study of the Salton Sea project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 5649. 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.

H.R. 5650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5651. 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. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5652. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide that for purposes of unemployment compensation the States shall treat accrued leave of ex-service-men as wages for past services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 5653. A bill Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr.

BLACKBURN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. SEBELIUS, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the submission of balanced Federal funds budgets by the President and action by the Congress to provide revenues to offset Federal funds deficits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution regarding persecution of Jews in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. Res. 273. Resolution to provide funds for expenses incurred under activities authorized by House Resolution 242; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 274. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5654. A bill for the relief of Francesca and Lyca Palminteri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 5655. A bill to convey the interest of the United States in certain property in Fairbanks, Alaska, to Hillcrest, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5656. A bill for the relief of Albert G. Feller and Flora Feller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5657. A bill for the relief of William D. Pender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5658. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of Thomas Pillifant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5659. A bill for the relief of Silvia del Socorro Arroyo de Lugo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5660. A bill for the relief of Jean-Yves Dejax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5661. A bill for the relief of Anthony and Carolina Monaco, and their daughters, Lucia Monaco and Patricia Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5662. A bill for the relief of Honesto M. Magdirla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 5663. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Bagnato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5664. A bill for the relief of Francesco Parinisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 5665. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Nery Bueno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 5666. A bill for the relief of Walter L. and Thelma M. Bossard; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5667. A bill for the relief of Lidia Teresa Zrobion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 5668. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ronald W. Grout, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

41. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, relative to family assistance programs, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.